

Frank Sysyn

OMELJAN PRITSAK
AND THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF UKRAINIAN STUDIES
AT HARVARD: THE VISION
AND THE ACTUALITY

Within the Ukrainian diaspora community the establishment of three chairs in Ukrainian studies and a research institute at Harvard University between 1968 and 1973 was frequently referred to as a *chudo* (miracle). The wonderworker of this miracle was a professor of Turkic and Altaic studies who had only arrived in the United States in 1961 and taken up a position at Harvard in 1964. Yet despite his late arrival in North America, over a decade after most of the post–World War II emigration had come to the New World, had established numerous academic institutions and societies, and in considerable numbers had entered the North American academic world, Omeljan Pritsak unquestionably redirected the movement to establish Ukrainian studies in North America and provided a model for educating specialists that would influence the field for well over the next half century. To write the life of a *chudotvoret's'* (miracle worker) should only be undertaken by a true-believing disciple. While I would not claim such a high calling, I do write as someone who learned much from Pritsak and who benefited from the institutions he established. I undertake this evaluation in part to understand my own formation by confronting the documentation available and comparing it with my own memories. The piece is intended to inspire those carrying on archival research and examining the role of Ukrainian studies in the West to provide more authoritative histories.

Pritsak frequently expressed his pride about having been born in Luka on April 7, 1919, during the existence of the independent Ukrainian state. This meant that he was born in the Western Ukrainian People's Republic just as the Haller Army was to attack. He described his father, a soldier in the Ukrainian Galician Army, as having died in Polish prison

camp. His mother remarried a year later but the property of his father and his stepfather, who also fought for Ukrainian independence, was seized by the Polish authorities. In the account he gave to Lubomyr Hajda, his mother and stepfather moved to Ternopil and decided to raise him as a Pole to secure his future.¹ He entered the Polish gymnasium in 1928, but in his third year became aware of his Ukrainian identity through his own observation, including attendance at a Greek Catholic church, and taunts from his Polish teachers. It was then that he secretly read Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi's *History of Ukraine-Rus'* and decided by the time he finished gymnasium in 1936 to become a historian of Ukraine. I reproduce this account at length because I have long been intrigued by it and more than a bit suspicious. It permits Pritsak to choose Ukrainian identity and Ukrainian history as an avocation, an act that was to be re-created in the 1960s and 1970s. It also opened him up to accusations that he had come from a family of *khruuni* (swinish traitors) in a society boiling over with national antagonism, but that he had against the will of his elders chosen the Ukrainian cause.

Most important for his future was his decision to take up Oriental studies at Jan Kazimierz University in Lviv, though his publications in newspapers and student publications on Ivan Mazepa and the Skopopads'kyi family demonstrated his determination to write on Ukrainian history.² He affiliated with the Shevchenko Scientific Society and his

¹ Lubomyr A. Hajda. Omeljan Pritsak: A Biographical Sketch. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1979–1980. Vol. 3–4. Pt. 1. Pp.1–6. Pritsak discusses the question of his national identity in an interview with Bohdan Strumiński: Rozmowa z prof. Pricakiem. *Zeszyty Historyczne*. 1983. No. 65. Pp. 16–17.

² For his early publications, see Lubomyr A. Hajda. The Bibliography of Omeljan Pritsak. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1979–1980. Vol. 3–4. Pt. 1. Pp. 8–9. For a discussion of Professor Pritsak and his goals based in part on interview, see Mykola Zhulyns'kyi. Uchenyi-intelektual svitovoho rivnia (do storichchia vid dnia narodzhennia Omeliana Pritsaka). Ostroh, 2019. For Pritsak's account of his early formation and how he came to choose both Turkic studies and Ukrainian history, see his Apologia pro vita sua. *Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* / ed. Yaymlayanlar. 1978. Pp. IX–XVIII (online Pritsak O. Apologia pro vita sua. *Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* / edited by Yaymlayanlar. [Cambridge, Mass. : Harvard University], 1978. Pp. IX–XVIII. http://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/4022/Pritsak_Apologia.pdf) and *Mii shliakh istoryka'*, in his *Istoriiosofia ta istoriohrafia Mykhaila Hrushevs'koho*. Cambridge, MA. ; Kyiv, 1991. Pp. 62–78 (online Прицак О. Й. Мій шлях історика. Прицак О. *Історіософія та історіографія Михайла Грушевського*. Київ ; Кембридж : [б. в.], 1991. С. 62–78. http://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/bitstream/handle/123456789/4023/Pritsak_Miy_shliakh.pdf). These accounts also contain his discussions of his activity in organizing the Harvard Ukrainian Institute.

political choice was support of the Hetmanite movement. In so doing he eschewed more radical movements of the Right and the Left and affirmed a Ukrainian statist position. It marked a position that would stimulate his interest in elites in his historical studies, in part because he considered the populist tradition to be at fault for the loss of the struggle for Ukrainian independence in 1917–1921.³ In the vortex of war, he completed his university degree under the Soviets, traveled to Kyiv at the invitation of the great Orientalist Ahatanhel' Kryms'kyi, was drafted into the Soviet army and sent to Bashkiria. He was taken prisoner by the Germans but released thanks to the intercession of the German Arabist Richard Hartmann permitting him to study at the University of Berlin. Throughout this period he was active in Ukrainian student circles and editor of the Ukrainian student bulletin *Mazepynets'*. In the recently published diaries of Ivan Lysiak Rudnytsky covering the early 1940s, Pritsak figures prominently, as do so many other members of the Ukrainian academic elite.⁴ Having studied in Berlin with the Iranist and Central Asian specialist Hans Heinrich Schaeder, Pritsak was able to resume these studies with him in 1946 in Göttingen. Receiving a doctorate in 1948 and defending a habilitation in 1951, Pritsak became a docent in Göttingen in 1951, then in Hamburg in 1952, and a professor there in 1957. After some visiting positions in Cambridge, Kraków, Warsaw, and Harvard, he took up a position as a professor of Turkology at the University of Washington in 1961, though plans were already afoot to bring him to Harvard. Indeed, subsequent to his visiting position at Harvard, he began to work with a promising graduate student in history and Middle East studies, Edward Keenan, and ultimately supervised his dissertation on Muscovy and Kazan.

Therefore, the Pritsak who arrived in the United States in 1961 had established an international reputation as an Orientalist. He had done so entirely within the German academic system and whatever the travails of postwar Germany he had not functioned as a homeless and penniless outsider as so many of the other Ukrainian students and academics had done before their arrival in a very alien North America, with the landings only somewhat softened by the existing Ukrainian communities.

³ Omeljan Pritsak. Teoriia, shcho stoit' za kontseptsiiu harvards'koho tsentru. Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu katedry Ukraïnoznavstva v Harvardi? Vybir stattei na temy nashoi kul'turnoi polityky (1967–1973)*. Cambridge, MA, 1973. P. 63.

⁴ Numerous mentions of Pritsak's student days can be found in I. Lysiak-Rudnyts'kyi. *Shchodennyky*. Kyiv, 2019.

By moving to Seattle, Pritsak took up an abode far away from the major Ukrainian communities of the East Coast or the Midwest. Yet, in his exodus to North America, the oldest of the Ukrainian settler communities played a role. Since 1957 John Reshetar had taught political science in Seattle. Reshetar was a descendant of the early settler immigrants from the Priashiv region who had formed the Minneapolis community converted to Russian Orthodoxy by Father Alexius Tovt. The author of the classic study on the Ukrainian Revolution published by Princeton University Press in 1952, Reshetar, who viewed himself as of Ukrainian background and had been active in the early phase of the founding of the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in New York, assisted the newly arrived Ukrainian colleague.⁵

In the 1960s, the University of Washington was a leading center of Slavic and East European studies and, under the editorship of the professor Donald Treadgold, the *Slavic Review* was published there. This milieu stimulated Omeljan Pritsak's turn toward Ukrainian history in North America in a publication in this prestigious journal. Ivan L. Rudnytsky published an article, "The Role of Ukraine in Modern History," that was commented on in a reply by the political scientist Arthur Adams and by a piece coauthored by Pritsak and Reshetar, "The Ukraine and the Dialectics of Nation-building," which at thirty-one pages was almost twice the length of the Rudnytsky article.⁶ These essays were later published in the volume *The Development of the USSR: An Exchange of Views*, edited by Treadgold. It is interesting to note that Reshetar and Adams were political scientists and, in the early phase of Ukrainian

⁵ John Reshetar. *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1920: A Study of Nationalism*. Princeton, 1952.

⁶ Ivan L. Rudnytsky. *The Role of Ukraine in Modern History*. *Slavic Review*. 1963. Vol. 22. No. 2. Pp. 199–216. The Pritsak–Reshetar article first appeared in *Slavic Review* (1963. Vol. 22. No. 2. Pp. 224–255) and later in Donald Treadgold (Ed.). *The Development of the USSR: An Exchange of Views*. Seattle, 1964. Pp. 236–267. The article was reprinted in the booklet *Kievan Rus' is Not Identical with Russia*. New York, 1973. This publication of the Ukrainian Studies Fund that also included Hrushevs'kyi's renowned article "The Traditional Scheme of 'Russian' History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of the East Slavs" appeared in large editions, including a reprinting in 1984, and served to strengthen Pritsak's appeal to the broader Ukrainian community. Ihor Ševčenko was originally scheduled to write the commentary but when he did not deliver it in time, Treadgold turned to his colleagues at the University of Washington. I thank Ernest Gyidel, who is studying the archive of Ivan Lysiak-Rudnytsky, for this information.

studies after World War II, Soviet studies, including political science, played the leading role. Yet even if history was a more conservative field, in the 1960s when national history was an accepted paradigm there was no need to resort to the query “Does Ukraine Have a History?” that Mark von Hagen used in the 1990s in the *Slavic Review*.⁷ Still, given Pritsak’s written English at this time, although we can assume the schemata is his, we must credit Reshetar with the form and language. Above all, the publication meant that when Pritsak arrived at Harvard in 1964 he had already taken up a prominent place in Ukrainian studies. At the same time, in engaging in discussion with Ivan Lysiak Rudnytsky, he was returning to the Ukrainian student cohort of the 1940s in which he had developed.

Pritsak arrived on the U.S. East Coast at a time when the displaced persons (DP) emigration had completed the first phase of its setting down roots in North America. Over 85,000 “new immigrants” had arrived in the United States and 35,000 in Canada. In leaving the DP camps and an Old World in partial ruin, they arrived in a New World with a booming economy. In the United States they predominantly settled in Ukrainian enclaves in cities on the East Coast and in the Midwest that already had Ukrainian churches, fraternal organizations, and national homes. Although their worldviews differed from those of the older Ukrainian community and especially its second and third generations, they could build on these existing organizations in forming a much stronger community. Whereas some of the younger immigrants were able to gain the language skills and certificates needed to pursue professional careers, many of the older immigrants had to take up manual labor alongside numerous immigrants without higher education. Transferring organizational experience and ties formed in the DP camps, these new immigrants, predominantly but not solely from Galicia, created a myriad of new organizations and institutions. Among these were the reconstituted Shevchenko Scientific Society and the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, with divisions in both Canada and the United States and ties to the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Europe, which was embarking on publishing a Ukrainian encyclopedia. The exodus from Europe had left the interwar institutions of Czechoslovakia that had been transferred to West Germany, above all the Ukrainian Free University, without a large pool of students. But the experience of main-

⁷ Mark von Hagen. Does Ukraine Have a History? *Slavic Review*. 1995. Vol. 54. No. 3. Pp. 658–673.

taining the interwar institutions and the long struggle for Ukrainian chairs and a university in Galicia had imprinted the emigration with a high regard for Ukrainian academic institutions and a conviction that Ukrainian studies was essential for the Ukrainian national cause.

New York emerged as the intellectual center of the new emigration in the United States with ties to other centers, above all Philadelphia, the headquarters of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. As the younger immigrants who had largely left Ukraine in 1943–1944 and arrived in the United States in 1948–1952 enrolled in American universities, they encountered an academy that knew little of Ukraine. Yet, at this very time, the onset of the Cold War and the infusion of funds into Soviet studies were opening up opportunities to teach and study Eastern and Central Europe (albeit largely Russian language). Some immigrants were able to use their language skills to obtain library positions. The relatively small groups of students who eschewed the more practical fields of engineering and medicine gravitated toward courses in Slavic and East European studies, with Columbia University, a leader in the field with the founding of the Russian (later Harriman) Institute in 1946, a focal point.

Urban legend has it that a group of Ukrainian students at New York University who requested that Ukrainian be taught were rebuffed with the answer that only languages, not dialects, were worth of university instruction. Whether or not this was actually the spark, the movement to promote Ukrainian studies at American universities emerged in the 1950s (though there had been earlier projects before the war). The initiative came from the Union of Ukrainian Student Associations of America (Ukrainian acronym SUSTA). By 1957 the New York student groups led by Stepan Chemych, who held a master's degree from Columbia, and his devoted wife Maria, incorporated the Ukrainian Studies Fund (USF) or as it was popularly known the FKU (*Fond Katedr Ukraïnoznavstva*) with the goal of establishing a chair in Ukrainian studies at an American university. Backed by students and professionals in many fields and a wider community, the students turned to the traditional fund-raising technique of the *koliada*, or Christmas caroling for causes, as well as wider appeals. By 1967 they had raised \$280,000, which was an enormous sum at the time.

With capital assembled it was time to look for a university. Most assumed that Columbia was the logical place, not least because George Shevelov had been a faculty member in the Slavic Department since 1954. The sum for an endowed chair at Columbia was still a daunting

\$700,000. But just before the professor of Turkology at Harvard was to come forth with his Harvard proposal, a competitor arose in the Midwest in the person of Oleksander Granovsky, a pre–World War I immigrant and noted entomologist at the University of Minnesota. Granovsky, a member of the Melnykite branch of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists, had long dreamed of such an opportunity and was able to convince his administration of a project for an endowment of \$500,000 that would have included matching funds.

We await a full study of the discussions that resulted in the USF's decision to accept Omeljan Pritsak's plan for three chairs at \$600,000 each and a research institute. What we have are the collected essays that Pritsak wrote from 1967 to 1973 to outline his vision for Ukrainian studies at Harvard and, unless otherwise indicated, the information in this article is drawn from that volume.⁸ Archival research is needed to establish when Pritsak first came into contact with the Ukrainian Studies Fund. What is clear is that his arrival at Harvard put him into contact with one of the largest academic communities of Slavic studies in North America. Indeed, his office at 1737 Cambridge Street was housed in the same building as the Russian Research Center (now Davis Center, founded in 1948). Harvard also maintained the most influential Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, though its chair Roman Jakobson who retired in 1967. Jakobson was pleased to see Pritsak join the Harvard faculty, in part because they shared the view that the Ihor Tale was authentic.⁹ Although George Shevelov and Dmytro Chyzhevsky had left Harvard in the 1950s, the arrival of Ihor Ševčenko at Harvard's Dumbarton Oaks in Washington, DC, as a professor of Byzantine studies

⁸ Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu katedry Ukraїnoznavstva v Harvardi? Vybır stattei na temy nashoi kul'turnoi polityky (1967–1973)*. Cambridge, MA, 1973. One should also consult his *Ukrainian Studies at Harvard University* (Ukraїns'kyi istoryk 1969. No. 4 (29)). Pp. 63–71).

⁹ Jakobson's views of Ukraine and Ukrainian studies have been the subject of considerable controversy. For a negative view of Jakobson's attitude toward Ukrainian language and Ukrainians, see Iurii Shevel'ov. *Zustrichi z Romanom Iakobsonom. Suchasnist'*. 1994. December. P. 104. This was in part based on Jakobson's positive views in 1934 of the Stalinist "reforms" of the Ukrainian language. Roman Jakobson. *Slavische Sprachfragen in der Sowjetunion. Slavische Rundschau*. 1934. Vol. 6. No. 1. Pp. 324–343. Horace Lunt argued against Shevelov's evaluation in a review of the article written in May 1995, but only published in 2010. *Horas Grei Land. Z pryvody spohadiv Shevel'ova. Krytyka*. 2010. No. 11–12. To my knowledge Pritsak was on good terms with Roman Jakobson and his wife Krystyna Pomorska Jakobson.

in 1965 put Pritsak in contact with another of his student cohort and afforded him a long-term adviser and ally for his Ukrainian studies project. Ševčenko was born in Radość, Poland, as the son of adherents of the Ukrainian People's Republic that had allied with Poland in April 1920. His roots in Eastern Ukraine and his experience as a youth in Warsaw as the offspring of Poland's former allies made for a formative experience very different from Pritsak's. After Ševčenko moved to Cambridge in the early 1970s and took up the position of associate director of the institute in 1973, these two émigrés of very different character and style were a team, if not always in agreement, in shaping Ukrainian studies at Harvard. But this runs ahead of the story of how Harvard accepted Ukrainian studies and how the Ukrainian Studies Fund decided to accept Pritsak's vision.

At the beginning of 1967 Stepan Chemych was instructed by the main executive of the USF to make academic contacts to help find an institution for the chair, and his discussions with Omeljan Pritsak resulted in forming an Academic Council headed by Pritsak.¹⁰ Already at the first meeting on May 7, 1967, Pritsak proposed his concept of three chairs and an institute. The background of Pritsak's activities that secured support at Harvard for his proposal needs to be fully studied, but he was able to report that by November 22, 1967, Franklin Ford, the third Minnesotan in our story and the dean of Arts and Sciences, had expressed his support for Ukrainian studies at Harvard.¹¹ But before proceeding to the Harvard project, Pritsak had to dispose of the proposal of another Minnesotan, Granovsky. After announcing that Columbia had fallen out of the competition because of price and what he intriguingly called its "state of reorganization and uncertain future," he outlined all the advantages in status and resources that Harvard had over Minnesota.¹²

Still, for the community he pointed out that the success would not only be scholarly but also political. To have chairs at Harvard would be of great political significance (*tse velyke politikum*).¹³ Certainly the political significance of founding the chairs and institute was frequently

¹⁰ Bohdan Tarnavskyyi. Slovo vid FKU. Pritsak O. *Chomu katedry Ukraїnoznavstva v Harvardi?* Pp. X–XI.

¹¹ Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu try katedry v odnomu universyteti i ne odna?* Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu katedry Ukraїnoznavstva v Harvardi?* Pp. 18–19.

¹² Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu naukova rada FKU vidkynula minnesots'ku propozyziuu.* Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu katedry Ukraїnoznavstva v Harvardi?* Pp. 20–21.

¹³ Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu try katedry v odnomu universyteti i ne odna?* P. 17.

in the donors' minds, however much Pritsak and Ševčenko might propagate the creed of pure scholarship. Knowing his audience, Pritsak explicated the relevance of academic endeavor for the success of the national political cause. He pointed out that the "Liberation Struggles" that occurred fifty years earlier, in the wake of 1917 and 1918, would have been unthinkable without the scholarly work of what he called the Silver Age of 1894–1914. In subsequent appeals to the community he declared scholarship on Ukraine the greatest service that could be afforded to the Ukrainian nation in its struggle for statehood.¹⁴

In addressing a Ukrainian audience that included many academics who had to abandon their vocations, and a large number of Galicians, he placed primary emphasis on the 1894–1914 period that was centered in Lviv.¹⁵ Yet in doing so he switched the usual chronology of the Silver and Golden Ages and declared the period that came after it, not before it, as a Golden Age that began with Ukrainian independence and the establishment of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kyiv in 1918 and was decimated in 1930 by Stalinist persecutions. Of course the survivors and carriers of the tradition of the Golden Age were fewer, especially in Pritsak's donor pool. The risks of being criticized for accepting the Soviet Ukrainian legacy were only somewhat mitigated by emphasizing the establishment of the academy under the Hetmanite government. But Pritsak also saw periods of state support as crucial, and inclusion of Ukrainian scholarship in mainstream structures as it was during the period of Ukrainization as a model. He was critical of western Ukrainian society of the interwar period for its failure to support scholarship adequately. The core of his argument was that only by supporting Ukrainian studies generously and carrying it on in mainstream institutions could a new generation of scholars emerge in North America.

Pritsak addressed a session on the state of Ukrainian studies in the West in 1974 after the success of the Harvard fund drive, and went as far as saying that given the lack of a Ukrainian state "the Ukrainian emigration in North America, which outnumbers many an independent nation (Iceland, for instance, has a population of 200,000), must assume the burden of creating a basis for Ukrainian identity on the highest level." One might add that literate Iceland whose sagas Pritsak studied in his

¹⁴ Omeljan Pritsak. Chy harvards'ka katedra ukraїnoznavchychk studii kontro-versiina? Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu katedry ukraїnoznavstva v Harvardi?* P. 31.

¹⁵ Omeljan Pritsak. Orhanizatsiia i zavdannia ukraїns'koї nauky v ZDA. Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu katedry ukraїnoznavstva v Harvardi?* P. 4.

research was often an example he held up before the Ukrainian community. He declared, “Ukrainian identity, which is the basis of cultural and political activity, as well as the drawing force for the new generation, cannot normally exist without the determined aid of the three Ukrainian disciplines: language, literature, and history (in that order),” and concluded his address on plans for Harvard with the assertion that “this plan is the only possible route which will lead the Ukrainian disciplines to the most advanced levels as equal and independent national disciplines. When this becomes an established fact, the Ukrainian emigration in the U.S. and Canada can be proud.”¹⁶

Pritsak pointed out that the scholarship of the Silver Age had been cultivated outside the University of Lviv and that only one fully operational Ukrainian chair had functioned there. In this circumstance, it was the Shevchenko Scientific Society that had state funding in the Habsburg period and had educated a generation of scholars. But because scholarship in North America was carried on above all at universities, he called for three chairs to be funded at one university that would educate a new generation in the core fields. At the same time, to ensure that the new generation would not cease its scholarly activity for lack of positions, a research institute would be needed to support the younger scholars until worthy candidates for the three chairs were identified. Indeed, after the Harvard choice was made and the funds were raised for the three chairs by 1973, Pritsak outlined a phased plan in which the chairs were to be filled by the new generation by 1983.¹⁷ The concentration of resources at Harvard would also permit turning the largest university library in North America into a preeminent Ukrainian studies library.

If much of Pritsak’s original plan was based on discussions of the past of Ukrainian scholarship and the deficiencies of the Ukrainian studies structure, little was addressed to the specificities of North American academia and of Harvard in particular. Not least of these omissions was that his vision of a research institute with long-term research and publishing projects, including the preparation of textbooks, differed from the various area studies centers that he gave as examples. Still we should first consider the age of miracles of the late 1960s and early 1970s.

¹⁶ Omeljan Pritsak. *Ukrainian Studies in the West: Problems and Prospects. Ukraine in the Seventies: Papers and Proceedings of the McMaster Conference on Contemporary Ukraine*, October 1974. Oakville, ON, 1975. Pp. 345–347.

¹⁷ Omeljan Pritsak. *Pereshchepliuвання в vyroshchuannya. Omeljan Pritsak. Chomu katedry Ukraїnoznavstva v Harvardi?* Pp. 155–156.

In attributing the wonderworking we must someday better define the roles of Pritsak and Ševčenko, who often took a back seat but who was undoubtedly crucial in maneuvering in the Harvard bureaucracy. Above all, Pritsak's visionary plan was accepted over the more modest Minnesota plan. Here politics may also have played a role in regard to those who opposed Granovsky because of his Melnykite affiliation. The funds for the first chair were raised by late 1967, and in early 1968 an agreement was reached with Harvard, establishing the chair in history and approving the whole project if sufficient funds could be raised.

In May 1968 the dean appointed an ad hoc Committee on Ukrainian Studies consisting of the Slavics professor Horace Lunt, the historian Richard Pipes, as well as Ihor Ševčenko and Omeljan Pritsak, who were later joined by the Polonist Wiktor Weintraub. All but Horace Lunt were themselves émigrés (indeed, all had lived in interwar Poland). Here cultural ties and a worldview united their visions of scholarship and their collegiality. (The committee was later joined by Edward Keenan, Pritsak's former PhD student and a close colleague who supported the Ukrainian project.) Yet the determination of Pritsak and the seeming wonder through which thousands of donors were responding to the Harvard challenge also won over the university administration, especially the dean, Franklin Ford. The lack of an East Central European Institute at Harvard also worked to the advantage of Pritsak's plan for a Ukrainian institute broadly conceived.

In congratulating Pritsak's fund-raising successes for the chairs in 1973 Dean Ford commented on how broadly the Ukrainian program had been conceived and how much it had contributed to southern and western Slavic studies at the university.¹⁸ That Pritsak's task in convincing the Harvard administration to accept the plan for Ukrainian chairs had not been easy is indicated by Ford's statement: "It seems to me clear that the views of some, expressed at the outset, that this might prove to be a parochial, culturally separatist enterprise, were not justified." Pritsak's ability to present the Ukrainian project in broad and interdisciplinary terms succeeded in obtaining permanent status for the committee and gaining permission to raise funds for an institute in Ukrainian studies. Seeing himself as a universal historian and dedicated to Rankean

¹⁸ Letter of February 5, 1973 from Franklin L. Ford to Omeljan Pritsak (Archive of the Ad Hoc Committee on Ukrainian Studies. Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University).

positivism, Pritsak would have been aghast at the idea that the program would be parochial.¹⁹

Timing was also crucial to the miracle story. Graduate schools were full in the late 1960s and fellowships could attract those inclined to academia. The post–World War II emigration had settled in the new land, and its children who had left Ukraine as toddlers or been born in the DP camps entered graduate schools in some numbers. Commanding the Ukrainian language and often aiming to combine Ukraine with their research, a dozen to a score arrived to study arts and social sciences at Harvard in this period. From fields as diverse as Flemish art to Incan archaeology, they intermingled with the students in Ukrainian studies to form a younger intellectual community and disciples for the Harvard cause, including fund-raising. The existence of a program in Middle Eastern studies and history permitted Pritsak to help in recruitment. Comparative literature offered another avenue through which graduate students could incorporate Ukrainian studies in their program. The metrics were still small, but a sufficient center of gravity was formed to sustain considerable activity. In some cases, graduate students who were interested in Ukrainian studies but attending other institutions, such as Zenon Kohut from the University of Pennsylvania, came to Harvard or received support when they finished their degrees, such as Paul Robert Magocsi from Princeton.

The graduate student milieu was somewhat buoyed by the cultural thaw in Ukraine in the 1960s and the appearance of scholarly works of merit. Taking the example of the graduate student review journal of works on Russian history, *Kritika, Recenzija* first appeared in the fall of 1970 as “A Review of Soviet Ukrainian Scholarly Publications” on a biannual basis.²⁰ Graduate students always took the lead in editing and authored most of the articles, though faculty also took part. An examination of the editorial boards reveals a whole generation of scholars who received Harvard PhDs and remained active in Ukrainian studies (Orest Subtelny, Lubomyr Hajda, Oleh Ilnytskyj, Natalia Pylypiuk, Frank Sysyn, Natalka Kononenko, John Barnstead, George Grabowicz).

¹⁹ For the credo as a universal historian and his discussion of his evaluation of the academy in a student paper see Omeljan Pritsak. Foreword: The Kiev Mohyla Academy in Ukrainian History. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1984. Vol. 8. No. 1–2. Pp. 2–8.

²⁰ *Recenzija: A Review of Soviet Ukrainian Scholarly Publications*. 1970–1979. Vols. 1–9.

The editors of the Ukrainian graduate student group included students not specializing in Ukrainian studies such as Zirka Zaremba Filipczak, Gloria Edynak, Uliana Klymyshyn, and Renata Holod. Among Russian studies graduate students were editors such as Lila Pinkus Everett, and Nancy M. Shields (Kollmann). By volume 2 the journal was listed as a publication of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies founded in the summer of 1970. Omeljan Pritsak remained its faculty adviser until it ceased publication with volume 9 (1978–1979) after the establishment of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. In many ways, *Recenzija* represented Pritsak's concept of integrating the training of Ukrainian specialists into North American models, in this case quite directly borrowing from a training tool long in practice at Harvard. Yet the initiative for this venture came from two of the first graduate students associated with him through the Committee on Mideastern Studies and History, Lubomyr Hajda and Orest Subtelny. At the same time, the journal demonstrates two aspects of the Ukrainian studies experiment – that in addition to Ukrainian studies specialists it involved graduate students of Ukrainian background from other fields and graduate students of Russian and East European studies not necessarily specializing in Ukrainian topics. Graduate students in history did double duty editing and writing for both *Kritika* and *Recenzija*. Like many aspects of the Pritsak project, the journal reflected an integration into the Harvard system while at the same time standing apart. This was emblematic of carrying out Pritsak's vision.

Pritsak's vision of being part of Harvard but initiating programs and structures outside of the usual pattern of instruction within departments and holding events at area studies centers can most clearly be seen in his establishment of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies. In the summer of 1970 he turned his office at 714 Widener Library into a Ukrainian Seminar Library and assembled source publications from throughout the Harvard system so that it would resemble the seminar or chair libraries of the European institutions he had been associated with.²¹ On October 13, 1970, the first meeting of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies was held, with Zenon Kohut as secretary in its first semester. I gave the first seminar, a discussion of a paper on Nestor Makhno connected with a paper that I was writing for Michael Confino's seminar in the History Department. At that meeting, Pritsak announced that this would be a European-type permanent seminar, not like the usual

²¹ Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies held at Harvard University during the Academic Year 1970–1971. Cambridge, 1970–1971. No. 1. Pp. 3–6.

American seminars, and would meet weekly to serve as a school of methodology, carry on biobibliographic work, collect documents, and be a regular forum through which participants could be exposed to the work of U.S. and Canadian scholars of diverse disciplines working on Ukraine. Lubomyr Hajda was to be the curator of the Ukrainian Seminar Library that would assemble materials for a biographical dictionary of Ukrainian scholars and the core of the Ukrainian state archive of the Hetmanate.

The emphasis on a re-creation of the archive of the Hetmanate was indicative of Pritsak's emphasis on sources and documentation. Indeed, he saw himself as a living link with the documentary school of Ukrainian historiography through his teacher at the Shevchenko Society Ivan Krypiakievych, the student of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, who was the student of Volodymyr Antonovych. He declared himself head of "the Ukrainian documentary school of historians in the system of Harvard University." He stated as its first principle the motto of the first volume of Hrushevs'kyi's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, the biblical "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" and affirmed that there could be no compromises with historical truth for the sake of any "national interest." He found it especially appropriate that the motto of Harvard was *Veritas*.²²

While attendance at the seminar was voluntary and in the first year the number of participants was usually well under ten, Pritsak took part without fail. Anyone with a Ukraine-related topic around Harvard was included and numerous out-of-town scholars were invited to speak. Attendance, abstracts, and discussions were duly noted down by secretaries.

After the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute (HURI) obtained its building at 1581-83 Massachusetts Avenue in 1973, the sessions were moved to its large conference room and the institute library was assembled in the basement. The biobibliographic and collection building were taken over by the institute librarian Edward Kasinec, but the basic model was never altered. Still, with increased resources to bring in outside speakers and the increasing number of the institute's academic associates, the international nature of the seminar became more pronounced and its attendance grew. The speakers came to be a who's who of Slavic and Eastern European studies, with Polish and Israeli scholars especially prominent. For example, in 1976–1977 the speakers included Stefan

²² Omeljan Pritsak. Harvards'kyi tsentr ukrains'kykh studii i shkola Hrushev-s'koho. Omeljan Pritsak. *Chomu katedry Ukraïnoznavstva v Harvardi?* Pp. 102–105.

Kieniewicz, Daniel Kaiser, George Shevelov, Dov Noy, Mateja Matejić, Riccardo Picchio, Yosyf Salmon, Lech Szczucki, Karl von Loewe, Shmuel Ettinger, and Dmitri Obolensky.²³ Still, it was always a forum for Harvard faculty, research associates, and graduate students to present their research. For the core at the institute and the graduate students associated with Ukrainian studies, the seminar remained a forum for the exchange of ideas as well as exposure to the methodology and research of major scholars in the field. Especially for the fields of premodern history, Slavic philology, and East Central European studies, the seminar occupied a central place on the Harvard intellectual map. The prominence of Edward Keenan, a staunch supporter of Ukrainian studies, as a specialist in Muscovite history and the initiator of a discussion about the authenticity of the Kurbskii–Ivan Grozny correspondence, a discussion in which Kurbskii's residence in Volhynia turned attention to Ukraine, served to heighten the role of the seminar and the institute as a meeting place for students and scholars in early Slavic studies.²⁴ In many ways the seminar was transforming into a center for Ukrainian studies specialists and for attracting scholars internationally to conceive of their topics as part of Ukrainian studies at the attractive Harvard forum. The broad contacts of Pritsak and Ševčenko brought numerous illustrious scholars to the seminar, and Pritsak in particular developed the Turkic and Steppe aspects of the field by involving scholars such as Alexandre Benningsen, Norman Golb, İ Metin Kunt, and Alan Fisher. The list expanded throughout the 1980s, and the seminar served as a place for Harvard graduate students to become acquainted with major scholars in numerous fields and present their own research.

²³ Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies Held at Harvard University during the Academic Year 1976–1977. Cambridge, MA, 1976–77. No. 7. Pp. 1–2. Over the decade of the 1970s major Polish scholars who spoke at the seminar included Marian Małowist, Aleksandr Gieysztor, Antoni Mączak, Andrzej Poppe, Zbigniew Wójcik, Stefan Kieniewicz, and Lech Szczucki as well as many major Polish specialists from the West including Norman Davies and Andrzej Kamiński. Among Israeli scholars were Mordecai L. Wilensky, Dov Noy, Yosyf Salmon, Shmuel Ettinger, and Moshé Altbauer. Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies Held at Harvard University. 1970–1979. Nos. 1–9.

²⁴ For Keenan's comments on Pritsak and the Ukrainian program, see his review of *Tentorium Honorum* in *Seventeenth Century News*. 2011. Vol. 69. No. 3–4. Pp. 185–187 and his necrology *Omeljan Pritsak (1919–2006)* in *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*. 2006. Vol. 7, No. 4. Pp. 931–936.

In the original conception of the plan, the Harvard project would produce the materials needed for teaching Ukrainian studies. Yet the initial publication series project was as much a restitution plan to save the publications of what Pritsak called the Golden Age and what others labeled the Executed Renaissance. Thus, works by Fedir Savchenko, Oleksandr Ohloblyn, Myron Korduba, and an edition of the *Eyewitness Chronicle* that had appeared in few copies or had been confiscated by the Soviet censors were reprinted with English-language introductions. This was a reading of the Fink Verlag series originally announced for fifteen volumes in the first year, out of which five appeared by that publisher and two subsequently.²⁵ This record was indicative of the Pritsak

²⁵ The announcement of the series included the following publications: Oleksander Ohloblyn. *A History of Ukrainian Industry*. Munich, 1971 (a reprint of three volumes that appeared in Kyiv between 1925 and 1931); Fedir Savchenko. *The Suppression of Ukrainian Activities in 1876*. Munich, 1971 (a reprint of a 1930 monograph and document publication, with an introduction by Basil Dmytryshyn); Orest Levyč'kyj (Ed.). *Litopys Samovydtisia*. Munich, 1972 (a reprint of the 1878 edition with an introductory article by Mykhailo Hrushevsky did not contain the introductory article by Oleksander Ohloblyn that had been announced; the second volume of scholarly articles on the chronicle was never published); George S. N. Luckyj. *Between Gogol and Ševčenko: Polarity in the Literary Ukraine, 1798–1847*. Munich, 1971; and Myron Korduba. *La littérature historique soviétique ukrainienne, Comptes-rendues, 1917–1931*. Munich, 1972 (which also contained a bibliography of the discussion occasioned by Korduba's article on the origin of the Ukrainian nation and a bibliography of Korduba's works). The volume of papers on the Ukrainian Revolution, 1917–1921, that had been announced appeared in a subsequent institute series distributed by Harvard University Press: Taras Hunczak, with the assistance of John T. von der Heide (Eds.). *The Ukraine, 1917–1921: A Study in Revolution*. Cambridge, MA, 1977. Pritsak also announced a volume he planned to author on *The Origins of Rus'* that in fact ballooned into a multivolume study, the first volume of which appeared in the series distributed by Harvard University Press as Omeljan Pritsak. *The Origin of Rus'*. Vol. 1: *Old Scandinavian Sources Other than the Sagas*. Cambridge, MA, 1981. The second volume dealing with the sagas together with the first appeared in Ukrainian translation as Omeljan Pritsak. *Pokhodzennia Rusy*. 2 vols. Kyiv, 1977; 2003. Pritsak's general theses were presented in his inaugural lecture delivered when he assumed the Mykhailo Hrushevsk'kyi Chair in Ukrainian History: Omeljan Pritsak. *The Origin of Rus': An Inaugural Lecture*, October 24, 1975. Cambridge, MA, 1976. He also announced a monograph on the Ihor tale as a historical document in the Fink Verlag series. It was published posthumously in Ukrainian: Omeljan Pritsak. *Koly i kym bulo napysano "Slovo o polku Ihorevim"*. Kyiv, 2008. Ihor Ševčenko announced a Byzantinological commentary to the Old Slavonic text of the Lives of Constantine and Methodius with an English translation

model of great plans that were only completed in part, but nevertheless accomplished much. Although the huge plan of 1970 did not come to full fruition, HURI's publications came to concentrate on the new works being produced in Ukrainian studies. These monographs and collections were distributed by Harvard University Press, beginning with the publication of Taras Hunczak, edited with the assistance of John T. von der Heide, *The Ukraine, 1917–1921: A Study in Revolution* in 1977. This new series represented a more effective integration of the Ukrainian project into North American academia. It also made the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute alongside the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies major publishers of academic books on Ukraine at a time when many university presses were reluctant to accept monographs and collections in a field that was considered of limited interest or marginal. Of the courses taught at Harvard, just the lectures of Ihor Ševčenko from History 1541, "History of Ukraine to the Seventeenth Century," were published, though this only took place in 1996 and at CIUS Press.²⁶ Projects to translate Ukrainian intellectuals' texts were also undertaken to provide

that may be published posthumously. The reprint of Kateryna Hrushevska's *Ukrains'ki narodni dumy. Korpus*, vols. 1–2 (Kyiv, 1929–1931), volume 1 of which was never released, was to appear with a biobibliographic preface by Pritsak, an introduction by Alfred Lord, a historiographic essay by Orest Zilynsky, and an English translation of the thirty-three basic texts by Patricia Warren (Kylyna) (Patricia Nell Warren) and George Tarnawsky. Only the English translations appeared separately as a publication of HURI and CIUS: *Ukrainian dumy* / trans. George Tarnawsky and Patricia Kilina. Toronto; Cambridge, MA, 1979. The two volumes of Hrushevska's edition were only republished in Kyiv in 2004. Kiril Taranovsky's monograph on the iambic tetrameter of Taras Shevchenko was never published. The planned reprint of Ivan Franko's original five volumes on Ukrainian apocrypha (Ivan Franko. *Aprokryfy i legendy z ukrains'kykh rukopysiv*. Lviv, 1896–1910) with an introduction by Dmytro Chyzhevsky did not appear. This is also true of the four volumes of reprints of Oleksander Lazarevsky's work that was to include major reviews and an introduction by Oleksander Ohloblyn. This is also the case for the reprint of Khvedir Titov. *Materiialy dlia knyzhnoi spravy na Ukraini v XVI–XVIII vv.* Kyiv, 1924, which was to have an introduction by Ihor Ševčenko. Ševčenko's work on this volume is clearly evident in his lectures published as Ihor Ševčenko. *Ukraine between East and West*. 2nd ed. Edmonton-Toronto, 2009. Titov's work was reprinted in Cologne in 1982 by Hans Rothe, who wrote an introduction to the volume. For a discussion of the plans for the Fink Verlag series, see my preface, "Ad Fontes," to Serhiy Bilenky (Ed.). *Fashioning Modern Ukraine: Selected Writings of Mykola Kostomarov, Volodymyr Antonovych, and Mykhailo Drachomanov*. Edmonton ; Toronto, 2013. Pp. IX–XI.

²⁶ Ihor Ševčenko. *Ukraine between East and West*. Edmonton ; Toronto, 1996.

the materials for teaching, though only published many years later by CIUS Press. But the Pritsak vision, always flexible, soon emphasized that with the virtual emasculation of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1963, HURI would take on many of the characteristics of an academy.²⁷ Those around him at the institute called him “Tornado” because of his whirlwind of activity and projects, albeit not always with the staff and resources to accomplish them.

Of all the publication programs Pritsak conceived for HURI, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies (HUS)* would have the most lasting influence. Appearing in 1977 and associating its publication with the centenary of the Ems Ukaz against Ukrainian language, *HUS* in many ways followed the seminar in attracting an international authors’ pool and emphasizing early Slavic studies and the East Central Europe dimension of the Ukrainian past. Its appearance was followed by the closing of *Recenzija*, which in any case faced the problem of having fewer books to review after the pogrom against Ukrainian scholarship in 1972. By the late 1970s little hope remained that Ukrainian studies would be able to draw on either archival sources or collegial contacts in Ukraine. Publishing *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* as a quarterly proved unrealistic as did many of Pritsak’s visions, and eventually the journal evolved into a biannual. *HUS* benefited greatly from the international contacts of Pritsak and Ševčenko, both of whom saw a scholarly journal as essential for a research institute. Once again they were following a European model and not the pattern of area studies institutes in North America. Managed carefully by Uliana Pasicznyk, *HUS* took on the task of publishing works by many nonnative speakers of English and dealing with scripts and transliterations in many languages. Its review section contained in-depth reviews of important publications in the field. The journal was published regularly throughout Pritsak’s tenure and he edited it with great dedication. It did however take the path of *Festschriften* in 1979–1980 for Pritsak and 1983 for Ševčenko, which involved its editorial staff in laborious editorial work in the complex fields of Turkology and Byzantine studies and provided products of marginal interest to many in Ukrainian studies. Yet the *Festschriften* brought together leading specialists in these fields, both related to Ukrainian studies, and the wide networks of the two main editors to participate in this Ukrainian studies enterprise. The special issues of the journal on Viacheslav Lypyn’s’kyi

²⁷ Omeljan Pritsak. Teoriia, shcho stoit’ za kontseptsiiu harvards’koho tsentru. P. 63.

(1985) and the Kyiv Mohyla Academy (1984)²⁸ yielded a high-quality thematic issue on central topics in Ukrainian studies, and the papers presented at a Yale conference on concepts of nation in East Central Europe in the early modern period (1986) produced a classic or leading work in nationality studies.²⁹ Pritsak wrote programmatic articles for each of the special issues, often returning to topics he had dealt with in his student days.

In the 1980s Pritsak responded to the desires of the Ukrainian community and donors by involvement in two projects that became emblematic.³⁰ Although he was not in favor of contemporary history as a research subject (but he did teach a course on the Ukrainian SSR), he approved a plan to write a history of the Ukrainian Famine that resulted in Robert Conquest's groundbreaking *Harvest of Sorrow*.³¹ In this project, another of the émigré professors, Adam Ulam of the Department of Government, played a crucial role. Despite the attempts of a delegation of the Ukrainian United Nations mission in 1981 to dissuade HURI from undertaking the project, HURI took on James Mace, a University of Michigan PhD, as a researcher, and supported the Ukrainian Famine project that was to place Ukrainian Famine studies on the scholarly agenda.

As the millennium of the conversion of Rus' approached, Pritsak enthusiastically planned the most important international academic conference on the topic, held in Ravenna and its presentations published in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* in 1988–1989, as well as the large project of the Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, including originals

²⁸ *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1985. Vol. 9. No. 3–4: special issue “*The Political and Social Ideas of Vjačeslav Lypyn's'kyj*,” guest editor Jaroslaw Pelenski; *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1984. Vol. 7. No. 1–2: special issue “*The Kiev Mohyla Academy: Commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)*”.

²⁹ *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. 1986. Vol. 10. No. 3–4: special issue “*Concepts of Nationhood in Early Modern Eastern Europe*,” guest editors Ivo Banac and Frank Sysyn.

³⁰ I have discussed the Famine and Millennium projects in Frank Sysyn. *Thirty Years of Research on the Holodomor: A Balance Sheet*. Andriy Makuch and Frank E. Sysyn (Eds.). *Contextualizing the Holodomor: The Impact of Thirty Years of Ukrainian Famine Studies*. Edmonton ; Toronto, 2015. Pp. 1–3. This article is also available on the website www.holodomor.ca.

³¹ Robert Conquest. *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine*. New York, 1986. The book was published by Hutchinson in Great Britain, Oxford University Press in the United States, and the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies and University of Alberta Press in Canada.

and English translations (with eighteen volumes to date).³² In these projects the advice and contacts of Ihor Ševčenko were crucial. In many ways Pritsak continued to use his financial supporters' desire for *velyke politikum* to launch projects that would normally be carried out by academies of science and large research teams. He also used his own and Harvard's contacts, not least of which were contacts with the Vatican. The Ravenna volume represented the culmination of the two directors' activities in medieval studies and the important place occupied by HURI and *HUS* in the field. HURI had indeed accomplished a feat that for most fields would have required an academy of sciences and a state apparatus.

Although Pritsak's influence on the journal continued after his retirement, we can consider the second Festschrift dedicated to him, *Adelphotos: A Tribute to Omeljan Pritsak by his Students* (1990), indicative of the end of his era.³³ Its nineteen contributors, limited to students dealing with Ukrainian topics, included sixteen Harvard PhDs, one Harvard BA who received a PhD elsewhere, and three PhDs from other institutions who had worked closely with Pritsak during or just after their PhD work. Among the authors were Olga Andriewsky, David J. Birnbaum, Jeffrey Featherstone, George G. Grabowicz, Richard Hantula, Oleh S. Ilnytskyj, Zenon E. Kohut, Nancy Shield Kollmann, Natalie Kononenko, Roman Koropecykyj, Paul Robert Magocsi, George Mihaychuk, Victor Ostapchuk, Donald Ostrowski, Natalia Pylypiuk, Orest Subtelny, Frank E. Sysyn, Maxim Tarnawsky, and Larry Wolff, with a preface coauthored by Lubomyr Hajda and myself. They represented the fields of history, literature, and philology. Almost all held university positions and represented a substantial segment of North American Ukrainian studies just as the field was being transformed by Ukrainian independence.

Thus, when Omeljan Pritsak retired from Harvard he left a great legacy and an unfulfilled agenda. This was a tall order for successors

³² Harvard Ukrainian Studies. 1988–89. Vol. 12–13: “*Proceedings of the International Congress Commemorating the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine*”. The Early Library of Ukrainian Literature has published seven volumes in English translation and eleven volumes (one in three parts) of original texts. See <https://www.huri.harvard.edu/pubs/publications-catalog/harvard-library-of-early-ukrainian-literature.html>.

³³ Harvard Ukrainian Studies. 1990. Vol. 14. No. 3–4: “*Adelphotos: A Tribute to Omeljan Pritsak by his Students*,” edited by Frank E. Sysyn.

to deal with, especially with Ukrainian independence revolutionizing the field of Ukrainian studies. Indeed his last efforts to launch the International Association of Ukrainian Studies and his own departure to Ukraine demonstrated that he was looking for new fields to conquer.

Still the evaluation of Pritsak's vision has to be placed in the context of education of the next generation. Although his original plan had been solely related to the education of the next generation of scholars, the request by the Ukrainian Studies Fund that the broader community be involved with Ukrainian initiatives at Harvard had resulted in the establishment of the Harvard Ukrainian summer school in the early 1970s. The funded program of Ukrainian studies courses brought scores of students, and at its height over 150 participants to four weeks of courses (later lengthened to eight weeks). Overwhelmingly attended by the Ukrainian community, the courses served a major educational and socializing function for a whole new generation of Ukrainian Americans and corresponded to Pritsak's original view that only programs integrated with American institutions would be accepted by the community's youth. In a number of cases, the attendees entered graduate studies at Harvard and other institutions. Numerous senior and younger scholars were given the opportunity to teach Ukrainian studies courses in the program. During the academic year a wide array of courses specifically on Ukraine or with a Ukrainian component were taught in the Departments of History and Slavic Languages and Literatures. My appointment as a junior member of the History Department permitted me to undertake over ten courses on Ukraine or East Central Europe with a Ukrainian component. These courses never had high enrollments, reaching a maximum of thirty, but they did permit generations of Harvard undergraduates to be exposed to university courses dealing with Ukraine.

Yet, just as Pritsak's plans and their many adaptations seemed to have reached unprecedented success, currents within North American academia and the structures of Harvard itself were working against the Harvard miracle. First and most important was the collapse of the academic job market of the mid-1970s that made obtaining a position very difficult and resulted in declines in enrollments in graduate programs. This development meant that there were fewer students in Slavic or history programs at Harvard who might be attracted by the Ukrainian

center and also that those who were completing PhD's would have problems finding employment. Pritsak had been able to secure support for some of the younger generation for a few years as he had planned in his original model, but resources were limited and the possibilities for other positions were fewer. Many dropped out of programs or were unable to secure positions. That Harvard PhDs did get a number of positions was possible because of the Ukrainian studies opportunities in Canada that had been created largely by the influence of the Ukrainian Canadian community and the establishment of the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Alberta. Therefore, the program in which the U.S. Ukrainian community had invested so much, outside of Harvard itself, largely benefited the Ukrainian Canadian community and, of course, the field in general since scholarship traversed the borders. Still the influence of Pritsak's plan to educate and sustain a generation of specialists in Ukrainian studies must be seen as a success. Without it, we would not have had as large a core of specialists in place in 1990.

Within the Harvard structure, Pritsak's full involvement in Ukrainian studies resulted in the university's request in 1975 that he take up the chair in history, which he occupied until his retirement in 1989 but not as a member of the department. His involvement in the Ukrainian project had been accompanied by his decision to resolve the major dispute on early Rus' history, the Norman question and the origin of Rus'. This constituted his inaugural lecture for the Hrushevs'kyi Chair and the multivolume project that he undertook using all available sources.³⁴ But the Harvard policy of making appointments as the result of international searches rather than hiring tenured faculty from within had always made the Pritsak model questionable. It did succeed in the appointment of George Grabowicz from within the ranks. The philology chair was another matter since it was not filled until 1991 by Michael Flier who was not a product of the Harvard Ukrainian program. And it was Roman Szporluk from the University of Michigan who followed Pritsak as holder of the Hrushevs'kyi Chair in the Department of History.

The other circumstances that shaped the Ukrainian project at Harvard were the shift toward modern history, including Soviet history,

³⁴ Omeljan Pritsak. *The Origin of Rus': An Inaugural Lecture*. The first of the six volumes that he planned to write on the topic, *Old Scandinavian Sources Other than the Sagas*, appeared five years later and established Pritsak as an innovative voice in the discussion of Old Rus' history.

in the training of graduate students in the 1970s and 1980s. It was also a period during which the “revisionist” school arose in Soviet historical circles, which questioned what was called the “totalitarian” school. This shift was accompanied by divides between Right and Left and affected the reception of Conquest’s book. This climate may also explain why James Mace did not secure an academic position despite his publications.³⁵ The discussion of twentieth-century Ukrainian history went on within the framework of Pritsak’s institute, but it was not emphasized. Hence, the Ukrainian project at Harvard did not have as great an influence as it might have. In the same way, the questioning of the nation and even the state as a basic subject of historical research put the field of Ukrainian history, like all national histories, in question. The difference was that, lacking a state formation for much of its past, Ukraine had only begun to find a place in historical studies when these changes occurred. At the same time, the new theories of nation placed into question the research that saw the national community as a long-term and basic subject of research. Moreover the rise of postmodernism was alien to the tradition of scholarship that Pritsak represented.

The core of Pritsak’s vision – a Ukrainian center with chairs and an institute at Harvard – was remarkably productive during his years at Harvard and laid a groundwork that has endured. He came from the smaller academic world of the mid-twentieth century in which traditional fields of history, literature, and philology in Slavic studies that originated in Europe were being transferred to the United States along with many scholars. He and the institute he shaped found an appropriate niche at Harvard in these traditional fields, and he had the good fortune that Ihor Ševčenko could serve as his partner and was a leader in a field so essential to medieval and early modern Ukrainian studies. He was fortunate that the generous Ukrainian Studies Fund and the Ukrainian community endorsed his plans and came to his aid time and again in supporting Ukrainian studies. He found a favorable situation

³⁵ For an attack on James Mace by Roberta Manning, see her comments quoted by Jeff Coplon. In Search of a Soviet Holocaust: A 55-Year-Old Famine Feeds the Right. *The Village Voice*. 1988. January 12. P. 32. I discuss this situation in by Frank E. Sysyn. The Ukrainian Famine of 1932–33: The Role of the Ukrainian Diaspora in Research and Public Discussion. Levron Chorbajian and George Shirinian (Eds.). *Studies in Comparative Genocide*. New York and London, 1999. Pp. 182–215. The article is available on the website www.holodomor.ca.

in that the Ukrainian Studies Fund had been established even before he arrived in the United States. Yet his role in galvanizing the community to support an academic project in part to fulfill their Ukrainian patriotic dreams was crucial.

Pritsak's successors have had very different interests and have worked in entirely new circumstances. Tensions were always present between much of Pritsak's vision, which was rooted in European academia of the early twentieth century, and the academic structures of Harvard and new trends in academia. He also had to balance between a Ukrainian community – which focused on the lost struggle for independence, above all in the generation of post–World War II immigrants, and had been convinced that the Harvard project was the way to save their national tradition and gain international recognition – and his dedication to the highest standards of scholarship and to placing Ukrainian studies in a broad context, frequently by pursuing arcane studies. Another basic tension was that to enact his plan Pritsak had to integrate his program into structures at Harvard and at the same time strive for the recognition of Ukrainian history, literature, and language as a separate field of research. The separate buildings in which HURI has been located symbolize the need to keep distance while integrating. Certainly for the period from 1968 to 1989 Pritsak devoted tremendous efforts to making this a creative tension.