Iaroslava Mel'nyk et al., editors. *Ukraina na istoriohrafichnii mapi mizhvoiennoi Ievropy: Materialy mizhnarodnoi naukovoi konferentsii (Miunkhen, Nimechchyna, 1-3 lypnia 2012 r.)* [*Ukraine on the Historiographic Map of Interwar Europe: Proceedings of the International Conference (Munich, Germany, 1-3 July, 2012)*]. Instytut Istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2014. Distributed by CIUS P. 252 pp. $22.95, paper.

Historiography is an enormous field of study, even when it is restricted to a single country, as in this volume. This simple fact is revealed by the great variety of papers gathered together and published here. The only common thread seems to be that all of the Ukrainian historians and subjects deal with the interwar period of European history and all of them place a special emphasis on historiography outside of the Soviet Union. Thus, Mark von Hagen writes about the young socialist follower of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi Pavlo Khrystiuk and his book on the Ukrainian Revolution; Vladyslav Verstiuk about interwar émigré historiography; Oleh Pavlyshyn on the idea of national unity during the period; Zenon E. Kohut on two biographies of the Cossack hetman Petro Doroshenko, both of which were written between the wars but published much later; Frank E. Sysyn on Hrushevs'kyi versus V''iacheslav Lypyns'kyi (Wacław Lipiński); Vadym Adadurov on Élie Borschak (Il'ko Borshchak) in France; Tetiana Boriak on the Prague Ukrainian historians; Leonid Zashkil'niak on the institutional arrangements of Ukrainian historians in Poland; Andrii Portnov on the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw and its historians; Iaroslav Hrytsak on the Polish historical school of Franciszek Bujak and its Ukrainian members; Michael Moser on the important émigré churchman Ivan Ohienko and his notions about the history of the Ukrainian language and how he explained them; Oksana Iurkova on reactions to the death of Hrushevs'kyi; and Serhii Plokhy on Ukrainian historians of the interwar period who studied the document called *Istoriia rusov (History of the Rus' People)*.

After reading this volume, only a few memorable issues immediately come to mind, but they are all quite important. For example, Khrystiuk was a pioneer in arguing that the events in Ukraine from 1917 constituted a real "Ukrainian revolution" separate from the Russian one; censorship and political events prevented the timely publication of the aforementioned two important books on Hetman Doroshenko; Borschak seems, on the surface, to have knowingly exaggerated, falsified, or even created documents to support his particular idea of how Ukrainian history should be written; Ukrainian historians in Poland were institutionally divided into Galicians and émigrés from eastern Ukraine; the Warsaw-based Ukrainian Scientific Institute was probably the single most successful scholarly institution of the period, with

Volume IV, No. 2 (2017) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21226/T2PW5D

the longest list of scholarly monographs and published papers to its credit; Bujak pioneered Polish social history and was friendly to his students from national minorities, such as the Ukrainians and the Jews, despite holding some politically biased opinions about them (but especially about the Jews); and Ohienko's writings generally divided the whole world into "us" and "them," meaning Ukrainians and others, although ironically, he also divided Ukrainians into "us"—that is, easterners—and "them"—Galicians.

While all of these points deserve some serious consideration and all of them deal with émigré historians, it seems to me that the essays on the Ukrainian historians in interwar Poland are topically most closely tied together. Indeed, at one time or another during the period, many of the most important Ukrainian historians lived in the Polish Republic. Aside from Hrushevs'kyi, who returned to Soviet Ukraine in 1924 and could thereafter no longer be considered an émigré, both of the leading historians, Dmytro Doroshenko and Ivan Kryp''iakevych, worked in the territory held by the Polish state, although Kryp''iakevych would already have considered his home to be "occupied western Ukraine" rather than an integral part of Poland. During the period, of course, there were tensions between the Galicians, like Kryp''iakevych, and émigrés, like Doroshenko, and these were encouraged by the Polish authorities in order to isolate the Galicians and to prevent anti-Polish Ukrainian nationalism from spreading from Galicia to other parts of Poland, such as Volhynia and other areas. But there can be no doubt that these Ukrainian historians were very aware of the untoward motivations of the Poles. These two greatest historians seem to have acted with a great deal of restraint: Kryp''iakevych bemoaned the extremism of the Ukrainian political elite and rejected its maximalism with regard to immediate national independence, while Doroshenko never wrote a bad word about his Galician critics, even though many of them boycotted his public lectures and accused him of collaborating with the Poles.

In political life, this type of thing was paralleled by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalist's (OUN) accusations against the Ukrainian National Democratic Alliance (UNDO), the largest Ukrainian political organization in interwar Poland, which, unlike the OUN, always retained a democratic political inclination. It was also paralleled by nationalist threats of political violence against some UNDO members (like Ostap Luts'kyi, a member of the Polish Upper House, or Senate, who was explicitly accused of being "a Polish collaborator"). Certain other Ukrainian public figures were, in fact, assassinated by those OUN extremists.

However, the pressure from the Polish authorities was doubtless more destructive than the threats and occasional violence of the Ukrainian integral nationalists. This was made clear by the stunning success of the Polish

government-supported Ukrainian Scientific Institute, which attracted dozens of talented émigré scholars and published many important books right through to the end of its existence, versus the relative poverty of the Lviv-based Shevchenko Scientific Society, which received no further government support after the Polish reconquest of Galicia in 1919. The Galicians had plenty of talent but little protection, few patrons, and no money. They did what they could, but it could not compare with what the émigrés were able to accomplish in Warsaw. What is quite remarkable, however, is that Kryp''iakevych, in particular, managed to publish a great deal in the Ukrainian language without ever caving in to those strong Polish pressures. Unlike Myron Korduba or Mykola Andrusiak (both of them equally respected and productive Ukrainian historians), throughout the whole period of Polish rule, never once did Kryp''iakevych publish a major work in Polish or any other non-Ukrainian language on Ukrainian history. This important fact goes unexplained in this volume, and it would be desirable to know why and how Kryp''iakevych managed to do it.

With regard to possible compromises and agreements with the Poles, 1935 seems to have been a pivotal year. Toward the end of Józef Piłsudski's life, talk of the establishment of a Ukrainian university once again came alive, and some financial support was promised to the Galicians. But the assassinations of influential Polish government officials—first, Tadeusz Hołówko (1931) and then, a short time later, Bronisław Pieracki (1934)—made this difficult to realize. After the death of Piłsudski, it became impossible.

There were also some important academic conflicts and tensions among the Ukrainian émigrés themselves. Ohienko, for example, kept his distance from the Ukrainian Scientific Institute. And relations between its central figure, Oleksander Lotots'kyi, and the Shevchenko scholar Leonid Biletsky were not good. Lotots'kyi accused Biletsky of a certain kind of unprofessionalism in his scholarship, while Biletsky accused Lotots'kyi of having a narrow-minded bureaucratic approach to things. It is notable that Biletsky's edition of Taras Shevchenko's *Kobzar*, with profuse annotation, was only published in Canada by the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences some years after the 1939-45 war. By that time, Biletsky was a central figure of that Canadian institution, together with Doroshenko and Jaroslav Rudnyckyj.

Adadurov's essay on Borschak also deserves some separate comment. Borschak was a good writer in both Ukrainian and French, and he was quite prolific. However, it has long been known that he frequently took certain liberties with his sources. Adadurov's detailed study reveals that these liberties were far from accidental and much more frequent than previously

Volume IV, No. 2 (2017) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21226/T2PW5D

thought. Doroshenko, in one of his historiographic essays, wrote that Borschak's discoveries were simply remarkable, and in hindsight one can now see what he was getting at—for Adadurov's research conclusively shows that many of these discoveries were simply invented. They reflected, he intimates, what Borschak wanted to see, not what he actually found in the archives.

I myself ran across such a questionable discovery when I was working on the topic of Voltaire's attitude toward Ivan Mazepa, about which he wrote in his books on Charles XII of Sweden (*Histoire de Charles XII roi de Suède* [*History of Charles XII, King of Sweden*], 1731) and Peter the Great's Russia (*Histoire de l'empire de Russie sous Pierre le Grand* [*History of the Russian Empire Under Peter the Great*], 1759-62). (I later published my paper in the *Canadian Journal of History* [no. 2, 2012].) Volodymyr Sichynsky quoted the bulk of an ostensibly important letter by Voltaire explaining his pride in his work on Mazepa and cited Borschak as his source. But when I checked Voltaire's published letters, I could find no trace of it. At the time, I noted that caution should be used when approaching this document, although it was simply too interesting not to quote in full (see Prymak 283; 283, note 51). In the light of Adadurov's essay in this volume, it seems very likely, indeed, that Borschak or one of his unknown editors simply made it up!

Although most of the essays in the book under review are in Ukrainian, almost all of them deal with historians working outside of Ukraine, and so they are also of some interest to scholars working on history, in general, in other countries. It would have been nice, however, had the organizers of the conference at which these papers were originally presented been able to find scholars willing to take on the question of Ukrainian history as it was treated at the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Berlin and by contemporary historians in the United States, such as George Vernadsky. This would have added much more balance to the volume, as indeed would have some discussion of Soviet Ukrainian historiography during the period. But, of course, such desiderata are often very difficult to fulfill. On a different level, the essays by Sysyn and Plokhy in this volume, or at least their contents, are also available in English elsewhere and need not be treated here. The rest of the essays, however, for the most part, make up a new and original contribution to the study of Ukrainian historiography and are to be welcomed for their own sake.

Thomas M. Prymak
University of Toronto

Works Cited

Prymak, Thomas M. "Voltaire on Mazepa and Early Eighteenth-Century Ukraine." *Canadian Journal of History*, vol. 47, no. 2, Autumn 2012, pp. 259-83. *Chtyvo*, shron.chtyvo.org.ua/Pryimak_Toma/Voltaire_on_Mazepa_and_Early_Eighteenth-Century_Ukraine_anhl.pdf. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

Shevchenko, Taras. *Kobzar*. Edited and annotated by Leonid Biletsky, 2nd revised ed., Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in Canada, Institute of Shevchenkology No. 1 / Trident Press, 1952-54. 4 vols. *Diasporiana.org.ua*, diasporiana.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/books/2157/file.pdf; diasporiana.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/books/2189/file.pdf; diasporiana.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/books/2197/file.pdf; diasporiana.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/books/2198/file.pdf. Accessed 28 Aug. 2017.

Sichynsky, Volodymyr. *Ukraine in Foreign Comments and Descriptions from the VIth to XXth Century*. Foreword by Clarence A. Manning, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1953.

Volume IV, No. 2 (2017) DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21226/T2PW5D