

HALF A CENTURY OF RUSSIAN SERIALS, 1917-1968: CUMULATIVE INDEX OF SERIALS PUBLISHED OUTSIDE THE USSR. Compiled by *Michael Schatoff*. Edited by *N. A. Hale*. Part 1: 1917-1956, A-M. Part 2: 1917-1956, N-R. Part 3: 1917-1956, S-Z, Supplement and Directories. Part 4: 1957-1968, A-Z, Directories. New York: Russian Book Chamber Abroad. Part 1: 1970, xiv, 173 pp. [2nd ed. 1972, xviii, 173 pp.]. Part 2: 1971, xiv, pp. 174-355. Part 3: 1972, xv, pp. 356-558. Part 4: 1972, xvi, pp. 559-697. \$13.85 each, paper.

The four-volume list of over thirty-seven-hundred serials published in the Russian language outside the USSR from 1917 to 1968 represents a tremendous bibliographical effort that deserves a hearty vote of thanks from concerned researchers. The title immediately raises expectations of a valuable counterpart to the two-volume index of Soviet publications, *Half a Century of Soviet Serials, 1917-1968*, prepared by Rudolf Smits under the auspices of the Library of Congress. Schatoff's task was much more difficult, since no serials directories were available to aid him in tracking down the many obscure, short-run publications from all corners of the world that he includes. In comparison to the merits of Smits's compendium, however, the weaknesses and shortcomings of the Schatoff project become readily apparent. There are bound to be gaps and errors in a work of this sort, but the Schatoff project shows a lack of bibliographical rigor and basic reference orientation that is particularly regrettable in these days of high costs for publications and library acquisitions.

In regard to format, the alternate listing of items under institutional corporate entries and titles without an adequate cross-reference system makes it needlessly difficult to find some entries. The phrase "See also under name of organization" will not help those who do not know the exact name of the organization. Such listing occasionally results in duplicated or contradictory data; for example, entry no. 886 ("*Letuchka*/Published by Kazachii soiuz") presumably is the same as no. 690 ("*Kazachii soiuz. Letuchki*"), and similarly the information supplied for no. 2497 ("*Svodka/Kazachii organ*") should have been checked against the inclusive but not analogous data given for no. 691 ("*Kazachii soiuz. Svodki*").

Many entries appear without indication of the number of issues published, and the distinction between those known to have been published and those now extant and examined should have been made more clearly. Unfortunately the compiler fails to indicate the sources of his data; and presumably for many of the entries he has more information that could have enriched the annotations. The fourth volume repeats many continuing serials already listed in earlier volumes, but assigns new entry numbers and fails to provide cross references to the previous ones.

The most glaring limitation of the volumes as a reference tool is Schatoff's failure to give library locations for any of the serials covered. (The Smits volumes efficiently combine the function of bibliography and union list.) At least the compiler might have indicated where the serial was examined or where it is known to exist; and it would have been relatively simple for him to code the different entries with references to their inclusion in previously published catalogues of Slavic periodicals in individual libraries.

To provide a full international union list may have been beyond the resources of the compiler or his organization. Yet the fact that Schatoff's substantial efforts were not more adequately supported for such an operation clearly demonstrates the lack of attention to basic bibliographical projects in the field. Even for materials in

the United States, both the Cyrillic Union Catalog and the Slavic Union Catalog (never integrated themselves or combined with the general Union Catalog) stand idle and incomplete for want of funding at the Library of Congress. Neither of them begins to provide the kind of comprehensive coverage of all the serials listed by Schatoff. But even if steps could be taken to revive these established union catalogue efforts, the Schatoff project was not conceived so its data would be compatible with these Library of Congress operations. The Slavic field suffers with many others from the lack of centralized, rigorous, and coordinated bibliographical efforts in the United States. Reference tools such as the Schatoff volumes are obviously the backbone of research, hence deserve considerably more effort and support.

PATRICIA K. GRIMSTED  
*Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute*

## LETTERS

### TO THE EDITOR:

Professor Rudnytsky's criticism of *The Cossacks* (*Slavic Review*, December 1972) reveals significant differences of interpretation between us. These differences may be to some extent semantic (for example, over the connotation of the word "nation" as used in the seventeenth century); however, they derive from basic differences of approach, a clearer definition of which may help to promote a better understanding of some important problems concerning the role of Cossackdom in the development of Eastern Europe.

Rudnytsky sees the Ukrainian Cossacks as standard-bearers of national aspirations and inspirers of a national legend, while I regard them as a caste primarily intent on promoting their own economic and social interests. He approaches the subject of Ukrainian Cossackdom as the protagonist of the unique, while my approach stems from an interest in exploring general parallels and relationships. Hence his claim that I have paid insufficient attention to the role of the Cossacks in the development of the Ukrainian nation, and my claim that Rudnytsky's view of the Cossack phenomenon is distorted by a traditional political filter which obscures important historical problems and leads, inevitably, to serious misconceptions. An examination of some specific points which Rudnytsky raises will serve to illustrate these divergencies while, hopefully, clarifying some of the genuine issues and eliminating the bogus.

He berates me in particular for looking at Ukrainian history through "Russian spectacles." Although I am not altogether clear as to his meaning here, I assume it is related to his claim that the Russian Cossacks' "historical experience" has little to do with the Ukraine. This assertion is questionable however. To be sure, the development of the Cossack communities was uneven and there were singularities in the Ukrainian situation. Nevertheless, Rudnytsky himself does not deny that the Cossacks of Zaporozhia, the Don, and the Yaik were "sociologically similar," and the parallels go somewhat farther than he will admit. Ukrainian "town Cossacks," to quote but one example, were not altogether *sui generis* as he implies: they had their counterparts in Muscovy's town Cossacks. It is true that the latter were gradually merged into the ranks of the Russian *odnodvortsy*, and that the Ukrainian Cossacks constituted a much stronger, more compact, literate, and economically