

developed economies. In particular, he asks, why is the share of the civilian labor force employed in services so low relative to comparable industrialized countries?

After adjusting for a variety of differences between the statistics of the USSR and those of the countries with which it is compared, Ofer considers the systemic and developmental characteristics of the USSR as explanatory factors. It is not surprising that he should see in the "socialist economic system" a common denominator of the various factors explaining the relatively low level of service employment in the USSR (and in most of socialist Eastern Europe as well). Industrial structure is a function of economic policy, particularly of the components affecting the rate of investment, the degree of urbanization, and rates of labor force participation. Soviet economic policy has kept a tight rein on the process of urbanization, has prohibited most private enterprise, and has constrained increases in disposable personal income. This has tended to constrict the sphere of services—a result obtained by direct limitation as well. But Ofer's analysis carries considerably further: to demonstrate and explain the relatively lower administration share of employment in the USSR; to distinguish between the peculiar industrial structure of the USSR viewed statically and the changes in structure taking place according to the general developmental model; to discuss the relation between growth strategy, ideology, and institutional structure and operation as explanatory factors; and to consider the degree to which the peculiar industrial structure will change in the future.

The theoretical and statistical apparatus of this book is wielded deftly. The noneconomist, nonstatistician who finds some of that material rough going will nevertheless be amply rewarded for patience in making his way. It would have eased his task of absorbing the large number of tables had they featured more effective separation of subtotals from components. A review for this journal must also note that the transliteration of Russian titles is often sloppy. But these are only minor blemishes on an expert performance.

ABRAHAM S. BECKER
The RAND Corporation

RECENZIIJA: A REVIEW OF SOVIET UKRAINIAN SCHOLARLY PUBLICATIONS. Published semiannually by the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies at Harvard University. Vol. 1, no. 1 (Fall 1970) to vol. 4, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 1973). 48, 80, 81, 93, 72, 61, 70 pp. Subscriptions (one year): \$5.00, libraries and institutions. \$4.00, private subscribers. Single copies: \$3.00.

The publication of *Recenzija* marks another significant success of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and fills a need in providing detailed review articles of Soviet Ukrainian works that are not being reviewed adequately in the standard scholarly journals. Each issue contains five or six review articles, a number of which are more than five thousand words in length. Contributors include such scholars as Professors George Shevelov, Horace Lunt, Assya Humesky, Henning Andersen, Patricia Grimsted, Max Okenfuss, Omry Ronen, Roman Serbyn, and Roman Solchanyk as well as *Recenzija's* faculty adviser, Professor Omeljan Pritsak. However, approximately half of the reviews have been prepared by advanced graduate students at Harvard, who have acquitted themselves in a highly creditable manner.

The first seven issues offer a fairly wide range of reviewed works. These

include, among others, studies devoted to Skovoroda and Kotliarevsky, the poetry of Tychyna, Ukrainian architecture, changing wedding customs, historical numismatics and portraiture, the Ukrainian brotherhoods (*bratstva*), Ukrainian folklore in Polish literature, and the Soviet Ukrainian fable. However, the most numerous single category of works reviewed deals with archival collections, bibliographical aids, and historical sources. This is understandable in view of the fact that the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute is placing special emphasis on archival research and reliance on original sources in its historical publications and doctoral dissertations. Thus one finds reviews of a guidebook to the State Archives of the Ukrainian SSR by Lubomyr Hajda (Spring 1973), new editions of the *L'vivs'kyi litopys* and *Ostroz'kyi litopysets'*, a catalogue of the collected documents of the Kiev Archeographic Commission (1369–1899), a new edition of *Litopys Samovydtisia* (whose editors are criticized in much detail by Pritsak in the Fall 1971 issue), and a handbook on sources for eighteenth-century Ukraine (reviewed critically by Zenon Kohut in the Spring 1971 issue).

The reviews of archival sources are valuable because they bring attention to collections of documents that would remain obscure or even unnoticed—such as *Akty sela Odrckhovoy* (reviewed by Shevelov in the Spring 1972 issue) containing 213 documents of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from the Lviv Central Historical Archives and especially valuable as a linguistic source. They also provide a convenient and detailed guide to the use of various collections, as in the case of Paul Magocsi's review (Spring 1972) of *Shliakhom zhovtnia*, six volumes of documents on Carpatho-Ukraine published by the Transcarpathian State Archive in Uzhhorod. The reader is made fully aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the particular published collection. In addition, the reviews indicate that Soviet Ukrainian historians and archivists are very active. This is attested to in Roman Serbyn's review (Fall 1971) of *Arkhivy Ukrainy*, the bimonthly official organ of the Archival Administration of the Ukrainian SSR published in 21,000 copies—a tirage indicating greater popularity than the all-union journal, *Sovetskie arkhivy*.

Several other periodical sources are reviewed in *Recenzija*. These include Orest Subtelny's evaluation (Fall 1970) of the twelve issues of *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* published in 1969, in which he quantifies the contents in terms of five categories and demonstrates an imbalance which shows pre-Soviet Ukrainian history neglected while Leniniana and Communist Party and class history were overemphasized. Subtelny contends that the weaknesses of *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal* result from historians not being permitted to ask new questions. The year-book on medieval studies, *Seredni viky na Ukraini*, first published in 1971, is given a far more favorable appraisal (by Frank Sysyn in the Spring 1972 issue). There is also a review (by Natalie Moyle in the Spring 1971 issue) of the bimonthly *Narodna tvorchist' ta etnografia* for 1970 which is highly critical. Four issues of the journal *Arkheolohiia* for 1971 are reviewed (by Alexandra Klymyshyn in the Fall-Winter 1973 issue) in a generally positive vein with certain reservations.

There are several kinds of articles in addition to the review limited to a single monograph, collection of documents, or reprinting of an important source. One is the review essay dealing with the art or scholarly writings of a particular author. Thus the review of a volume of Pavlo Tychyna's poetry by George Grabowicz (Spring 1972) provides a profile of the poet which differs from previous interpretations. Grabowicz distinguishes between the "private" poetry and the "socialist realist" poetry of Tychyna and sees less discontinuity in his work

and a "dialectic of social duty and poetic integrity." Another example is the article by John-Paul Himka (Fall 1971) on various publications of the philosopher Ivan Vasyliovych Ivan'o, whose work on aesthetics and in the history of philosophy is quite unusual.

The review by Orest Subtelny (Spring 1973) of a monograph on the noted Ukrainian Orientalist and Slavist Ahatanhel Krymskyi as a historian provides not only a means of reviewing the specific work but of introducing the reader to the whole range of Krymskyi's remarkable scholarly interests. Another kind of article examines the extant and recent literature as it pertains to a specific problem or issue. Thus Daniel Waugh (Spring 1971) traces the various sources of the apocryphal "correspondence" between the Zaporozhian Cossacks and the sultan, which was given currency by Repin's famous painting. He provides a model of scrupulousness in scholarship tracing the origins of various texts by means of careful analysis and uncovering certain errors made by Soviet scholars. Two reviews of works on Skovoroda (by Richard Hantula, Spring 1972 and Fall-Winter 1973) provide some very valuable correctives.

Judged on the basis of the first seven issues, *Recenzija* has set a high standard not only for Soviet Ukrainian scholarship but for its contributors as well. The high quality of the contributions prepared by advanced graduate students associated with the Harvard Ukrainian Studies Program bears testimony to its exacting standards.

The reviews are often extended bibliographic essays as well as critiques. Contributors relate works under review to the relevant literature and indicate sources not used by authors. At times they also do, in brief, what authors have failed to do. Thus Titus Hewryk, in his review of the architecture sections of the six-volume *Istoriia ukrains'koho mystetstva* (Fall 1972) recreates the time sequence in the hasty decision to demolish Kiev's famous twelfth-century Saint Michael's Church in 1935, demonstrating that it was taken *before* the development of a master plan for the city. As is known, clearance of the site did not result in any construction. In addition to identifying serious lacunae and unanswered questions, reviews indicate occasional instances of outright dishonesty, distortion, and misrepresentation—including suppression of simple bibliographic facts. For example, Pritsak (Fall 1970) compares the 1969 Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Social Science Bibliography with the 1930 edition and finds the most flagrant omissions in the later work designed to eliminate any references to such scholars and "unpersons" as S. Efremov, V. Miiakovsky, O. Hermaize, and K. Hrushevska.

Yet no reviewer has hesitated to praise Soviet Ukrainian scholars when merited, and the latter do have many significant achievements attained under difficult circumstances. *Recenzija* offers a valuable contribution to what one hopes will be a developing dialogue between Soviet Ukrainian and non-Soviet scholars. New editions of reviewed works will certainly benefit from *Recenzija's* reviews. This reviewer hopes that the various institutes of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences and the Soviet academic community in general, as well as publishing organizations, will monitor *Recenzija*. Scholarship will be the gainer. *Recenzija* also performs the valuable service of calling attention to certain worthwhile works that are published in such limited editions that they are instant rare books—an all too common Soviet publishing practice.

This reviewer would offer several suggestions to *Recenzija's* editors. Expansion would be appropriate in both the size and the scope of individual issues. More

works of literary scholarship and from the social sciences and law should be reviewed. Although only the most important works can be reviewed fully, *Recenzija* should be enlarged to include significant Soviet Ukrainian current bibliographical listings with brief annotations. Presumably professional librarians could contribute here with a minimum of additional burden on the editorial staff. From a technical standpoint *Recenzija* is well executed.

The Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and its director, Professor Pritsak, are making a singular contribution to Ukrainian and Slavic studies in publishing *Recenzija*. It belongs in every serious research library and deserves the widest possible circulation.

JOHN S. RESHETAR, JR.
University of Washington

POVNE ZIBRANNIA TVORIV U DVOKH TOMAKH. By *Hryhorii Skovoroda*. Edited by *V. I. Shynkaruk* et al. Akademiia nauk Ukrain's'koi RSR. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1973. Vol. 1: 532 pp. Vol. 2: 575 pp.

In Skovorodnyivka (formerly Pan-Ivanivka) near Kharkiv an inscription on a simple tombstone reads: "Hryhorii Savych Skovoroda / Ukrainian Philosopher / Born in 1722. Died October 29, 1794. / The World Was After Me, But Never Trapped Me."

The publication of these volumes in the original Old Ukrainian coincides with the celebration of the 250th anniversary of Skovoroda's birth. It is the first complete, critically edited collection of all the known works of the most original Ukrainian thinker and one of the greatest minds of Eastern Europe. In addition, Skovoroda was a many-sided literary genius: philosopher, biblical scholar, theologian, mystic, poet, writer, translator, and critic of culture. Many Ukrainian scholars (Chyzhevsky, Mirchuk) see in Skovoroda one of the most distinguished prototypes of the Ukrainian psyche—a man of intense introversion, with a generous heart, showing domination of spiritual virtues over the intellectual, displaying a joyful love of nature, a very keen aesthetic sense, profound humanism, and a genuine religious spirit. All these traits are clearly evident in Skovoroda's works. Therefore, he cannot be labeled a "Russian philosopher" or a "representative of Russian culture."

The introductory essay "Hryhorii Skovoroda" by V. Shynkaruk and I. Ivanio (1:11–57) contains many valuable insights. In the final analysis, however, it offers the "official" (and absurd) Soviet interpretation of Skovoroda: his profound humanistic views were supposedly evolving in the direction of materialism and were characterized by an ever-sharper presentation of social problems and an effort to liberate himself from the bondage of idealism and religion. This essay is followed by the "Garden of Divine Songs Sprouting Forth from the Seeds of the Sacred Scripture"—that is, a cycle of thirty religious poems based on biblical themes and with very strong theological and mystical tendencies (1:60–90). Next comes the section "Songs and Fables" (1:91–106), and most of these are in impeccable, classical Latin, bearing witness to Skovoroda's profound erudition; he had a perfect command of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and German and was extremely well versed in classical poetry and literature. "The Tales of Kharkiv" (1:107–33) is a collection of thirty fables which recall Aesop's style and which reveal Skovoroda's theological intention: to illustrate with human examples the divine truths revealed in the Bible.