

MYKHAILO HRUSHEVSKY, *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, vol. 3: *To the Year 1340*, ed. Yaroslav Fedoruk, Robert Romanchuck, and Frank E. Sysyn, with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasicznyk, trans. Bohdan Strumiński. (The Hrushevsky Translation Project.) Edmondton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2016. Pp. xciv, 651; 1 black-and-white figure and 4 maps. \$119.95. ISBN: 978-1-894865-45-6. doi:10.1086/699883

Mykhailo Hrushevsky is considered an enigmatic researcher of Eastern European History, as he was the first to produce a monumental survey of Ukrainian past. Since its publishing, the *History of Ukraine-Rus'* has become a fundamental work in the field. The ten volumes have been republished several times, half of them twice during the author's life, and reprints of Hrushevsky's *History* appeared in New York between 1954 and 1958. Due to the increased demand for Hrushevsky's works, a big translation project coordinated by the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies started in 1989. For the translation of Volume 3, the second edition (1905) was used. In the introduction to this volume, the author himself pointed out the changes that had their mark on the structure of the volume.

The aim of the Canadian editors was the translation and publication of Hrushevsky's text in its entirety, including notes and bibliography. The task was not an easy one—to translate a work written more than a century ago, and to make it accessible for today's use. Throughout the twentieth century, many contributions on the history of Ukraine have been published, and many scholars have touched upon the same problems discussed by Hrushevsky, some of them even questioning his results. As a consequence, some of Hrushevsky's ideas have been progressively demonstrated as untenable and discarded by more recent scholarship. The editors of the Hrushevsky Translation Project have solved these difficulties by adding new essays and an annotated bibliography as well as an appendix and index into Volume 3, which also includes a glossary and four annotated maps.

The first study, Svitlana Pankova's "Volume 3 of the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*: Mykhailo Hrushevsky's Creative Laboratory," describes the genesis of Volume 3 by using Hrushevsky's diary, correspondence, and autobiography, and includes even references to Volume 3 appearing in the correspondences between other individuals (see, for example, the critical remarks in the correspondence between Alekseĭ A. Shakhmatov and Ivan A. Lynnichenko). Hrushevsky put a lot of energy into the presentation of his work and views. His role was vital in the foundation of the scientific society named after Shevchenko in Lviv (the *Naukovo Tovaristvo imeni Shevchenko*), of which he was the inaugural president. The mission of this society was to "disseminat[e] a national scheme of the Ukrainian past" (xxxii). Reviews in the bulletin of the society and the translation of Volume 3 into French and German significantly helped to popularize Hrushevsky's ideas and, at the same, generated heated discussions.

In the second essay, "The Unparalleled Significance of Volume 3 in Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*," Volodymyr Aleksandrovych points out that "Hrushevsky followed the prevailing scholarly tradition of his time, namely, the requirement that historians devote their attention first and foremost to conclusions" (xlix). Although Aleksandrovych's evaluation is basically very positive, he has many critical remarks. Among the points of criticism, he mentions that Hrushevsky did not compare Roman Mstislavych's activity—for example, political choices, policies, etc.—with that of Danylo and did not ponder the significance of the foundation of Kholm in Danylo's activity (liii). Aleksandrovych does not agree with Hrushevsky's view on Danylo's "chaotic policy" (lv); he explains Danylo's connection with

*Speculum* 93/4 (October 2018)

the papacy in a different way (lvi) and gives a more important role to German law in the development of cities and in trade (lxv). On the other hand, Aleksandrovych does not find problematic many other choices made by Hrushevsky, such as the title of the first chapter of Volume 3, “The Galician-Volhynian State.” Hrushevsky and Aleksandrovych are right that through the unification the two principalities (1199–1205) of Galicia and Volhynia at the end of twelfth century, a new form of integration came to existence in the southwestern area of the former Kyivan Rus’. But from 1205 through 1238, that region can be characterized as an example of political instability. In the period between the Mongol invasion and Danylo’s death in 1264, a new political formation emerged which territorially differed from the previous one, and although this new formation can be labelled as a kingdom after the coronation, it cannot be defined as a “state”. Galicia-Volhynia was far from being one. The use of the concept of “state” as a historical category to describe the realities of the Middle Ages is a distinctive feature of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historical scholarship—in fact, it was typical of Hrushevsky’s time. The idea of “state” was to become an essential concept in Marxist historiography too, and it was used in both cases without a subtle definition. Contemporary historiography has serious doubts on whether applying the concept of “state” in the study of medieval institutions is convenient. (For example, see Joseph Canning’s *Politics, Institutions and Ideas, c. 1150–c. 1450*, in *Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought*, ed. James Henderson Burns [1989], 341–66). In the case of Ukraine, it would be more acceptable to talk about “medieval roots” and to use the term “principality” (as in Márta Font and Beáta Varga, *Ukrajna története* [History of Ukraine] [2006]). Looking at the problem from this angle, the idea of “loss of statehood” (lxx) should be abandoned. Due to the lack of criticism by Pankova and Aleksandrovych, I should point out that their use of the term “Hungarian Rus’” (xxxii, xli n. 125, etc.) is erroneous. In medieval times, populations were inherently diverse. For example, German communities settled in Galician towns; nobody, however, considers these towns part of the German Lands. Different ethnic groups lived in the north-eastern part of the Hungarian Kingdom, among them Slavonic people. This region was organized according to the general administrative structure (*comitates*) and was subordinated to the Hungarian king. The concept “Hungarian Rus’” did not exist in the Middle Ages: it is simply a creature of nineteenth-century historiography. I cannot agree with Aleksandrovych’s interpretation of the Polish-Hungarian Višegrad meeting of 1339. He replicates Đura Hardi’s position, which claimed that the negotiations had an anti-Galician character. Surely during these negotiations Galicia-Volhynia was an issue; nevertheless, the crucial problem was the question of the Polish succession. Since the end of twelfth century, Galicia-Volhynia was a target of expansion for both lands. In 1339, the Hungarian king gave up the claims to the Galician territory, and in turn the Polish king admitted Louis’s claim to the Polish throne.

I must also mention other problematic points in Hrushevsky’s opus, such as the concept of the “throne of Galicia” and of “patrimonium.” The so-called *otchina* (fatherly inheritance) was more of a claim than a reality, as the Rus’ followed the principle of *senioratus*, which would mean that the place of underage Danylo and Vasylo in the line of inheritance was behind the adult members of the dynasty. After Roman’s death, their right to the principality as an inheritance existed only in the wording of the chronicler.

The third map of the volume, entitled “Western Ukraine in the 11<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> centuries,” suffers from many mistakes. The town of Bartfeld/Bártfa (now Bardejov), the monastery in Lelesz, and the village of Telych never belonged to Galicia (xci–xciii). (The latter could be identified with the settlement of Telcs, near Beszterce in Transsylvania; see Márta Font, *Árpád-házi királyok és Rurikida fejedelmek* [2005], 261.)

Editors present Hrushevsky’s original bibliography (528–91), but the notes are complemented with a very detailed annotated bibliography (384–510), which makes up c. 80–90 percent of the editorial additions. Robert Romanchuk’s essay, “Writing, Reading and Rhetoric:

*Speculum* 93/4 (October 2018)

‘Lettered Education’ in Kyivan Rus’,” is included as an appendix, either because of its short length or because it only discusses the fourth chapter of Volume 3. According to Romanchuk, “Hrushevsky’s outline of these institutions in Kyivan Rus’ is in need of thorough revision” (512). Furthermore, his analysis follows contemporary studies on literacy, which leads to statements such as the following: (1) “other discourses on reading available in Kyivan Rus’ focused primarily on what has been called the ethics of reading, not reading for information” (517); “Such ‘monastic’ habits of reading and study—and the texts supported them—were available to secular elites, in all likelihood through their spiritual advisors” (519).

Transliteration in the volume follows the standard of American orthography, and not the internationally used transcription of the Cyrillic alphabet (for example, *otchina* instead of *otčina*). In general, editors follow modern Ukrainian orthography also in the case of old texts and for the personal and place names as well. The result sometimes is unusual: for example, we read Hlib, not Gleb. I think that the original forms would have been a better choice.

To conclude, the 746-page English translation of Volume 3 of Hrushevsky’s *History of Ukraine-Rus’* is a monumental work. The reconstruction of Hrushevsky’s footnotes in itself was an unusually difficult enterprise. The contributions about his “laboratory” and its significance in historiography and their attention to new developments in the field help the reader to get guidance on and to evaluate Hrushevsky’s opus in relation to the current state of research. The editors made efforts to provide a complete bibliography of twentieth-century scholarship on the topic. From the point of view of Hungarian historiography, some choices in titles for primary sources are inconvenient and still follow nineteenth-century scholarship. For example, the so-called “Chronicon Pictum Vindobonense” has been in possession of the National Library of Hungary (Országos Széchényi Könyvtár) for nearly a hundred years and is now referred to in current Hungarian scholarship as the *Chronici Hungarici compositio saeculi XIV*. This choice should also be followed by the scholars of eastern-Slavonic historiography. It is important to point out that the “Chronicon Pictum” is only one of four other versions; its critical edition was published by Imre Szentpétery in the first volume of the *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum* (1937). Unfortunately, the editors also failed to cite Pál Engel’s *The Realm of Saint Stephen* (2000), the most recent history of medieval Hungary.