



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

A Note from the Editors: The First Ten Years of "Harvard Ukrainian Studies"

Author(s): Omeljan Pritsak and Ihor Ševčenko

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 1/2 (June 1987), pp. 5-7

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036238>

Accessed: 20/10/2014 04:18

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Harvard Ukrainian Studies.

<http://www.jstor.org>

A Note from the Editors

The First Ten Years of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*

In the spring of 1977, the first issue of a new journal, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies (HUS)*, was presented to the scholarly community. "It intends," wrote the editors in their introductory note, "to be an international forum for the exchange of current scholarly research in Ukrainian studies and to cultivate an interdisciplinary approach to the field."

Now, ten years later, we can look back at the ten volumes (in twenty-five issues, comprising over 5,500 pages) of *HUS*. In these years we have tried to follow the intent of our introductory note. Our journal has kept an international and interdisciplinary profile, both when it came to its contributors and to its subject matter. While topics dealing with modern folklore, economy, and political science were not absent from *HUS*'s pages, our profile has been historical and philological, with the stress on pre-modern periods; within those periods, there was virtually no limitation as far as the philologies were concerned—we ranged from the Slavic to the Chinese.

The bulk of *HUS*'s articles and reviews dealt with Ukrainian studies as the term is commonly understood, with special attention paid to publication of source materials. In order to offer a forum for the examination of crucial problems in Ukrainian studies, special thematic issues were put together, of which three have appeared hitherto. "The Kiev Mohyla Academy" commemorated the 350th anniversary of the founding of the first Orthodox college in Eastern Europe. The focal point in this discussion was the multicultural aspect of that institution of higher learning. The issue, "The Political and Social Ideas of Vjačeslav Lypyn'skyj," was devoted to the ideas and theories of that Ukrainian political thinker, and for the first time his legacy was made known to Western scholars. The problem of Ukrainian national consciousness was brought into relief in an issue devoted to "Concepts of Nationhood in Early Modern Eastern Europe," with contributions coming from scholars representing many of the nations involved. The fourth thematic issue, the volume for 1988, will be the publication of the proceedings of the International Congress Commemorating the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine (Ravenna, April 1988).

So much for Ukrainian studies in the strict sense of the word. The ten volumes of *HUS*, however, also contain articles dealing with two areas of research relevant to the Ukrainian past: Oriental and Byzantine studies. In

part, the presence of such articles in *HUS* reflected the interests and competence of its editors, one of them an Orientalist, the other a Byzantinist. There was also a theoretical reason behind according hospitality to publications of this kind: the conviction that the Ukrainian past, especially its early periods, could best be understood in two of its important contexts, Oriental and Byzantine. This had not been the prevailing view since the 1930s, and the narrowing of outlook in Ukrainian scholarship happened both in the Soviet Ukraine and outside of it. When it came to Byzantium, we realized that the present-day Rus'-Ukraine—a land which a thousand years ago accepted Byzantine Christianity and culture, and which in prerevolutionary times boasted prominent Byzantinists, was the only major European country without a significant academic position in the field of Byzantine studies.

The same could be said of Oriental studies. Between 1918 and 1930 there were active at the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences four institutions, the Chair of Jewish Culture and the Jewish Historico-Archaeographic Commission, and two Near Eastern Centers for Arabo-Islamic studies and for Turkology. All four were headed by the eminent Orientalist Ahantanhel Kryms'kyj. At present, the land with the Khazarian and Turko-Tatar background, which for centuries was also home to large Jewish and Armenian minorities, has no scholarly institutions worth mentioning in these respective fields. The past volumes of *HUS* corrected this imbalance within our limited means: the journal also became a meeting place for students of the early Ukrainian past, as well as for Byzantinists and Orientalists.

As a further example of the contributions of *HUS* to interdisciplinary studies, we should mention Jewish topics discussed in the journal. Both Ukrainian and Jewish scholars found in its ten volumes new discoveries and analytical studies concerning a people many of whose members made the Ukrainian territory their home for centuries, starting with Ancient Greek and Khazar times.

* * *

HUS has published 419 articles and reviews by 241 authors from 22 countries. The majority of them (158) came from the United States; they were followed by scholars from Canada (27), Poland (13), England (9), Israel (9), Germany (8), and France (7). Three each were from Italy, Yugoslavia, and Turkey, and two each were from Austria, Australia, Greece, Hungary, and Romania. Finally, one each came from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Holland, Lebanon, Singapore, Sweden, and the Ukraine. The new developments in the Soviet Union give us reason to hope that participation by Soviet Ukrainian scholars in *HUS* will increase in the near

future. Of the 241 *HUS* authors, only 70 were Ukrainians or scholars of Ukrainian background. This shows that Ukrainian studies have established themselves in international scholarship.

Time brings inevitable changes of perspective in scholarly matters. Still, in all cultural enterprises, some continuity is salutary. Thus, as *HUS* enters upon its second decennium, we expect it to continue its role as an international forum for Ukrainian studies and their wide background, but we also expect that the new generation of able contributors and editors who are now assisting us will improve upon our efforts.

Omeljan Pritsak
Ihor Ševčenko
Harvard University