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In the introduction Grabowicz explains the long history of this much-awaited collection of articles. It was thought up as one of the products of the Millennium Project that was to celebrate one thousand years of the Christianization of Rus’-Ukraine in 1988. The project was designed by the late Professor Omelian Pritsak. For many reasons, the changes in Ukraine, the demise of the Soviet Union, Pritsak’s move to Kiev and shortage of funds, the publication was long delayed. Still we are pleased to have this delayed collection of articles.

Bociurkiw’s first article “Some Methodological Problems in Writing a History of the Orthodox Church in Interwar Soviet Ukraine” was written in the late 1980s. It describes some problems for the study on this theme. Many historical materials were intentionally destroyed. The historian’s task is to reconstruct history from the survived fragmental materials. As a leading historian of church history in Ukraine, we can feel Bociurkiw’s eagerness for the reconstruction of this history from his essay.

The second article by Bociurkiw “The Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine” is on the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine in 1920-1939. It is highly valuable research. There is almost no research on the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine, in spite of many researches on the two oppressed churches, the Uniate Church and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church. Bociurkiw clearly describes that there were many arguments on the relation with Moscow in the Russian Orthodox Church and that the Church experienced an organizational split. Then the Church was oppressed by Soviet authority. It is a surprise to know that the attack of the Soviet power to the Ukrainian nationalist reached also to the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine. In order to write the history of the Ukrainization era more thoroughly, it is necessary to analyze the movement of the Russian Orthodox Church in Ukraine and the Soviet policy against it. It is a new message for the study of the history of the Ukrainization period. This article points out some key ways for the study of the church history of Ukraine in the future.

Chynczewska-Hennel’s article “The Political, Social, and National Thought of the Ukrainian Higher Clergy, 1569-1700” treats the thought of church elites. The author shows the idea of the Ukrainian church elites for the maintaining of the church in the complicated relations with Poland and Russia. Chynczewska-
Hennel focuses on the thought of Mohyla, Smotryts’ky and Balaban. From her analysis, we can understand that the Union of Brest was not the end of anything, but the beginning of something. It is very interesting that just after the Union, they began to seek for a new, next Union. The attitude of Rus’ church was characterized by the words of Smotryts’ky, “Uniting Rus’ with Rus’.”

Wolff’s article “The Uniate Church and the Partitions of Poland” describes the situation of “disunion within the Uniate” with persuasive arguments. His article is solid, voluminous (more than 90 pages) and informative. In the period of the First Partition of Poland, Catherine II was playing a game for the consolidation of her rule. In the period of the Second and Third Partitions, she began to think of the “reunion” of the Uniate Church and the Russian Orthodox Church for the reinforcement of her rule in Poland. This is a new point of view. Generally speaking, Wolff’s description keeps good balance. He is free from the stereotype that Catherine II intended the liquidation of the Uniate Church from the beginning of her rein. His argument, which is written after p. 225, that quantitative loss made qualitative change in the Uniate Church and millions of faithful, peasants and lower clergy changed themselves, is interesting. This paradoxical truth, “restoring the Union by themselves,” which is shown by Wolff, causes the scales to fall from our eyes. This is a superb article in this collection of articles.

Himka’s article “The Greek Catholic Church in Galicia, 1848-1914” surveys the situation of the Uniate Church in Galicia before Sheptyts’kyi became metropolitan. This period was very important for the study of Ukrainian modern history, experiencing of emergence of new secular national organizations like the Radical Party outside the Church. Considering the importance of this period, Himka’s survey is too short in length and not so rich in content. Of course, Himka has published his voluminous book, Religion and Nationality in Western Ukraine, probably we should refer to the book in detail. For example, Himka writes that Hrushevs’kyi had little sympathy for the Greek Catholic Church. We would like to know a more detailed story with sufficient evidence for this conclusion.

Sorokowski’s article “The Lay and Clerical Intelligentsia in Greek-Catholic Galicia, 1900-1939” treats the relations between the Uniate Church and the secular organizations outside the Church in the interwar period. His survey focuses on the Church’s attitude toward the secular organizations, from Prosvita to OUN. He also traced the change of the Church during the period of the Catholic Action. Taking it by and large, it was the problem of the relation between the Church and the Ukrainian nationalism. To sum up, Sorokowski concluded that the Christian nationalism came into being among the clerical intelligentsia under the guidance of Sheptyts’kyi. This article is a good and persuasive article which sheds new light on the change of the Church in interwar Galicia.

Budurowycz’s article “The Greek Catholic Church in Galicia, 1914-1944” is a nice survey on the Uniate Church in interwar Galicia. This period can
be called the era of Sheptyts’kyi. This article can be a good introduction to Sheptyts’kyi’s activity and his religious and political thought.

This volume of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* is formally dedicated to the late Bohdan Bociurkiw. But actually it is a tribute to three eminent scholars, Bociurkiw, Pritsak and Budurowycz. All three passed away recently. It is quite sad to hear and we are still stunned by the news of their death. It is a great loss to the Ukrainian academic world. At the same time, we, still alive, should develop Ukrainian studies further in order to express many thanks to our mentors.