COMMUNIST system before it was allowed to be published. In this edition he describes the three strict stages of Soviet censorship: 1) Typesetting 2) Printing 3) Publication and distribution. The Soviet system also demanded propaganda promoting Ukrainian-Russian friendship.

The author is the Director of the Institute of Ukrainian Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in Lviv. He is well known as a scholar and an authority on Ukrainian cultural history and the history of books in Ukraine. In this edition Isaievych has removed the material demanded by the Soviet censors, has updated the text and expanded the research of the last forty years and included an excellent bibliography and footnotes.

SYNOPSIS: FESTSCHRIFT FOR PROF. ZENON KOHUT


This Festschrift honors Dr. Zenon Kohut, the Director of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta. CIUS has an office also at the University of Toronto. This solid volume includes contributions from 52 historians from five countries including many well-known and prominent scholars in Ukrainian and Slavic studies. They range over the history of the past thousand years. Naturally Kohut’s biography, career and a bibliography of his many works is included. He is currently working on the Synopsis from the 17th century which inspired the title of this book. He is the author of the monograph Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy (1988) and is a recognized expert on Ukrainian-Russian relations and the history of Ukraine.

Among the many contributors are such scholars as Volodymyr Kravchenko, Olga Andryskiw, Martha Bohachevska-Chernish, Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, Mark von Hagen, John-Paul Himka, Yaroslav Hrytsak, Natalia Yakovenko, Yaroslav Isaievych, Serhii Plokhy, Frank Sysyn and Oleksiy Tolochko.

Prof. Volodymyr Kravchenko of Kharkiv University opens the volume with an Intellectual Biography of Zenon Kohut in which he explores the impact of the world of Zenon Kohut are helping to foster the methodological renewal of Ukrainian historiography and its gradual approach to world standards.” For a country like Ukraine which had been denied the opportunity to know its own history because of foreign censorship and disinformation this is a vital area. Olga Andriyewsky describes the Generation of 1917 and concludes that “the rapid radicalization of the Ukrainian national movement at the turn of the century [1900] was, unquestionably part of a larger, much more complex intellectual and political process…” Patricia Kennedy Grimsted, a noted expert on European archives, writes on “The Fate of the Kyiv Archive of Early Acts in the Second World War: A Trite Tragedy of Destruction, Plunder and Propaganda.” Mark von Hagen of Columbia University in New York provides a concise biography of Pavlo Skoropadsky (1873-45) who became a “frustrated Ukrainian state builder.” Hagen says that “For Skoropadsky the final proof of Bolshevik vileness was their murder of 3,000 officers in Kyiv during their attack on the capital in January 1918.” On April 29, 1918 Skoropadsky led a coup with German help and became Hetman (Leader) of Ukraine but he lasted only to December when the Directory took over. John-Paul Himka reviews recent books on the Ukrainian Icon. Himka is astonished that Stepovyk claims A_charge Against Ukraine from Volhynia.” Yaroslav Hrytsak, Lviv University, contributed a study of the Boryslav Cycle by the major Ukrainian writer and scholar Ivan Franko (1856-1916). Historian Natalia Yakovenko, of the National University of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, provides in Ukrainian a study of the 1619 panegyric Maiiores Wisniewiecki and Yaroslav Isaievych, Director of the Ivan Krypiakiewycz Institute of Ukrainian Studies of the National Academy of Sciences, contributed an important study of titles used for rulers in history. He deals with kniaz, kahan, kord, prince and says that grand prince was used after the death of the ruler. He says “the word ‘prince’ came to be accepted in Central Europe as a title inferior to that of king.…” Isaievych also says “In western Latin-language narrative and documentary sources, the princes of all Kyivan Rus…often figure as reges (kings).” Although Isaievych doesn’t touch on English usage the title Prince is also much more prevalent in the English language. A prince is the son of a king or an adult like Prince Philip of the UK who is not a ruler. For this reason Forum prefers to use the title KING for rulers of Kievan Rus. For instance we use it for King Vladimir whose son Yaroslav was a Prince until his father died and then he became King.

Prof Plokhi at the University of Alberta analyzes the debate of Soviet historians on the Khmelnytsky war. Oleksiy Tolcho is head of the Research Centre for the History of Kyivan Rus in the Institute of History of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. Tolcho identifies Vasili Tatsich as the origina- tor of the most popular scheme of Russian history. An authority on 17th century Ukraine, Prof. Frank Sysyn in Toronto studies the depiction of Poles in Samoilo Velychko’s Skazanye written in the early 1700s about Bohdan Khmelnytsky and his war against Poland.

SYNOPSIS is a book rich in history which is not only a tribute to Prof. Kohut it is also an exciting volume to read for anyone interested in history.