

*Arzneibuch der Rosse* is of particular interest, since previously only a Czech edition dated 1564 was known, and no copy of it had been preserved.

Czech history is especially well represented in the Gotha catalogue by sections entitled "Schriften von Hus, über Hus und den Hussitismus" (pp. 96-103) and "Wallenstein-Literatur" (pp. 168-72). There are also many items drawn from leaflets written during the period of the Thirty Years' War (pp. 103-68). The catalogue does not include Slavic manuscripts, most of which were listed as early as 1714 by Ernst Salomon Cyprian in his *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Gothanae*. This work subsequently prompted Josef Dobrovský to visit the Gotha Library in May, 1792; thus a special section of the catalogue is devoted to "Schriften von und über Dobrovsky" (pp. 176-78).

Highly competent annotations to entries concerning rare prints, and careful indexes (index of authors, of anonymous titles and periodicals, and a list of names of about one hundred printers or publishers of the Library's incunabula) facilitate the use of the topically arranged catalogue. Both the Jena and Gotha catalogues are very valuable tools which might serve as a basis for the development of a regional catalogue of the *Slavica* in the leading libraries of Thuringia: at Jena, Gotha, Weimar (Landesbibliothek), and Erfurt (Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek).

It should be added that work on the catalogue began in 1957 after the restitution of the Library to East Germany by the Soviet Union. According to the preface, the Library, like the editorial office of the *Almanach de Gotha*, had been "safeguarded" by the Red Army. It was in the custody of the Soviet Academy of Sciences for ten years before being returned to the East Germans well preserved and in good order. Praise is given to the director of the Academy's library, Professor Chebotarev, whose interest in the Gotha deposit earned him an honorary degree from Jena University.

Bonn

FRITZ T. EPSTEIN

## LETTERS

### TO THE EDITOR:

In his "Reply" to my article "The Awakening of the Ukraine," both of which appeared in the June, 1963, issue of the *Slavic Review*, Professor Ivan Rudnytsky asserted that my "conception of the Ukrainian Revolution is basically one of a wild and chaotic peasant revolt, of a *jacquerie*." He further stated: "This picture . . . is an extremely one-sided one, almost to the point of caricature."

I must protest that it is Rudnytsky who has drawn the caricature. Since he has totally distorted the theory presented in my commentary, I wish to restate my main points in their briefest form.

In opposition to Professor Rudnytsky's emphasis upon the Ukrainian nationalist movement as the magnetic center toward which all other forces in the Ukraine "pointed in the same direction" were pulled, "as if drawn by an irresistible attraction," my main thesis was and remains "that while Ukrainian nationalist groups did help to bring about a national awakening, the nationalist movement itself was but one component of a complex process involving other forces, events, and ideas of equal, or perhaps greater,

significance." While retaining the nationalist movement as one of the predominant factors in the Ukraine's awakening (a fact Professor Rudnytsky has chosen to ignore), I listed and discussed five other factors (four of which Professor Rudnytsky also disregarded in his assessment of my commentary). The six contributing factors were: (1) The nationalist movement. (2) The Ukraine's historical development. (3) The activities of non-nationalist political groups, for example, the Russian Menshevik, Bolshevik, and Social Revolutionary parties. (4) The social, economic, and political effects of German occupation, the Bolshevik invasion, civil war, and Allied intervention. (5) Actions of individual Cossack leaders, determined in part by their Cossack traditions. (6) Peasant *jacqueries*.

In respect to point 6, which was presented in two concluding paragraphs of my commentary, I said: "At least in part, the final years of the awakening of the Ukraine should be viewed as a history of a peasant *jacquerie* that crushed all lesser forces beneath its boots, until, at last, peasants and land were so exhausted that Bolshevism's patient workers were able to slip into power almost unchallenged." This is a strong statement, as I intended it to be, since I firmly believe that the role of the peasants has too often been underestimated and the role of the nationalist movement too often exaggerated. Taken in context, however, the statement obviously does not justify Professor Rudnytsky's extreme oversimplification of my interpretation of the last years of pre-Soviet Ukrainian history.

Since, despite our differences, we are both, I believe, primarily concerned with identifying the factors that have determined the course of modern Ukrainian history and in analyzing their influence up to the final Soviet victory in early 1920, I respectfully suggest that Professor Rudnytsky may wish to consider more carefully than he has the hypotheses I have advanced.

ARTHUR E. ADAMS  
*Michigan State University*

TO THE EDITOR:

Like our capacity to overkill the Russians many times, William Henry Chamberlin repeatedly buries my book *The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-1960* in his review in your September, 1962, issue.

Though he finds in it "an enormous amount of reference material," there is "so much standing of historical truth on its head" that "Fleming has failed." To prove the enormity of his failure, Chamberlin cites two cases of Fleming's monumental bias. He says: "In the face of overwhelming *circumstantial* evidence [my italics] that only the Russians were in a position to have massacred some 15,000 Polish officer war prisoners in the Katyn Forest" Fleming declares that "the evidence in the case is conflicting."

But note what I really said: "The evidence in the case is conflicting. On balance it indicates that the Russians killed the officers. . . ." Thus my conclusion was that the Russians were guilty. Why did Chamberlin give the opposite impression? Is it credible that he did not read immediately beyond the sentence he wanted to quote? Who is now guilty of standing truth on its head? I invite anyone to read my account of the Katyn affair and judge it for "perspective and objectivity."