

UKRAINE AND THE EUROPEAN TURMOIL, 1917–1919. 2 vols. Vol. 1 by *Matthew Stachiw, Peter G. Stercho and Nicholas L. F. Chirovskyy*. Vol. 2 by *Matthew Stachiw and Nicholas L. F. Chirovskyy*. Shevchenko Scientific Society, Ukrainian Studies, English Section, vols. 10 and 11. New York: Shevchenko Scientific Society, 1973. Vol. 1: x, 426 pp. Vol. 2: x, 552 pp.

This is essentially a history of the Ukrainian National Republic (UNR) during the turbulent and chaotic period stretching from early 1917 until March of 1919. Important events of this period are followed closely—from the establishment of the Central Rada to the rise and fall of Hetman Pavlo Skoropadsky, the formation of the UNR Directorate, and the second war with the Bolsheviks—including as well the alarms and excursions created by White Russian armies, foreign intervention, and the crosscurrents of international military and diplomatic interference.

The authors assigned themselves the task of providing a fully “documented and extensive history of the Ukraine in the indicated period,” intending that it should satisfy an “especially urgent” need. They have made wide use of émigré and Soviet materials, including published and unpublished memoirs of Ukrainians who participated in the events of the period.

This is nationalist history written by émigré Ukrainian patriots who see the Soviet Union as the enemy and who consider Western scholars of Slavic history to have been so brainwashed and bemused by Russian and Soviet historical writing that they need awakening to the truth about the Ukraine. In other words, although presented as an objective study, this work is in fact a scholarly polemic written at least in part to justify and eulogize the UNR and the men who led it or fought in its defense. The larger purpose of the book appears to be to preserve the memory of one brief attempt to establish an independent Ukrainian state, so that it may serve as a rallying point for all those Ukrainians (in the Soviet Union and abroad) who dream of someday establishing a permanent Ukrainian state outside the Soviet Union.

Much that is interesting and new in English is presented in these pages. Indeed, extensive use of documents and careful attention to detail make this a useful work despite its nationalist-polemical ambience. Nonetheless, the heroism, nobility, and wisdom of UNR leaders are consistently exaggerated, while opponents or neutrals are depicted as villains or as victims of their own ignorance. The political ideals of the authors skew their descriptions of events, influence their interpretations of source materials, and encourage less than rigorous mixing of documentation, personal opinion, and the memoirs of men who wrote several years after the chaos. In sum, the genuine value of these volumes is diminished because the conclusions are dictated more by political doctrines than by objective analysis of the evidence.

Throughout, the book is marred by turgid writing, bad idiom, grammatical awkwardness, malapropisms, and innumerable misspellings. It is to be deplored that the Shevchenko Scientific Society did not insist upon meticulous proofreading and adherence to the highest stylistic standards. The errors permitted disfigure page after page and will undoubtedly distract readers from the substantive contents that should be their sole concern.

It is true that the historical significance of the Ukraine has been twisted out of shape by Russian and Soviet historical scholarship, and it is equally true that we badly need exhaustive and perceptive studies of the Ukraine in the twentieth

century. The present work, however, does not achieve the authors' stated purposes. As a result, the earlier studies of John Reshetar and Jurij Borys, both of them distinguished for accuracy and objectivity, will continue to hold their places as the standard works in the field.

ARTHUR E. ADAMS
Ohio State University

SKOVORODA: DICHTER, DENKER, MYSTIKER. By *Dmitrij Tschizewskij*.
Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, vol. 18. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag,
1974. 233 pp. DM 68, paper.

Scholarly attempts to interpret the work of the eighteenth-century philosopher Skovoroda have frequently been hampered by unfamiliarity with the intellectual currents from which he drew. In the present book the noted Slavist, Dmitrij Tschizewskij, skillfully explains the elements of Skovoroda's philosophy—his antithetic manner and symbolic method; his metaphysics (a "monodualism"); his teachings on man, focusing on the so-called inner man or heart; and his ethics, which, as the author correctly argues, dovetail with his mysticism. Tschizewskij also offers a few pages on Skovoroda's theory of pedagogy and on his poetry—drawing attention in the latter to Skovoroda's language, technical innovations, and firm grounding in tradition.

What is most valuable, however, is the book's delineation of Skovoroda's mysticism, previously overlooked, or at least minimized, by many scholars. Tschizewskij's demonstration of Skovoroda's affinity to the major traditions of neo-Platonic, patristic, and German mysticism is particularly interesting, and the author provides an abundance of quotations not only to support his analysis of Skovoroda's philosophy but also to illustrate what Skovoroda accepted from these traditions and what he rejected. Yet, Tschizewskij is careful to say, especially in regard to the Germans, that this is a question not so much of influence (although many Western writers may have been accessible to Skovoroda—there are remarkable parallels with Valentin Weigel and Angelus Silesius), but rather a question of an "inner relation," a spiritual commonality the symptom of which is external similarity of expression.

Though one may quibble with certain details of Tschizewskij's interpretation, there are more objective shortcomings to be noted. The book was actually written more than four decades ago, and although this fact does not impair Tschizewskij's analyses (based on textual comparisons), recent discoveries have rendered much of the biographical material obsolete. In addition, the author claims a popular audience for his book, and so has omitted the customary scholarly apparatus. Thus, readers will have to turn to Tschizewskij's other book on Skovoroda (*Filosofija H. S. Skovorody*, Warsaw, 1934) for scholarly documentation. (Although the two books are essentially one, the earlier work stresses Skovoroda's domestic aspects and contains a short discussion of Skovoroda's rhetorical-philosophical manner. The present book gives a fuller explanation of his philosophy, particularly in regard to anthropology and ethics, and includes a summary of Tschizewskij's writings on Skovoroda's poetry.) The scattered typographical errors are perhaps inevitable but still unfortunate.

Tschizewskij rightly claims that Skovoroda is worth studying not only for historical reasons, but also because he can aid us in understanding the achievements