

American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages

Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter by Peter J. Potichnyj; Marc Raeff; Jaroslaw Pelenski; Gleb N. Zekulin; National History as Cultural Process: A Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914 by Stephen Velychenko

Review by: Mark von Hagen

The Slavic and East European Journal, Vol. 39, No. 3 (Autumn, 1995), pp. 467-469

Published by: [American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/308264>

Accessed: 06/10/2014 13:01

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavic and East European Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Ukraine and Russia in Their Historical Encounter. Edited by Peter J. Potichnyj, Marc Raeff, Jaroslaw Pelenski, Gleb N. Zekulin. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, University of Alberta, 1992. 346 pp., \$24.95 (cloth).

Stephen Velychenko. *National History as Cultural Process: A Survey of the Interpretations of Ukraine's Past in Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian Historical Writing from the Earliest Times to 1914*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, University of Alberta, 1992. 283 pp., \$24.95 (cloth).

A distinguished set of scholars participated in the first Conference on Ukrainian-Russian Relations in Hamilton, Ontario in 1981. The first volume under review, produced by that conference, starts from the premise of mutual historical misunderstanding between Ukrainians and Russians (and consequently between historians of Ukraine and historians of Russia) and from the hope that such misunderstanding might be overcome through dispassionate scholarly discussion. In his introduction to the volume, Omeljan Pritsak traces the roots of the distrust to the Treaty of Pereiaslav in 1654, while Jaroslaw Pelenski insists that an even earlier conflict over the Kievan patrimony is primary. Nearly all the articles have held up remarkably well over the more than ten years that have elapsed since the conference was convened. The first several contributions, by Edward Keenan, Pelenski, Marc Raeff, and Hans-Joachim Torke (and Nicholas Riasanovsky in his concluding remarks), insist on not anachronistically applying modern conceptual categories to the study of premodern mentalities. The national historians of both Ukraine and Russia have to a large degree been guilty of such anachronism, so the contributors to this conference volume, instead of posing new questions, in fact go back to old ones but with a new critical attitude toward the extant sources.

Pelenski warns that we should not assume the existence of a unified Old Rus' state or speak of a conflict between "nationalities" in the early medieval period. He concludes that the Kievan inheritance, in important ways, belongs to neither (and both) the histories of Russia and Ukraine, that both Muscovy and Galicia-Volhynia can trace their origins and legitimacy to the Rus' state. Keenan's think-piece on the Muscovite perception of other East Slavs before 1654 strikes the reader as very modern in its attempt to understand notions of identity in the early modern period. He finds in the Smuta the first traces of Russian national sentiment, but the transformation of mentalities took much longer to work itself out; otherwise, Muscovites paid precious little attention to their Slavic neighbors and certainly were not set on a conscious program of imperialist expansion. He insists that we not assume too much about what Muscovite secular elites read or understood, in particular that they shared the more ambitious values of the clerical elites' chronicles. Torke, too, denies an early Russian imperialism that culminated in the Pereiaslav Treaty, but demonstrates that Muscovy's attitude toward the Hetmanate was one of reserve due to fear of Cossack ideals of revolution and the social unrest associated with the *dikoe pole*. Raeff tries to answer the question of how it was that Ukraine was transformed from the cultural superior of Russia at the time of its subordination into a peasant culture, inferior and repressed, in the nineteenth century. In so doing, he explores some of the ironies that resulted from Ukraine's role as the transmitter of modern European political culture, in particular cameralist and Enlightenment absolutist thinking, in the building of the Petrine empire. The volume's "history" section is rounded off by Edgar Hoesch's review of legislation affecting Ukraine during the reign of Paul I and Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak's essay on Ukrainian women's organizations and the participation of Ukrainian women in community activities.

John Armstrong returns to some of the issues raised by Pelenski, but chooses to ask a different question: rather than expend effort to determine whose myth of origins is "truer," he

proposes studying the myths and symbols as such, how they work, and how they are transmitted. He relies on the writings of Karl Deutsch (1953) and Clifford Geertz to reconsider Ukrainian nationalism as something more than a chapter in the history of ideas, closer to sociology of knowledge. He identifies the foundation myth for Ukrainians in Cossacks and an image of “freer, less centralized Ukrainian society.” In keeping with the theme of mutual misperceptions, John Reshetar tries to explain why the period of Revolution and Civil War remained a lost opportunity for restructuring the Ukrainian-Russian relationship. Except for Semen Petliura, he finds too many Ukrainians holding on too long to their illusions about a democratic or revolutionary Russia; except for Vasili Maklakov, he can identify no significant Russians who were able to break with their idea of Ukraine’s subordinate place in the Russian state. Although Reshetar tries to sympathetically portray the Ukrainians’ perceptions, he is far less even-handed with the Russians (i.e., unless a Russian agrees to Ukrainian independence from the start, he is a renegade). Reshetar has taken as his perspective one that posits an independent Ukrainian state as its end; this is not only anachronistic but it also misrepresents much Ukrainian political thought, especially that from Eastern Ukraine. Yaroslav Bilinsky continues the exploration of Russian-Ukrainian misunderstandings in his investigation of the political thought of the anti-Soviet dissident circles of the 1970s. He finds at least the liberals associated with the Helsinki Groups to have been capable of collaborative work, but beyond these small groups, he finds much of Russian dissidence to be dominated by Russian nationalists or imperialists. He unfortunately ignores some of the more extreme Ukrainian dissident ideologists. His hopes for an evolution of Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s views toward greater understanding of the Ukrainian question are belied by Solzhenitsyn’s open letter to the conference participants, which appears as an appendix to the volume.

The culture section opens with James Cracraft’s discussion of Baroque art in Russia and Ukraine. After a discussion of problems of definition and sources (especially the destruction of so many architectural monuments in the twentieth century), Cracraft nonetheless defends the notion of a Baroque, but prefers to speak of a Baroque in Ukraine rather than a “Ukrainian Baroque.” He distinguishes among periods of differing cultural diffusion that produced an early Galician Baroque architecture with clear Italian and Polish influences, a distinctive Cossack architecture that employed some Baroque ornaments but fails his test for a genuine Baroque style, and finally the Imperial Baroque that came back to Ukraine from the Russian capital, most vividly captured in Rastrelli’s St. Andrew’s Church in Kiev. George Grabowicz outlines several important parameters for a history of Ukrainian-Russian literary relations in the nineteenth century, including the issues of legacy and influence, the bilingualism of several Ukrainian writers, the political and cultural context of the relationship, and what he calls the deep structures of the two literatures. He rejects the Romantic notion of literature as the emanation of a “nation” and proposes instead a new periodization for Ukrainian literature that reflects the evolution of Russian Imperial, Russian national, and Ukrainian national identities and cultures.

Bohdan Bociurkiw views the politics of revolution and Civil War in Ukraine through the prism of the reform movements in the relations between Ukrainian and Russian Orthodoxy. Similar but not always parallel to the competing political orientations of autonomy and separatism, religious activists, facing a very anti-Ukrainian Orthodox higher clergy, also experimented with autonomy and then autocephaly. Red and White invasions rendered the experiments stillborn. Ralph Clem and Peter Woroby round out the volume with a survey of demographic and economic trends that shape the Russian-Ukrainian encounter; both focus on especially the redistribution of Russians away from their traditional “ethnoterritories” and into regions of economic development, including eastern and southern Ukraine. Clem and Woroby evaluate this growing demographic imbalance very differently; Clem refrains from drawing any political implications, while Woroby sees the strength of the Russians in the east and south as having “produced a dangerous situation for Ukrainians.” Finally, both authors

raise the fascinating issue of how to study the process of assimilation of Ukrainians to Russian identity, whether in or outside of Ukraine.

One particularly revealing aspect of the Ukrainian-Russian encounter as revealed in the first half of the Potichnyj volume has been the creation by historians of national traditions in historiography. That is the subject of the second book under review, by Stephen Velychenko, a research fellow at the Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Toronto. Velychenko sets out as his aim “a comparative study of historiography as ideology” and “a guide and summary of the Polish, Russian and Ukrainian images of Ukrainian history.” He argues that, despite “advances” in the writing of scientific history especially in the nineteenth century, most historians of the three traditions remained firmly in the hold of national mythologies that permitted little room for evolution of ideas. Velychenko comes to the rather unsurprising conclusion that historians writing during the century of “high” nationalism were biased.

For Polish historians, the important context was the acceptance of Poland’s “civilizing mission” in the borderlands, first in a Christian version and later in the secular, positivist variant. Velychenko highlights the work of Joachim Lelewel and Aleksander Jablonowski. For Russians, too, the competition with Poland was paramount in shaping their view of Ukrainian issues; in so far as Ukrainian history figured in Russian narratives, it was to challenge Poland’s rights to right-bank Ukraine. Here the key figure who formulated the Russian position was Nikolai Ustrialov. Ukrainian history by Ukrainians evolves from the Cossack elites’ defense of their rights and autonomy to the nineteenth-century populists’ assault on imperial depredations on the welfare of the Ukrainian peasantry. In large measure, *National History as Cultural Process* was conceived to situate the landmark 1904 essay by Myhailo Hrushevskyyi, “The Traditional Scheme of Russian History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the Eastern Slavs.”

Velychenko’s bibliography is a very useful guide for scholars; his summaries of the major, and often minor, histories and historians is painstaking. He chooses to narrow his inquiry to events and issues that he deems significant in relations between Poland, Russia, and Ukraine, and whose interpretation helped to shape each nation’s image of Ukraine and Ukraine’s image of them. The principle of selection, however, appears somewhat arbitrary. Why, for example, should the subjection of the Kievan Metropolitanate in 1686 to Muscovite Patriarchal authority be excluded from this list? Velychenko also omits the history of source publications from his account, surely an important component of the “scientization” of modern history-writing.

The result is a work of indeterminate character, neither intellectual, political nor social history as such. The summaries of various trends in historical writing are presented largely without any of the surrounding contexts that were so important both in shaping the trends as well as in explaining their widespread dissemination among elites. The principle of organization of the book is also frustrating in that Velychenko devotes one chapter to general works of history that treat Ukrainian topics among others and then a second one on textbooks and monographs that deal specifically with Ukrainian topics. Since most of the authors appear in both chapters, much of the summarizing is very fragmented and repetitive. Unfortunately, the work is not one for the generalist or general reader, but will be useful only for those specialists who know the history of medieval and early modern Ukraine. Those qualifications aside, this volume and its companion by the same author on twentieth-century histories will serve as important reference works for historians of all three nations, as well as those interested in nationalism and its relationship to the discipline of history.

Mark von Hagen, Columbia University