

because of the absence of reference notes, readers cannot easily identify the scholarly literature that Cowan draws upon. Thus, despite the book's overall solidity, it fails in many respects to measure up to another recent survey of European urban history: Christopher R. Friedrichs's *The Early Modern City, 1450-1750*.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Terence McIntosh

History of Ukraine Rus', Volume Seven: The Cossack Age to 1625, by Mykhailo Hrushevsky. Translated by Bohdan Strumiński, edited by Serhii Plokny. Edmonton, Alberta, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1999. lxvi, 548 pp. \$90.00 Cdn (cloth).

On 23 February 1898 a gathering of Ukrainian scholars associated with the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Lviv made what they knew to be an epoch-making decision: they approved for publication the first volume of a "History of Ukraine-Rus'" written by a professor at the local university, Mykhailo Hrushevsky.

Actually, the decision was a foregone conclusion, since Professor Hrushevsky had just been elected the Society's president three weeks previously. It was momentous nonetheless, because this was still an era when history writing could have immense and immediate repercussions on politics, culture, and even social life.

By inaugurating a multi-volume scholarly history of Ukraine, they were proclaiming to the world their existence and their right to exist. They meant to give the lie to a widely shared view, expounded with the most intellectual force by the German philosopher Hegel, that certain peoples, including the Ukrainians, were entirely "without history," destined to be mere objects in a great game that only others could play. More concretely, they were proving that in spite of centuries of Polish and Russian rule over the lands of Ukraine, the Ukrainians had pursued their own distinctive and distinguished development and were not to be digested in the bowels of their neighbours.

Hrushevsky was a master of symbolism. It was he, as president of the Ukrainian Central Rada and of the short-lived Ukrainian National Republic of the revolutionary era, who drew from the depths of history the trident symbol that was to serve as the Maple Leaf of Ukraine both during 1917-20 and again after the renewal of independence in 1991. His historical work of 1898 was also a piece of symbolism, perfectly, deliberately timed to coincide with the hundredth anniversary of the publication of the first book in vernacular Ukrainian, Ivan Kotliarevsky's *Eneida*.

The publication of this travesty of Virgil's *Aeneid* in 1798 had touched off the Ukrainian national revival that dominated the nineteenth century, and Hrushevsky, a century later, meant to do something similar. Indeed, the century that has followed the publication of Hrushevsky's first volume has been the most dramatic in the entire course of Ukrainian history. It has seen the first, bloody, defeated attempt to establish an independent Ukrainian state during the tempest of world war and revolution, events in which Hrushevsky himself played a leading role. It has

also seen the establishment of Soviet rule in Ukraine, which took an unspeakable toll through purges and unnatural famine. It saw Nazi occupation, followed by Stalinist reoccupation. And it saw, at the end, the re-emergence of a Ukrainian state, with more than its fair share of problems, but peaceable, stable, and awkwardly finding its place among the world of nations. Many of the ideas which fuelled the final outcome were Hrushevsky's.

Now, a century after the publication of the first Ukrainian edition, an English translation of Hrushevsky's major work is coming out, with an updated scholarly apparatus. This new publication will not have the repercussions that the Ukrainian original did. It is no longer necessary to prove the distinctiveness of the Ukrainian people, nor, in the post-colonial age, does much depend politically on the length of a people's history or the length of the footnotes in a scholarly treatment of that history. Now Hrushevsky's book can be just a book, not a brick in the edifice of a national construction.

The original promoters of this project, however, still held to the brick-in-the-edifice point of view. The idea to translate Hrushevsky's ten (or eleven, depending how you count) thick and erudite volumes into English was originally pursued in the decades after World War II by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in exile. But this association of emigre scholars, through no fault of its own, lacked the financial and professional wherewithal to bring such a massive and complicated project to fruition.

The idea was reinvigorated in the late 1980s by Peter Jacyk, a Toronto businessman who wanted to do something for his native Ukraine by funding Ukrainian studies in the West in a spectacular way. Ukraine at that time was still part of the Soviet Union, and Ukrainian political prisoners were still dying in exile. Mr. Jacyk thought that publishing all of Hrushevsky in English translation would strengthen awareness of Ukraine in Western intellectual circles.

After discussions with Bohdan Krawchenko, then the director of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta, Mr. Jacyk agreed to give one million dollars to found the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research. Its first major project was to be to publish all of Hrushevsky's *History* in English.

By the time that the Centre was actually established, in 1989, things had changed in Ukraine. The country was not yet independent, but political exiles were returning home from the camps and the public squares resounded with political speeches. Censorship largely collapsed, and long-forbidden texts once more appeared on the pages of newspapers and journals. In 1989 one of the great sensations was the republication of some of Hrushevsky's works in installments in literary journals. For over half a century his works had been banned in the Soviet Union. The Jacyk Centre was only two years old when Ukraine declared independence in 1991. In that same year the leading scholarly publishing house in Ukraine began republication of the full ten volumes of Hrushevsky's *History* in the original. With Hrushevsky making such an impressive homecoming in the independent Ukraine that he had championed, the Hrushevsky Translation Project at the University of Alberta shed much of its political significance.

Nonetheless, the Project team plugged ahead, under the leadership of Professor Frank Sysyn, the director of the Jacyk Centre. They lavished tremendous care on their work.

The result is an edition of Hrushevsky's work that supersedes the original. Hrushevsky's footnotes have been corrected, typographical errors almost completely eliminated and many new footnotes have been added. Although the publication of Hrushevsky in English will not have the political import that its original motivators hoped for, it remains a scholarly event of the first magnitude.

I suspect that few people, aside from professional historians of Eastern Europe, will read these books cover to cover. And that's a pity. It's a pity that we no longer have the time and the intellectual stamina of readers at the turn of the last century, when indeed these volumes were avidly read. Hrushevsky's *History* is the product of an entirely different mind set.

Hrushevsky was a hard worker, a driven man. He had to be to write as much as he did. Aside from his ten-volume *History*, he also wrote other multi-volume works as well as numerous specialized studies. The level of quality in all he did was extraordinarily high. People who knew him personally have told me that he placed high demands on other people as well as on himself, and that he was, to put it plainly, a curmudgeon. He recruited students to help him survey mountains of sources. He liked to work standing up, at a special desk that was more like a bar than a desk. Spread out over the "bar" were open books and extracts from sources relevant to the topic on which he was writing at that moment. The fruit of all this erudition and hard work were texts that were substantive and stood the test of time.

The volumes of Hrushevsky's work are not appearing in English translation in the order in which they were written. Volume One did appear first, in 1997. But the volume under review, Volume Seven, is only the second to be published. Volume Seven, which was originally published in 1909, is the first volume of a subseries within the *History* entitled *History of the Ukrainian Cossacks*.

The volume opens with an introduction by Serhii Plokyh (pp. xxvii-iii). Plokyh does an excellent job of explaining the Ukrainian intellectual and political context in which Hrushevsky worked, the concrete steps he took to research and write this volume, the specificities of his approach to Cossack history and its overall contribution to the development of Ukrainian historiography.

Hrushevsky begins his text with an account of the origins of the Cossacks. He sees them as growing out of settlements of foragers. Because of Mongol devastation and subsequent Tatar raids, the Eastern Ukrainian lands were relatively uninhabited. But for that very reason these lands were rich in animals and vegetation and attracted a colonizing population which ventured out to fish, hunt, trap and gather honey. These foragers began banding together for protection and then raiding the Tatars. The raids "turned imperceptibly into military campaigns" (p. 47). By mid-century one can speak of almost continual border warfare, and the Cossacks took control of the lower reaches of the Dniro and the steppes. In 1625, the year in which Hrushevsky ends this volume, the Cossacks launched a series of expeditions against Istanbul involving about 20,000 men in over 300 boats.

The Cossack raids in Crimea and elsewhere along the shore of the Black Sea were so devastating that time and again they provoked the Turks to retaliate against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. On the one hand, the Commonwealth valued the Cossacks, because it was unwilling to make the appropriations necessary for proper defence of the border with the Tatars, who made large-scale slave-catching expeditions almost every year. On the other hand, the Cossacks drew the Commonwealth into wars with the Turks that it was rarely ready for. Moreover, the

Cossacks provided refuge for runaway serfs and meddled in religious affairs. The Commonwealth therefore oscillated between a policy of accommodation of Cossackdom and attempts to suppress it entirely.

Hrushevsky pays close attention to religious issues, beginning with his account of the Cossack uprising under Nalyvaiko and Loboda in 1595-96 (pp. 160-85). This conflict coincided with the Union of Brest, whereby the Ruthenian church agreed to unite with the Roman church. The Cossacks opposed the Union right from the start and attacked some of its key promoters. There were several levels to the Cossacks' support of traditional Ukrainian Orthodoxy. The Cossack elite, in Hrushevsky's view, naturally, by education and culture, took up "the national cause" (p. 305), for example, the defence of the Orthodox faith. But even the "wild freebooter. . . found it pleasant to sense a higher mission in Cossack life, to have some ideological framework for his rampages in the steppe borderland" (p. 304). The vicar of the Uniate metropolitan of Kyiv had to flee from Vydubychi monastery when a Cossack entered and began firing at him from a hackbut (p. 309); his escape was only temporary, because later, as a chronicle relates, Cossacks captured him, took him to the Dnipro river "and put him under the ice to drink the water" (p. 311). The Cossacks also engineered the restoration of an Orthodox hierarchy in 1620 (pp. 332-41). The king ordered the bishops arrested, but the Cossacks were able to prevent this by delivering the state from near-certain death at the hands of the Turks. A large Turkish invasion threatened to overwhelm the Commonwealth in 1621, but the Cossacks joined the Polish forces at the last minute and fought valiantly at the Battle of Khotyn, less to save Poland-Lithuania than to protect their Orthodox bishops.

Hrushevsky's text is a fascinating exploration of early modern history, and the English edition of it is an eminent achievement.

University of Alberta

John-Paul Himka

The Thirty Years War: The Holy Roman Empire and Europe, 1618-48, by Ronald G. Asch. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1997. xiv, 247 pp. \$49.95 U.S. (cloth), \$19.95 U.S. (paper).

The Thirty Years War, fought largely within the boundaries of the Holy Roman Empire from 1618 to 1648, is a war which has been neglected by twentieth-century historians. There are many reasons for this neglect. Because the participants in this war came from throughout Europe, the documents on which a good history could be written are not located in one country, let alone in one central archive. They are also in many different languages, with the Thirty Years War historian needing to read Latin, German, French, Dutch, Spanish, Swedish, Danish, Czech, Russian, Slovakian, Polish, and Italian even to get by the most basic contemporary descriptions of the war. And, of course, very few of these documents appear in printed editions.

Then there are the questions which any good historian should ask of these sources. What was the reason the war was fought? Why did the war last for so long? Why was it only fought in the Holy Roman Empire? Why were so many states involved in what might initially have been only a civil war? What role did