underestimate the importance of this work, for as Guiringer remarks (57), "Il [Universae naturae theatrum] nous indique clairement qu’à la base de toute la philosophie politique de Bodin il y a une métaphysique naturaliste." Much study and research is still to be done concerning this aspect of Bodin’s philosophy, for the *Theatrum* has been rightly described as the culmination of Bodin’s work, and the closing chapter of a system, the construction of which was begun some forty years earlier in the *Methodus*.

Guiringer’s introduction is in many ways a success: it helps readers discover the man, his writings, and his philosophy. Guiringer’s presentation facilitates access to the passages that he has chosen, and encourages further reading.

Making Ukraine: Studies on Political Culture, Historical Narrative, and Identity.

Reviewed by: Andrew Kier Wise, Daemen College

Zenon Kohut’s collection of essays is an important contribution to our understanding of early modern Ukrainian history. This volume consists of fifteen updated essays, which were published between 1977 and 2006. The author deals extensively with the development of a distinct Ukrainian national identity. He believes that the construction of the modern Ukrainian state and nation “began in the early modern period rather than simply being the ‘invention’ of nineteenth- and twentieth-century nation-builders” (xi).

In this book, Kohut focuses much of his attention on developments during the tumultuous seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was during this time that Cossack rebellions, such as the Khmelnitsky Uprising of 1648, challenged the authority of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In 1654, the Pereiaslav Agreement heralded a turning point for Ukraine by linking it with Muscovy through a shared monarch.

Ukrainian efforts to establish a distinct identity in the early modern period were thus shaped in part as a reaction to influences from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Muscovy. For example, the attitude of Ukrainian elites was greatly affected by the notion of “rights and liberties” that was institutionalized in the Commonwealth. This informed the elites’ responses to the Muscovite challenge. Thus, the Pereiaslav Agreement was regarded by Cossacks as a contractual agreement similar to the Treaty of Zboriv with Poland (1649), rather than a submission to the tsar (15). On the other hand, Russian historiography since the early modern period developed a “myth of Russo-Ukrainian unity” (1) that interpreted the agreement as confirmation of a permanent union between Russia and Ukraine.

The official Soviet version of history absorbed this older Russian view, which regarded Ukraine’s place within the Russian political and cultural orbit as the normal state of affairs. In 1954, for example, the Central Committee of the Communist Party celebrated the 300th anniversary of the Pereiaslav Agreement by decreeing that the event had permanently joined Russia and Ukraine. Indeed, the so-called Pereiaslav myth of the unification of two kindred peoples was an important “pillar” of the “long-standing and officially promulgated Russo-Ukrainian unity doctrine” (308). In the post-Soviet era, Kohut finds that Ukrainian historians and other writers have sought to escape from this “conceptual straitjacket” (223).

Some of Kohut’s best analysis deals with the “history wars” of the post-Soviet era. His discussion of the debates in Ukraine during the early 1990s suggests there was a postcolonial concern with “the question of ‘deimperialization’—the adjustment of institutions and intellectual approaches to the dissolution of an empire” (217). In this context, the story of
the Pereiaslav Agreement has proven to be an unpopular reminder of Ukraine's past 'colonial' status in relation to Russia.

Rather than rely on the assumptions of outdated approaches, Kohut suggests that scholars should embrace fresh perspectives to help them understand the role of "Little Russia" (the Ukrainian political unit later referred to as the "Hetmanate") in the eighteenth century. He contends that Cossack elites living under tsarist control in the centuries after Pereiaslav "underwent some of the stages of organic, premodern nation-building that resulted in the formation of a 'Little Russian' identity" (40). However, there was a disconnect between the desire of Ukrainian elites to maintain their privileges and distinct cultural identity and the tsarist regime's insistence on an extension of Russian state power. This was especially the case from the time of Peter I (1682–1725) onward, as administrative uniformity was advocated as a part of rational rule.

Kohut argues that a "clash between the concept of a centrally regulated empire and the idea of Little Russian 'rights and liberties' was inevitable" (46). During the eighteenth century the Ukrainian elites sought to mimic the nobility of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, who had preserved their rights in relation to the monarch. But the Russian rulers who sought to extend their control over the borderlands and simultaneously rationalize their administration would not accept any notion of a contractual relationship between tsar and gentry. Ukrainian institutions were dissolved and Ukrainian and Russian elites merged through the enticements of Catherine II's Charter of the Nobility (1785) as well as the rewards of imperial service.

A "rediscovery, recovery, and reconstitution of the history of the Hetmanate" (303) is urged by Kohut as a way to engage with Ukraine's past. While there has been a transformation in recent years regarding the Pereiaslav Agreement and its celebration, Kohut concludes in an essay from 2005 that "the rejection of the Pereiaslav myth can hardly be equated with the demise of the Russo-Ukrainian unity paradigm.... Thus, the Russian legacy in Ukraine will continue to be a subject of controversy, debate, and politics" (318).


Reviewed by: Todd Marquis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

The translation of the German Bible, often heralded as Luther's greatest literary achievement, had as its scope the bringing of the word of God into the hands of an increasingly literate laity to introduce them to proper doctrine. Luther's call for sola scriptura in no way negated his affinity for the Apostle's Creed, of which his shorthand was often simply "the faith." It was necessary for Luther that the "faith" be taught to the laity. This volume has at its core an attempt to explicate Luther's catechetical understanding of the Apostle's Creed. It serves as the second in a series of translated works on Luther's catechism by Albrecht Peters, which after revision and in its original form appeared with three other volumes in Kommentar zu Luthers Katechismen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991). It is preceded in place by a volume explicating Luther's perspicacity of the Decalogue, and is superseded by one on the Lord's Prayer, both shown catechistically.

In the volume under review, the chief concern for Peters is Luther's credenda of the Apostle's Creed. His structure is itself quite simple, in that he devotes a chapter to each of the three articles of the creed: God as Creator, Jesus as Lord and Redeemer, and the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier. Yet, despite what the title suggests, this book is less a commentary on