

Serhiy Bilenky, ed. *Fashioning Modern Ukraine: Selected Writings of Mykola Kostomarov, Volodymyr Antonovych, and Mykhailo Drahomanov.*

The Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research Monograph Series 6. Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2013. xlvi, 500 pp. Foreword by Frank E. Sysyn. Illustrations. Index. C\$64.95, cloth. C\$44.95, paper.

This collection of documents (translated mostly by Richard Hantula, but in one case by Marta D. Olynyk and in another by Dolly Ferguson) contains some of the most important texts of nineteenth-century Ukrainian intellectual history: excerpts from the long version of Mykola Kostomarov's autobiography and a complete translation of the short version; his essay "Two Rus' Nationalities"; Volodymyr Antonovych's "Memoirs"; his "My Confession"; his essay "The Views of the Ukrainophiles"; Mykhailo Drahomanov's "Autobiographical Sketch"; his essay "Jews and Poles in the Southwestern Region"; and about a hundred pages of his "Selected Correspondence with the Old Hromada of Kyiv." Apart from valuable explanatory footnotes, the book's editorial matter includes a substantial general introduction, brief biographies of each of the three authors, and prefaces to each of the translated works. Because the selected authors were prolific, doing justice to the full range of their work is difficult, but the book provides much better access to their ideas than English-speaking readers have had until now. Henceforth, it will be much easier for these readers to understand such penetrating accounts of prerevolutionary Ukrainian political thought as Ivan Lysiak-Rudnyts'kyi's remarkable 1977 essay, "The Fourth Universal and Its Ideological Antecedents."

The editor's wide-ranging general introduction discusses intellectual life in Ukraine over the course of the "long" nineteenth century (roughly the years from the Russian abolition of the Ukrainian Hetmanate in 1764 and the Austrian annexation of Galicia from Poland in 1772 to the collapse of the Russian and Habsburg empires at the end of the First World War). It begins by pointing out that the Ukrainian awakening in the Russian Empire had its origin in the determination of the "Cossack middle stratum" to confirm its privileges in the wake of the dissolution of the Ukrainian Hetmanate. In the course of trying to prove their entitlement to Russian nobility, these descendants of Cossacks acquired a sense of their community's history, which, in turn, made them more self-confident and even assertive. At a remove, the first two of the three authors in the book, Kostomarov and Drahomanov, emerged from the formerly Cossack milieu. In part because it no longer existed, their country suffered from "an incomplete social structure, the lack of a powerful 'national' bourgeoisie, and belated and insufficient modernization of Ukrainian culture and society" (xv). These were

the problems with which all three of the authors in the book had to contend. Bilenky outlines the three main sets of categories that scholars have devised for chronologizing the Ukrainian intellectuals' responses to their difficulties: the first is essentially geographic (in which, it is held, Ukrainian intellectual leadership passed from Novhorod-Siverskyi to Kharkiv to Kyiv to Geneva and, finally, to Galicia); the second is essentially social (in which intellectual leadership passed from nobles to populists and then to modernists); and the third is essentially methodological (in which ethnically conscious Ukrainians began by heritage-gathering before turning to the foundation of nationally orientated organizations and, eventually, taking up politics). However one periodizes Ukrainian intellectual life in the long nineteenth century, the editor contends that three main issues lay at its heart: 1) whether to concentrate on the promotion of Ukrainian culture or focus on politics; 2) whether to espouse socialism or nationalism; and 3) whether to advocate partnership with non-Ukrainians in some sort of federal political structure or press for complete independence. Some of these dilemmas still confront Ukrainians today.

These three main issues figure prominently in the book's translated texts. Much of Kostomarov's work after his return from internal exile in the second half of the 1850s testified to the emphasis that he placed not on politics, but on the historical dimension of Ukrainian culture. His 1861 essay "Two Rus' Nationalities" was a striking attempt to create a framework for Ukrainian history in which the latter can be held to begin not with the emergence of Cossacks in the fifteenth or sixteenth centuries, but with the chroniclers' first mentions of Slavs a thousand years earlier. In the course of his translation of this essay into English, the translator faced the particular quandary of the Russian-language original using the word *ruskii* to mean "pertaining to Rus'" (the medieval entity from which a number of subsequent polities emerged), when, even in the nineteenth century, it usually just meant "Russian." Titling the translation "Two Rus' Nationalities" instead of the literal, but misleading, "Two Russian Nationalities" was a good solution to this difficulty, but it also might have been a fine idea to employ the adjectival form "Rusian" (in place of "Russian") for use in the translation of Kostomarov's essay, on the grounds that its novelty would have obliged readers to keep the author's principal thought in mind at all points in their reading.

It could be argued that Volodymyr Antonovych's orientation was even more strongly cultural than that of Kostomarov. While making very clear the cultural foundations of his commitment to Ukraine, his 1881 essay "The Views of the Ukrainophiles" pointed to "the many past and present states where diverse nationalities live together in friendship" and objected to the view that developing an ethnic group's cultural foundations amounted to

“high treason” or “an act of political separatism” (263). Antonovych’s cultural approach had federalist implications, but he did not insist on them.

Of the three authors represented in this volume, Mykhailo Drahomanov is the most highly politicized. As the editor points out, the passages translated here from his “Selected Correspondence” (from the late 1880s) show “the most important Ukrainian political émigré admonishing the Old Hromada [in Kyiv] for abstaining from political activity in Russian-ruled Ukraine” (356). Thus, the book reflects the way in which, toward the end of the nineteenth century, Ukrainian political thought was turning in the direction of activism.

All students of Ukrainian history and culture need this book, as well as those with any kind of interest in the ways that intellectuals have found to codify and develop subordinate ethnic identities.

David Saunders
Newcastle University, UK

