der Sukin, the treatment each prisoner was to receive: whether he was to be kept in chains, placed under special surveillance, or allowed more liberty. These orders, one hundred and fifty of them, often written on small pieces of paper, are preserved and they constitute a remarkable record. They show the keen interest that Nicholas took in the whole affair and his determined effort to obtain at any price maximum evidence from every person detained. . . . "Ryleev," reads the note accompanying him, "to be placed in the Peter and Paul Fortress, but his hands not tied; no communication with others, give him writing paper and whatever he writes daily deliver to me personally." "Upon receiving Bestuzhev, as well as Obolensky and Shchepin," reads another, "order them to be manacled." A third reads, "Yakushkin to be treated severely and not otherwise than a villain."

Compare also Barratt, p. 139, and Mazour, p. 205; Barratt, pp. 140-41, and Mazour, pp. 208-10; and Barratt, pp. 209-11, and Mazour, pp. 222 ff; compare also the materials in Barratt, Appendix B, pp. 331-36 to Mazour's appendix, pp. 274-90; and finally, the translation from Iakushkin's memoirs, Barratt, p. 40, with that of Mazour, pp. 55-56.

At best this pattern of unfootnoted similarity may be attributed to carelessness, but for this reader at least it cast an unpleasant shadow over the entire enterprise. Readers should think twice about regarding Voices in Exile as a monument to the Decembrists' memory.

Daniel T. Orlovsky
Southern Methodist University


The career of Dmytro Ivanovich Doroshenko (1882-1951) as bibliographer, pedagogue, historian, and Ukrainian state and cultural leader began in the last century. Professor Doroshenko's Moji spomyny pro nedavne mynule (L'viv, 1923-24 and Winnipeg, 1949, as well as the 1942 Prague polyglot bibliography of his more than eight-hundred published works, testify to his important and productive role in modern Ukrainian history and historiography.

Mr. Gerus' work represents a reprinting of the 1939 translation of Dmytro Doroshenko's 1932-33 Warsaw lectures (Narys istoriji Ukrajiny, 2 vols. [1932-33]), which were also reprinted in the original Ukrainian in Munich in 1966. The 1939 Edmonton edition [2nd ed., 1941] was translated and abridged by Hanna Keller and was edited and introduced by G. W. Simpson of the University of Saskatchewan. To the 1933 edition Mr. Gerus has added five new chapters surveying the impact of World War I in Ukraine as well as an overview of the Soviet period. The concluding portions of this new edition contain an extensive bibliography, twenty illustrations and photographs, five chronological tables of the rulers of Ukraine, and eleven maps. The author used a modified LC system of transliteration from the Ukrainian.

The introductory matter, entitled "An Outline of Ukrainian Historiography" (pp. 1-10) contains several inconsistencies (e.g., p. 5, Kamanyna should be Kamany; p. 7, Our Past and Proceedings of the Ukrainian Scientific Society should not be run together since they constitute two separate publications). Between the "Outline" and Gerus' biography of Doroshenko, inconsistencies such as the spelling of Kamianets-Podil'sk appear (see p. 128).

Let us now turn to the question of the quality of text in the Gerus edition. For this purpose we have selected two sections of the Munich edition (1966):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warsaw/Munich edition</th>
<th>Gerus edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pp. 94-96</td>
<td>pp. 77-80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Munich edition**

(1)

Oğıe faktyćno Halyc'ko-Volyns'ka deržava, cja druga velyka deržava na ukrajins'kij zemli, zbudovana ukrajins'kymi rukamy, jaka zumila objednati bilja sebi bil'yu častynu ukrajins'koi etnohrafičnój terytoriji svoho času, faktyćno v polovyni XIV st. perestala isnuvaty. Ale pivtora stolittja jiji isnuvannja ne promynulo bezslidno dni dal'soj si oli ukrajins'koho narodu. Novišyi doslidnyk Prof. St. Tomašis'kij duje vysoko stavyt' zasluhůy Halyc'ko-Volyns'kijj deržavy pered ukrajins'kym narodom. Cja deržava, kaze vin, zberehla Ukrajinu pered pereděčasnym opanuvannjam i asimiljacijeju z boku Pol'sči.

Roziravši j cerkovno-polityćni zvjazky z Suzdalem, vona z drugoju boku prypynyla proces asimiljaciji ukrajins'koho element'j z velykorus'kym z perevahoj velokoruscyny. Nejsi vóna vidkryla zaxid'n'oevroepejs'kym dostup v šyroki mīri j nej-tralizovala bnobićnist'vplyviv vizantijs'kij. [From Dmytro Dorosenko, p. 94]

(2)


Reviewer's literal translation

(1)

Thus, the Galacian-Volhynian state, the second in the Ukrainian territory built by Ukrainian hands, a state that had managed to unite lands with a Ukrainian population, actually ceased to exist at the middle of the fourteenth century. But one-and-a-half centuries of its existence did not pass without leaving a trace in the further fate of the Ukrainian people. The modern researcher Prof. S. Tomasiv'skij very highly values the merits of the Galician-Volhynian state to the Ukrainian people. That state, he says, prevented Ukraine from being dominated and assimilated by Poland very early. On the other hand, by breaking dynastic and ecclesiastic-political connections with the princedom of Suzdal, the Galitician-Volhynian state stopped the process of assimilation of the Ukrainian element to the Great Russian, to the latter's advantage. Finally, that state opened itself widely to West European influences and neutralized the one-sided Byzantine influence.