

# Shaping Ukrainian Studies: A Portrait of Frank E. Sysyn

*Zenon E. Kohut*  
*with Olga Andriewsky*

On Friday evening, 2 November 2007, seventy-five colleagues, friends, and relatives of Frank E. Sysyn gathered at Trinity College of the University of Toronto to mark his sixtieth birthday, celebrate his distinguished academic career, and announce the publication of a Festschrift in his honor. It was most appropriate for us to acknowledge a scholar whose work has shaped the interpretation of Ukrainian history, a teacher who has trained a generation of students and scholars, and an organizer of scholarship who has substantially influenced the development of Ukrainian studies. But the story of Frank Sysyn needs to be told not only as a well-deserved accolade, but also to illustrate how Ukrainian studies has developed, how Frank was part of this process, and how he has helped shape and obtain recognition for the field in which scholars of Ukrainian studies work today.<sup>1</sup>

## *The Many Worlds of Frank Sysyn*

Frank was born on 27 December 1946 in Passaic, New Jersey. His father, Frank, was the son of immigrants from Western Ukraine. A veteran

---

<sup>1</sup> My portrait of Frank Sysyn is based first and foremost on personal experience. Frank has been my colleague and friend for over four decades, and I have had the privilege of working with him both in the early days of the Harvard Ukrainian studies project and over the last two decades at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS). In compiling “the Frank Sysyn story” I have had the opportunity to refresh my personal memories and to verify and supplement them with written records, particularly Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute (HURI) and CIUS newsletters, press releases, annual reports, and other materials. A three-hour interview I recorded with Frank has also filled in many details. Olga Andriewsky provided further details and thoroughly revised, clarified, and abridged my expanding manuscript. I am indebted to Olha Aleksic (HURI), Ksenya Kiebusinski (University of Toronto), and Roman Procyk (Ukrainian Studies Fund) for providing me with complete sets of the *Harvard Ukrainian Studies Newsletter* and *Newsletter for the Friends of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute*. I am also grateful to Roman Shiyan for helping me locate, copy, and organize relevant materials at CIUS and for transcribing the taped interview.

of World War II, he married Hattie Miller, his fiancée of Dutch- and Irish-American extraction, right after the war and brought her to live in his parents' house in Clifton. Frank's paternal grandfather was an immigrant from Mshanets, a village in the Boiko region near Staryi Sambir. The village was small but had an illustrious pedigree as perhaps the most fully documented rural community in Ukraine, owing to scores of articles about it written by its pastor, the nineteenth-century ethnographer Reverend Mykhailo Zubrytsky. Frank's grandmother had come to America from Trushevychi (near Dobromyl) after World War I and the failed attempt to found a Western Ukrainian state. She had a talent for recounting tales of the old country, and many years later, in the dedication of his monograph on Adam Kysil, Frank would credit his grandmother with awakening his interest in Ukrainian history.

Frank grew up in the Athenia section of Clifton, near Passaic, in a vibrant enclave of Slavic immigrants. Many of these people had arrived from Galicia, Transcarpathia, or the Lemko region before or immediately after World War I. Passaic, in general, was a place where eastern European immigrants established Orthodox, Protestant, Greek Catholic, and Roman Catholic churches as well as Jewish synagogues, which can still be found on virtually every block. It was also a place where issues of religious affiliation, politics, and national identity—the very subjects that would later define Frank's academic focus—were part of the discourse of everyday life. Frank himself grew up to be an excellent raconteur—a talent clearly inherited from his grandmother. Anyone who has spent any time in his company has heard his warm and often humorous tales about life in Clifton, the many characters and personalities who inhabited his neighborhood, and his grandfather's tailor shop, which functioned as a community meeting place of sorts, whose window was for him a wonderful observation and listening post.

By all accounts, Frank was a precocious child and a star pupil. His public speaking abilities were soon recognized by his teachers, who put them to use in many school assemblies. At the age of eleven or twelve Frank began reading the *Encyclopedia Britannica* in the renowned eleventh edition (the first assembled under American publisher Horace Everett Hooper), a gift from his maternal grandfather. He recalls that the encyclopedia's entries on history held a special fascination for him, and he remembers in particular reading the entry on Austria-Hungary very closely. At about the same age Frank read his first book on Ukrainian history—*The Black Deeds of the Kremlin*, a five-hundred page volume of essays and eyewitness accounts written by survivors of the Holodomor of 1932–33 in Ukraine, which left a deep impression on him. In school and later at university, Frank performed superbly and won numerous aca-

demic awards. (He often sings the praises of the Clifton public school system of the 1950s and lauds the rigorous scholastic standards to which he was introduced by his teachers.) In 1964 he graduated from Clifton Senior High School as a National Merit Finalist, recognized as one of the top high school students in the United States, and that fall he entered Princeton University on a full scholarship.

Princeton opened up more new worlds to Frank. He was soon accepted into the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, which offered an elite program of multidisciplinary undergraduate courses that included sociology, politics, history, and economics. Princeton had long prided itself on the quality of its undergraduate education, and for Frank it offered the opportunity to meet, learn from, and work with outstanding scholars and intellectuals. Setting out to earn a certificate in Russian and Soviet studies, Frank took courses with Robert Tucker, Cyril Black, and James Billington, and met George Kennan and Georges Florovsky. He became a research assistant to the sociologist Allen Kassof. Professor Kassof became his senior thesis adviser, and it was he who urged Frank to consider a career in academia instead of law, for which Frank remains grateful to this day.

Princeton also gave Frank the opportunity to expand his knowledge of Ukrainian history and to begin rethinking the Moscow- and Russo-centric approach that informed so much Western academic writing on Ukraine and the Soviet Union. In 1967 he won the McConnell Scholarship to conduct senior thesis research abroad. By this time Frank had become deeply interested in the Soviet Ukrainian revival and dissident movement of the 1960s, the *shistdesiatnyky* (“generation of the 1960s”). The arrest of Ukrainian dissidents had begun in 1965, followed by another wave of arrests in 1967. For his senior thesis, Frank proposed to do a study of the Ukrainian intelligentsia after World War II, building on Yaroslav Bilinsky’s *The Second Soviet Republic* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1964).<sup>2</sup>

Formal research in the Soviet Union on Frank’s chosen subject was unthinkable, but the McConnell Scholarship did make it possible for him to enroll in a Russian-language course in Leningrad and travel to Kyiv, Odesa, and Baku. While in Odesa, Frank encountered one of the many hidden chapters of Soviet history in a most personal way—he clandest-

---

<sup>2</sup> During his thesis research, Frank benefited greatly from reading the *Current Digest of the Soviet Ukrainian Press*, a major source to events in Ukraine issued in English translation by the Ukrainian émigré publishing house Prolog. Vyacheslav Chornovil’s dissident treatise *Lykho z rozumu* (The Misfortune from Intellect), published in English translation under the title *The Chornovil Papers* (New York and Toronto, 1968), also had a profound impact on Frank.

tinely met with his grandfather's younger sister, Teklia, who, like so many other Western Ukrainians, had been deported from her native village after World War II. In the remote village where she had been resettled some ninety kilometers from Odesa, Frank saw the photograph of his grandfather, his father, his two uncles, and himself at the age of four or five that Aunt Teklia kept on the wall of her house. The photo had been sent to the family in Mshanets just before they were deported. The encounter was a very moving experience, both for Frank and his relatives. Frank's family was elated to meet him, for contacts with the family in America had been severed and lost for years. In the short time they spent together, Frank's relatives described the horrors they had endured under the Soviet regime and Frank was introduced to many of the village's other deportees, who were also eager to tell him about their plights.

When he returned to Princeton, Frank wrote a 350-page treatise titled "The Ukrainian National Movement and Soviet Nationality Policy after World War II," which won the 1968 Woodrow Wilson School Senior Thesis Prize. At about this time, too, Frank wrote a review of a first-hand account of Russification in Ukraine by John Kolasky, a former Ukrainian-Canadian Communist.<sup>3</sup> That was the first of Frank's many reviews of works in Ukrainian studies, which together have greatly enriched study and discourse in the field.

In recognition of his outstanding undergraduate academic record, Frank won a Fulbright Award, enabling him to pursue a master's degree in history at the University of London's celebrated School of Slavonic Studies. The school had a unique complement of specialists who were studying virtually every corner of the Slavic and east European world, however remote or arcane. Its seminar series was presided over by Hugh Seton-Watson, the holder of the chair of history and author of a seminal study on nations and states. For more contemporary topics, Frank also attended lectures at the London School of Economics, where Peter Reddaway was teaching at the time. Frank worked most closely, however, with three other scholars—John Keep, a historian of Russia and later a professor at the University of Toronto; Piotr Skwarczyński, a specialist in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth; and Victor Swoboda, an expert in Ukrainian language and literature. Influenced by reading the work of Viacheslav Lypynsky, the founder of the statist school in Ukrainian historiography, Frank wrote his master's paper on the old Ukrainian nobility in the Khmelnytsky Uprising. Research on that topic inevitably led him to study Jakub Michalowski's *Księga pamiętnicza*, a massive nineteenth-

---

<sup>3</sup> "John Kolasky, *Education in Soviet Ukraine: A Study in Discrimination and Russification*," *The Ukrainian Quarterly* 24, no. 4 (Winter 1968): 369–71.

century publication of historical documents that included the letters of Adam Kysil, perhaps the single most important Ukrainian nobleman of the mid-seventeenth century. That was a very ambitious scholarly undertaking: it meant, for instance, that Frank had to acquire a knowledge of seventeenth-century Polish though he had never studied modern Polish, and that he be competent in reading Latin, which he had last studied in high school.

A chance meeting in London with Renata Holod, then a graduate student in fine arts at Harvard, influenced Frank's subsequent life dramatically. By this time he had become convinced that history rather than law or government service—which he had also considered—was his vocation. Frank had received offers to enroll in Ph.D. programs in history at Stanford, Princeton, and Harvard. He also had the option of continuing on to a Ph.D. at the School of Slavonic Studies itself. As Frank contemplated these choices, it was Renata Holod who persuaded him that Harvard University, where the first chair in Ukrainian studies (in history) was being established at just that time, was the place for him to be.

The founding of the Harvard chair was a remarkable achievement. In the 1950s the request by a group of Ukrainian-American students for Ukrainian language courses at a major American university had been rebuffed because “universities don't teach dialects.” It was this incident that spurred these students and others to launch a community campaign to establish Ukrainian studies at the university level and led to the creation of the Ukrainian Studies Fund (USF) to support such a development. The founding of the Harvard chair that came about in 1968 was thus the result of a decade-long effort to endow a university chair in Ukrainian studies by the Federation of Ukrainian Student Organizations of America. By the late 1960s the USF had collected over half a million dollars for the project, mostly in small donations from the Ukrainian-American community. The mass participation of ordinary Ukrainians in the undertaking was undoubtedly a reflection of the extent to which they believed that their history and culture were being misrepresented and marginalized by the prevailing academic and popular narratives.

Harvard University's acceptance of the project to establish a program in Ukrainian studies there was due in large part due to the authority of two Harvard professors of Ukrainian background: Omeljan Pritsak, an eminent Turcologist, and Ihor Ševčenko, a renowned Byzantinist. As essential as Professors Pritsak's and Ševčenko's efforts were, however, they could not have succeeded without the support of leading scholars in the Russian, Soviet, and Slavic fields at Harvard, specifically Richard Pipes, Adam Ulam, and Wiktor Weintraub. All three scholars were emigrants from Poland with a refined understanding of the national and cul-

tural complexities of Europe and the Soviet Union. Already in 1954, for instance, Professor Pipes had published a groundbreaking work on nationality issues and the formation of the Soviet Union.<sup>4</sup>

As a graduate student at Harvard, Frank was attracted by the ambitious Ukrainian studies project. It offered the opportunity to study Ukraine in the widest possible context, the prospect of working with some of the leading scholars in the world, and the chance to help create and develop a unique scholarly program and institution. Indeed, Professor Pritsak was insisting on the creation of not one, but three chairs of Ukrainian studies—in Ukrainian history, Ukrainian literature, and Ukrainian philology—within Harvard’s corresponding departments of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. He also argued for the creation of a Ukrainian research institute at Harvard as an autonomous institution that would engage in research and publishing and, in effect, serve as a surrogate academy of sciences, free of the heavy ideological restrictions constraining Ukrainian scholarship in the Soviet Union. His philosophy and goals were to promote the highest level of quality of scholarship, to make Ukrainian studies internationally attractive, and thus to put Ukraine and Ukrainian issues on the map, as it were. That aim attracted a whole generation of graduate students, Frank Sysyn among them, who for the last thirty years have constituted the core of academics working on Ukrainian topics in the West.

Frank entered the Ph.D. program in history at Harvard in the fall of 1969. He now jokes that between his studies, travels, service in the National Guard,<sup>5</sup> and the building of the Ukrainian program at Harvard, he effectively missed much of the 1960s and early 1970s. In his first year at Harvard, Frank took a graduate seminar on Russian anarchism with Michael Confino, a visiting professor from Israel, during which he utilized the considerable holdings at Houghton Library to write a research paper on Nestor Makhno; that essay became his first published scholarly article.<sup>6</sup> He studied the “Crisis of the Seventeenth Century” with Franklin

---

<sup>4</sup> *The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism, 1917–1923* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954, rev. 1964; New York: Atheneum, 1968).

<sup>5</sup> In 1969, during the height of the Vietnam War, military deferments for graduate students were ended and replaced with a lottery system intended to promote equality before the draft. Frank’s number was 76; only those with numbers of 250 or higher were reasonably assured of not being drafted. For Frank, like many Harvard graduate students, the alternative was six months of basic training (which postponed his doctoral exams), followed by six years of service in the Cambridge branch of the Massachusetts National Guard.

<sup>6</sup> “Nestor Makhno and the Ukrainian Revolution,” in *The Ukraine, 1917–1921: A Study in Revolution*, 271–304, ed. Taras Hunczak (Cambridge, Mass.: HURI, 1977).

Ford, the noted early-modernist, exploring a theme that would become the trademark of his work on the Khmelnytsky Uprising. Frank benefited greatly, too, from Wiktor Weintraub's instruction in early Polish literature. He also enrolled in a seminar with newly tenured Edward Keenan on diplomatics (the study and verification of very old documents). Frank recalls that students in the course were especially excited by Keenan's revolutionary theories on the Kurbsky–Ivan the Terrible correspondence.<sup>7</sup> Frank wrote his seminar paper on the diplomatics of the Kyiv metropolitans, in the process finding that Horace Lunt's course in Church Slavonic stood him in good stead. At one point in the seminar, Frank recalls, he was instructed to read a book in Romanian. When Frank responded that he didn't know the language, Keenan pointedly rejoined, "But you know French, don't you?"

Frank's first encounter with Omeljan Pritsak was no less memorable. A few weeks after arriving in Cambridge, Frank walked over to Professor Pritsak's office and introduced himself. Pritsak first chided him for not coming to see him sooner and then proceeded to give Frank a brief oral exam in history, as was his custom on meeting aspiring academics; subsequently he began giving Frank projects to do, such as translating historical texts. Frank thus became part of the first group of Harvard graduate students in Ukrainian studies, joining Lubomyr Hajda, Orest Subtelny, George G. Grabowicz, Omry Ronen, Richard Hantula, Luba Dyky, and Natalie Kononenko. That group was soon joined by young academics and Ph.D. students from other institutions attracted by Harvard's vibrant academic program, including me from the University of Pennsylvania and Paul Robert Magocsi from Princeton University. This core group was expected to implement Pritsak's ever-expanding grand design for the field. Their cadres were supplemented by other graduate students who participated in the Ukrainian program's activities on a regular basis. During the 1970s and 1980s a subsequent wave of graduate students, including Oleh Ilnytzkyj, Natalia Pylypiuk, Roman Koropecyk, Victor Ostapchuk, Maxim Tarnawsky, Olga Andriewsky, Borys Gudziak, and Leonid Heretz, joined the Harvard group, as did young scholars from other institutions, including Don Ostrowski, Paul Hollingsworth, and George Liber. Harvard's Ukrainian Research Institute (HURI), formally established in 1973, continually attracted scholars from far and wide. They consistently found encouragement and support from its energetic director, Omeljan Pritsak.

---

<sup>7</sup> Edward Keenan, *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the "Correspondence" Attributed to Prince A. M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971).

The first pillar of the Ukrainian program at Harvard was the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies. Inaugurated on 13 October 1970, the seminar met every Thursday afternoon during the academic year, initially at Professor Pritsak's office in Widener Library; once HURI was established in a separate building owned by Harvard on Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge, meetings were conducted in its spacious seminar room. Attendance was viewed as a sacred duty. The seminar sessions were intended to serve as a academic workshop for graduate students and common meeting place for scholars and students in various fields. Thus seminar topics encompassed all disciplines of Ukrainian studies—history, philology, linguistics, literature, arts, political science, anthropology, sociology, and economics. Over the years an array of internationally renowned scholars spoke at the seminar, drawing an audience from throughout the Harvard community. Summaries of the seminars and the discussions were published in the *Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies* (1970–79). Frank was an engaged discussant and frequent presenter at seminar sessions. Beginning in 1976, he also served as the seminar's coordinator.

In addition to his required history courses, Frank attended all new courses offered in the Ukrainian program, including ones in philology such as Kirill Taranowski's course on Shevchenko's *Haidamaky*. He especially profited from a course taught jointly by Omeljan Pritsak and Ihor Ševčenko, titled "History of Ukraine to the Seventeenth Century." Frank would later organize the publication of Professor Ševčenko's course lectures as the volume *Ukraine between East and West: Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century*; it appeared in 1996 and has now been republished both in Ukrainian translation and a revised second edition. Frank also benefited from the expertise of Oleksander Ohloblyn, the well-known historian of Ukraine who, as a visiting professor, taught three courses in Ukrainian history at Harvard ("Select Topics," "Sources," and "Historiography of Ukraine of the Seventeenth and the Eighteenth Century").

Another area of Frank's graduate student activity centered on the journal *Recenzija: A Review of Soviet Ukrainian Publications* (1970–79), which the eminent Ukrainian historian Yaroslav Isaievych has recently called "an excellent (and still unsurpassed) periodical devoted to information on and criticism of Ukrainian publications in the humanities."<sup>8</sup> The journal was modeled on the Harvard graduate student publication in Russian history titled *Kritika*, which aimed to engage Soviet scholarship

---

<sup>8</sup> Yaroslav [sic] Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS Press, 2006), xxv.

through in-depth reviews of books and analyses of the state of research on specific topics. *Recenzija* was established in 1970, at a time when there was a thaw in Ukrainian intellectual life, but by 1972 a pogrom of the Ukrainian intelligentsia was crippling research and publication in Soviet Ukraine. Frank wrote a number of the journal's in-depth review articles, served as an editor, and helped plan a thematic issue that commemorated the 400th anniversary of Ukrainian printing.<sup>9</sup>

Frank proved to be an active and effective promoter of Ukrainian studies beyond the walls of the university. In 1968, having successfully campaigned to establish a chair in Ukrainian history at Harvard, the USF, led by Stepan Chemych (president) and soon also Bohdan Tarnawsky (executive director), had made a commitment to raise an additional \$1.2 million over the next five years to fund chairs in Ukrainian literature and language together with a research institute at Harvard. Hence, through the early years of Frank's graduate career the USF was engaged in a massive fundraising campaign. Harvard's Ukrainian graduate students were quickly enlisted in this effort as a way of demonstrating the success and vitality of the Ukrainian studies project there. It is fair to say that few were as keen or as creative in proposing new fundraising schemes as Frank. Beginning from this time, fundraising for Ukrainian studies would become a hallmark of his career.

When the time came to choose a topic for his doctoral dissertation, Frank decided to focus on cultural and political concepts in the early seventeenth century. With the support of Professors Keenan and Pritsak as his dissertation advisers, he returned to a study of Adam Kysil, begun several years earlier in London. It was an important and unusual dissertation topic, for reasons discussed below. Frank applied to do dissertation research in Poland and Ukraine through the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), founded in 1968. His project was accepted, and he departed for Poland to do research there. Just before he was to go on to Ukraine, Soviet officials threw Frank off the exchange. The year was 1972, when Ukraine's intelligentsia was experiencing yet another wave of arrests and repressions. Frank was later told that the mere mention of the seventeenth-century metropolitan Petro Mohyla in his research proposal was sufficient reason for rejection by the Soviet side. Puzzled IREX officials found it difficult to fathom how anyone could be denied access for such an obscure topic. Frank, of course, understood the problem. He realized that the Soviet authorities were using archival access to influence the research topics American academics chose. The de-

---

<sup>9</sup> *Recenzija* 2, no. 2 (Spring 1972); 3, no. 2 (Spring 1973); and 4, no. 2 (Spring–Summer 1974).

nial of access to Soviet archives made him treasure the source material he had found in Poland all the more.

Fortunately Frank was able to spend his entire IREX year in Poland. He was well prepared for such study, having done a field on the history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at Harvard with Zbigniew Wójcik, an outstanding specialist of seventeenth-century Polish history who had worked on Ukrainian topics at a time when they were frowned upon in Poland. Professor Wójcik was the first of scores of Polish scholars who would come to HURI for scholarly exchange and cultural dialogue in the 1970s and 1980s. (Similarly Pritsak's close relations with many Israeli academics, above all with Shmuel Ettinger, forged close contacts between scholars working on Ukrainian and Jewish history.) Through Professor Wójcik, Frank also met and worked with Józef Gierowski, Adam Kersten, Aleksandr Gieysztor, Antoni Mączak, Andrzej Poppe, Janusz Tazbir, Maria Bogucka, and other important historians in Poland. This brilliant generation of scholars managed to maintain the integrity of Polish scholarship and engage creatively with French and other Western historiographies. Although ideologically constrained in what they could write about the twentieth century, Polish scholars had a good deal of autonomy when it came to the early modern period, and some of the best minds in Poland were attracted to that field. They became Frank's mentors, not only deepening his understanding of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth but also sharing with him their approach to the craft of history. During that year Frank traveled to Warsaw, Cracow, Gdańsk, Wrocław, and Poznań to visit and use all of Poland's major archives, his search for materials often greatly aided by Polish archivists and librarians.

### *The Builder*

Frank completed and defended his dissertation in 1976 and was appointed a lecturer in history at Harvard (1976–77). Subsequently he was promoted to assistant professor (1977–83) and associate professor (1983–85). Between 1985 and 1988 Frank served as associate director of Harvard's Ukrainian Research Institute. In fact, however, from his first academic appointment in 1977 Frank played a large role in all the institute's scholarly projects. Thus it was at Harvard that Frank's career as a professor and an administrator began.

As a scholar and a teacher, Frank filled a crucial gap in Harvard's Department of History in the 1970s and 1980s. In effect he became the resident expert on east-central Europe, the lands and peoples between Germany and Russia. All the while Frank taught a number of undergraduate courses and graduate seminars specific to Ukraine: "History of Ukraine

to the Seventeenth Century,” “History of Ukraine since the Eighteenth Century,” “Topics in Early Modern Ukrainian History,” and “Topics in Modern Ukrainian History.” He also developed a remarkably wide range of additional courses dealing with the history of Poland (“The Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth” and “From the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth to Modern Poland”), the history of east-central Europe (“History of East-Central Europe to 1800”), and to revolution and revolts (“Political and Social Upheavals in Eastern Europe”) and nationalism there (“Nation-Building and Nationalism in East-Central Europe”). One of the most popular Harvard courses he created and taught was “The Other Europe: A Cultural History of Eastern Europe,” an interdisciplinary offering he taught together with Roman Koropeckyj, then a graduate student in Harvard’s Slavic Department.

As his colleagues and former students can attest, Frank quickly proved to be a born teacher and a brilliant lecturer. One of his greatest strengths remains his ability to tackle very complex issues of east European history, apply a nuanced methodology, and yet make the material accessible to a broad spectrum of students. His lectures were and are perceptive, dynamic, and laced with humor. Frank’s courses consistently received excellent ratings in the course guides written by and for Harvard students. Olga Andriewsky, my collaborator in writing this introduction and an editor of this *Festschrift*, recalls that during her time as a graduate student at Harvard in the 1980s

It was Frank, probably more than anyone, who showed me that Ukrainian history wasn’t something small and narrow, and was never done in isolation. Ukrainian history, as presented by Frank, is intimately connected to world history, to all of those big issues, problems, and themes that historians everywhere are concerned with. Frank was working on comparative history more than a decade before it became fashionable. To study Ukrainian history with Frank was to study Polish, Jewish, Hungarian, and Russian history, too. And I can honestly say that I learned more Armenian history than I ever imagined I would.

Frank was thinking and writing about heterogeneous cultural and social spaces, minorities, contested identities, resistance and agency long before they became mainstream themes in the academic world. He was deconstructing the grand narratives of history before doing so came into vogue. He was focusing on social history and discussing the lives of ordinary people at a time when the senior historians in the Department of History at Harvard were still debating the value of this kind of approach. To do Ukrainian studies at Harvard with Frank in the

1980s, as it turned out much to my surprise, was to do cutting-edge historical scholarship.<sup>10</sup>

Frank became a caring mentor to a whole generation of graduate students. He served on many of their examination committees. More importantly, perhaps, he spent countless hours offering guidance, dispensing advice, and helping graduate students to navigate the sometimes tricky shoals of academia. Rev. Borys Gudziak, another former Harvard student and now rector of the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv, summed up his own experience with Frank thus:

I can say that no historian has taught me more about the craft and no teacher has been more patient with my limitations. At all the most important junctions in my academic life over the past twenty-five years [he has] been present with ideas, counsel, and friendship. [He] has given generous critical attention to virtually all of my texts and grant proposals and provided key advice.... It would be difficult to enumerate all of the ways in which [he has] helped me and the Ukrainian Catholic University. A large number of people spread around the globe are encouraged by a reassuring intuition: "When in trouble you can always count on Frank!" This, too, attests to the powerful influence that [he has] had on the lives of many of us.<sup>11</sup>

As Rev. Gudziak notes, many of Frank's former graduate students have kept in close touch with him, regarding him as both a friend and the *pater familias* of contemporary Ukrainian studies.

Frank also proved to be a very talented, capable, and energetic administrator. In addition to being HURI's associate director and seminar coordinator, he served as an associate editor of the institute's new journal, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies (HUS)*, from 1977 to 1995. He also planned Harvard's Ukrainian summer schools, which during the 1970s and 1980s drew hundreds of students, largely from the Ukrainian diaspora, and continue today. Frank was involved in all institute activities, offering enthusiastic support and an array of ideas. The latter seemed to appear constantly, so much so that HURI's ever-competent and patient administrator, Brenda Sens, once suggested that he really ought to be limited to one idea per day.

Frank was especially creative in organizing conferences, planning special issues of *HUS*, and engaging in joint projects with scholars in the Harvard community and beyond. For example, in 1977 Frank and his

---

<sup>10</sup> From a testimonial Olga read at Frank's Festschrift evening, 2 November 2007, at the University of Toronto.

<sup>11</sup> From a testimonial by Rev. Gudziak read at Frank's Festschrift evening, 2 November 2007.

colleague then at Boston University, Andrei Markovits, organized a very successful conference titled “Austria-Hungary, 1867–1918: Cultural, Social, and National Movements.” The volume resulting from the conference came to be recognized as a seminal work in the field.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, Frank developed close relations with the Yale University scholars Riccardo Picchio, Harvey Goldblatt, Ivo Banac, and Paul Bushkovitch. That collaboration led to a conference at Yale University in 1981 called “Concepts of Nationhood in Russia and Eastern Europe in the Early Modern Period” and, subsequently, a special issue of *HUS* (vol. 10, nos. 3–4 [1986]) devoted to this groundbreaking theme, which Frank co-edited with Ivo Banac. He planned another special issue of the journal marking the 350th anniversary of the founding of the Kyiv Mohyla Academy, which also became a standard work in the field.<sup>13</sup> *HUS*, owing in no small part to Frank’s efforts, soon emerged as a leading periodical on pre-1800 east European history, with HURI an internationally recognized center in the field.

Two other anniversaries became central to Frank’s work at HURI: the fiftieth anniversary in 1982–83 of the great Ukrainian Famine of 1932–33, today known as the Holodomor (literally “torture to death by hunger”), and the Millennium of the Christianization of Ukraine-Rus’ commemorated in 1988. Frank was not directly involved in the research aspect of the famine project, but he was very much a part of the planning, organization, and dissemination of its research. In 1980, as the fiftieth anniversary was approaching, the USF proposed to raise funds for scholarly research on the Holodomor. On the advice of Adam Ulam, the Harvard committee contacted the British historian Robert Conquest, an internationally renowned writer and researcher on the Stalin era, to produce a monograph on the subject. At the same time, James Mace, a student of Roman Szporluk and a recent Ph.D. graduate of the University of Michigan, was hired as a researcher. As I noted earlier, Frank had encountered the testimony of Holodomor survivors in his youth, and it was a project that had great meaning for him. He was disturbed by the general silence about the Ukrainian famine in Western scholarship, as well as the refusal or reluctance to even consider the testimony of émigrés who were survivors. He was also incensed by the Soviet denial that that famine had ever occurred and by the attacks on anyone who raised the subject of the millions of people who had been starved to death. At one point a delegation from the Soviet Ukrainian Mission of the United Nations traveled to

---

<sup>12</sup> Frank Sysyn and Andrei Markovits, eds., *Nationbuilding and the Politics of Nationalism: Essays on Austrian Galicia* (Cambridge, Mass.: HURI, 1982).

<sup>13</sup> *HUS* 8, nos. 1–2 (June 1984).

Harvard to try to dissuade HURI's directors from pursuing the project. Professors Pritsak and Ševčenko and the institute's associates were warned that if the Ukrainian famine project was not shut down, they would not be permitted to work in Soviet archives and libraries. To their credit, HURI's directors refused to be coerced. In 1983 the institute mounted a major exhibition on the Ukrainian famine at Widener Library, and in 1986 Conquest's epochal study appeared.<sup>14</sup>

Publicizing current research on the Holodomor became an ongoing concern for Frank—one that he maintains to this day. In 1995, for instance, he attended an international conference on “Problems of Genocide” in Yerevan, Armenia. The paper he presented there, titled “The Ukrainian Famine of 1932–33: The Role of the Ukrainian Diaspora in Research and Public Discussion,” remains the best analysis of this topic.<sup>15</sup> Since coming to Canada and joining the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS), Frank has been instrumental in organizing a number of talks and conferences on the Holodomor and publishing the resulting papers.<sup>16</sup> He has been closely involved in the planning of the annual academic Famine-Genocide Lectures held under the auspices of the Petro Jacyk Program for the Study of Ukraine at the Centre for European, Russian, and Eurasian Studies of the University of Toronto and the Toronto Office of the CIUS. He has also written about the Holodomor's impact on Russian-Ukrainian relations.<sup>17</sup>

The Harvard Project in Commemoration of the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine was another major undertaking, and one that involved Frank's longstanding interest in religious and cultural history. The project's centerpiece—and part of Omeljan Pritsak's grand vision to show the continuity between Kyivan Rus' and later Ukrainian culture—was the inauguration of a very ambitious publishing project called the Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Frank was appointed an associate editor of this still ongoing series, which aims to publish the ma-

---

<sup>14</sup> Robert Conquest, *The Harvest of Sorrow: Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine* (London: Oxford University Press; Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press in association with the CIUS, 1986); Oksana Procyk, Leonid Heretz, and James E. Mace, *Famine in the Soviet Ukraine, 1932–1933: A Memorial Exhibition. Widener Library, Harvard University* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard College Library, 1986).

<sup>15</sup> Subsequently published in *Studies in Comparative Genocide* (New York and London: St. Martin's Press and Macmillan, 1999).

<sup>16</sup> See his preface to *The Holodomor of 1932–33: Papers from the 75th-Anniversary Conference on the Ukrainian Famine-Genocide*. Vol. 16, no. 2 (November 2008) of *The Harriman Review*.

<sup>17</sup> “The Famine of 1932–33 in the Discussion of Russian-Ukrainian Relations,” *The Harriman Review* 15, nos. 2–3 (May 2005): 77–82.

for medieval and early modern cultural texts of Rus'-Ukraine, both in the original and in English translation.<sup>18</sup> In 1984, as a way to promote interest in the history of religion on the Ukrainian lands, Frank also launched a series of reprints of important articles by major scholars in the field: a total of fourteen such booklets were published by the USF and widely disseminated as the Millennium celebration approached.<sup>19</sup> Frank also negotiated the creation of a research position dedicated to Ukraine at Keston College's Centre for the Study of Religion and Communist Countries (now the Keston Institute) in Oxford, England, founded in 1969 by Rev. Canon Dr. Michael Bourdeaux, a leading voice for religious freedom in the Soviet bloc. Financed by the USF as part of the Millennium project, the position was assumed by Andrew Sorokowski (1984–88), who conducted research and made a major contribution to popularizing the religious samizdat then emerging in Ukraine through publications in the authoritative periodicals *Keston News Service*, *Right to Believe*, and *Religion in Communist Lands*.

In many ways the Millennium Project complemented Frank's own scholarship on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Ukraine. In the course of his career he has published a number of groundbreaking articles on the role of religion in the early modern period.<sup>20</sup> He has also writ-

<sup>18</sup> As part of the Millennium project, Harvard sponsored a major international conference held in Ravenna, Italy, in April 1988. The proceedings of the conference were published in *HUS* 12–13 (1988–89).

<sup>19</sup> Bohdan Bociurkiw, *Ukrainian Churches under Soviet Rule: Two Case Studies* (1984); Ihor Ševčenko, *Byzantine Roots of Ukrainian Christianity* (1984); Ivan Hvat, *The Catacomb Ukrainian Catholic Church and Pope John Paul II* (1984); *From Kievan Rus' to Modern Ukraine: Formation of the Ukrainian Nation*—articles by Omeljan Pritsak, John Reshetar, and Mykhailo Hrushevsky (1984); Vasyl Markus, *Religion and Nationalism in Soviet Ukraine after 1945* (1985); Ihor Ševčenko, *The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla* (1985); George Y. Shevelov, *Two Orthodox Ukrainian Churchmen of the Early Eighteenth Century: Teofan Prokopovych and Stefan Iavors'kyi* (1985); Omeljan Pritsak, *On the Writing of History in Kievan Rus'* (1986); John-Paul Himka, *The Greek Catholic Church and Ukrainian Society in Austrian Galicia* (1986); Omeljan Pritsak, *When and Where was Ol'ga Baptized?* (1987); Frank E. Sysyn, *The Ukrainian Orthodox Question in the USSR* (1987); Frank E. Sysyn, *History, Culture, and Nation: An Examination of Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian History Writing* (1988); Andrew Sorokowski, *Ukrainian Catholics and Orthodox in Poland and Czechoslovakia* (1988); George H. Williams, *Protestants in the Ukrainian Lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth* (1988).

<sup>20</sup> "The Formation of Modern Ukrainian Religious Culture: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in *Church, Nation and State in Russia and Ukraine*, 1–23, ed. Geoffrey A. Hoskings, (Edmonton: CIUS; London: Macmillan, 1990); "The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and the Tradition of the Kiev Metropolitanate," in *Kirchen im Kontext unterschiedlichen Kulturen*, 625–40, ed. Karl C. Felmy (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1991); "The Union of Brest and the Question of National Identity," in *400 Jahre Kirchenunion von Brest*, 10–22, ed. Hans-Joachim Torke (Berlin: Freie

ten widely on more modern topics, such as religion in the twentieth century.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, in the early 1980s, well before the collapse of the Soviet Union, Frank was one of the first analysts to presage the revival of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in Ukraine.<sup>22</sup>

In 1989 Frank received an offer to head the newly created Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the CIUS at the University of Alberta.<sup>23</sup> In many ways the division between the American and Canadian phases of his career may be termed his “before Ukraine” and “with Ukraine” phases. Glasnost and Perestroika came late to Ukraine, so contacts there were just beginning as Frank left Harvard. Soon after he arrived in Canada, Ukraine became independent (1991). As a result, the field of Ukrainian studies was fundamentally transformed. A major part of Frank’s activity in Canada has thus been associated with new opportunities and challenges in Ukraine.

Frank arrived in Edmonton in November 1990 to assume his duties as director of the Peter Jacyk Centre. When CIUS director Bohdan Krawchenko took a leave and left for Ukraine at the beginning of 1991, Frank also became acting director of CIUS. He served in that capacity until January 1993, when I, already in Edmonton as head of the CIUS’s new Stasiuk Program for the Study of Contemporary Ukraine, became the institute’s new acting director. After the untimely demise of his colleague and friend Danylo Husar Struk in 1999, Frank became head of CIUS’s Toronto office. Working closely with Roman Senkus, Marko Stech, Andrii Makuch, and the late Taras Zakydalsky, among others, he has contributed greatly to CIUS projects such as the Internet *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*, the CIUS Publications Program, and the *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. In doing so he has enhanced the institute’s scholarly profile and worked tirelessly to secure funding for its endeavors.

---

Universität Berlin); “Orthodoxy and Revolt: The Role of Religion in the Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian Uprising against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth,” in *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views from China, Russia, and the West*, 154–84, ed. James D. Tracy and Marguette Ragnow (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

<sup>21</sup> See “The Eastern Orthodox Church in the Ukraine,” *Religion in Communist Lands* 14, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 73–76; “Politics and Orthodoxy in Independent Ukraine,” *The Harriman Review* 15, nos. 2–3 (May 2005): 8–19; also five articles published in Serhii Plokhyy and Frank E. Sysyn, *Religion and Nation in Modern Ukraine* (Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS Press, 2003).

<sup>22</sup> In his article “The Ukrainian Orthodox Question in the USSR,” *Religion in Communist Lands* 11, no. 3 (Winter 1983): 251–63.

<sup>23</sup> Before moving to Canada, Frank took up a fellowship at the Kennan Institute in Washington, followed by a yearlong stay in Germany on a grant from the Humboldt Foundation.

As Frank was contributing to the revitalization of CIUS as a whole, he was also organizing the new Jacyk Centre. Its founding donor, the late Peter (Petro) Jacyk of Toronto, proposed that the new centre's major project be a translation of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusy*, a monumental history of Ukraine published in ten volumes between 1898 and 1937.<sup>24</sup> Frank accepted the idea and set to work. In order to make the volumes accessible to the contemporary English-language reader and valuable even to scholars who could read the original Ukrainian, Frank believed that the Hrushevsky Translation Project (HTP) would also need to be an extensive research project on Hrushevsky and his work, including providing full bibliographic information about the literature cited in the notes, tracing the fate of archival sources, and updating the academic literature pertinent to each volume of the translation. Above all, it meant placing Hrushevsky's contribution within the context of current historical knowledge. All of this required engaging excellent translators, outstanding scholars as subject editors, and a staff of competent editors and specialists for each volume. In short, Frank envisioned the HTP as an enormous scholarly enterprise.<sup>25</sup>

Frank organized and co-ordinated a production process spanning two continents and six countries. He assembled a formidable team of translators, subject editors, content editors, specialists, and consultants. From the outset he has been aided by two very capable editors, Uliana Pasicznyk, formerly at HURI, and Myroslav Yurkevich of the CIUS. Six translators—Marta Skorupsky, Ian Press, the late Bohdan Strumiński, Andrij Kudla Wynnyckyj, Leonid Heretz, and Marta Daria Olynyk—have worked on the history's ten volumes. Numerous scholars have served as specialist editors and consultants, including Bohdan Strumiński, Ihor Ševčenko, Paul Hollingsworth, Simon Franklin, Andrés Riedlmayer, Barbara Voytek, Adrian Mandzy, Maria Subtelny, Martin Dimnik, Victor Ostapchuk, Volodymyr Mezentsev, Robert Romanchuk, and Tomasz Wislicz. Frank has also enlisted the scholars Andrzej Poppe, Serhii Plokhly, Yaroslav Fedoruk, Myron Kapral, Andrew Pernal, Paul

---

<sup>24</sup> See Frank E. Sysyn, "Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*," <[www.ualberta.ca/CIUS/Jacykcentre/About-Ukraine\\_Rus.html](http://www.ualberta.ca/CIUS/Jacykcentre/About-Ukraine_Rus.html)>.

<sup>25</sup> Judging by reactions to the five volumes already published, Frank's approach to the HTP has been highly successful. See the reviews by Charles J. Halperin in *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 1, no. 1 (2000); David Saunders in *European History Quarterly* 28 (1998); Caroline Finkel in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 62, pt. 2 (2001); Brian J. Boeck in *Russian Review* 63, no. 4 (2004); and Paul W. Knoll in *Polish Review* 49, no. 2 (2004). These and many other reviews of the volumes are posted at <[www.utoronto.ca/cius/publications/books/hrushevskyv1.htm](http://www.utoronto.ca/cius/publications/books/hrushevskyv1.htm)> and its subsequent Web pages.

Knoll, Paul Hollingsworth, and Yaroslav Isaievych as subject editors. In fact, Frank recruited Serhii Plokyh, since 2008 the Mykhailo S. Hrushevsky Professor of Ukrainian History at Harvard University and one of the editors of the present Festschrift, from Dnipropetrovsk University in 1992 to work on the project. By 1996 Serhii was associate director of the Jacyk Centre and head of the HTP in Edmonton, while Frank has headed its Toronto office. Most of the bibliographic work on the HTP has been done by Andrii Grechylo and his colleagues at the Institute of Ukrainian Archeography in Lviv, headed by Yaroslav Dashkevych. Frank himself has co-edited the five volumes published thus far and written two of the long scholarly essays that serve as introductions to each volume.<sup>26</sup>

Frank's work at the Peter Jacyk Centre has not been limited to the HTP. In the early 1990s he established a monograph series at CIUS Press of important works on Ukrainian history.<sup>27</sup> Recognizing the need to make scholarly work published in the West available to scholars in Ukraine, he also initiated a series, called Ukrainian Historiography in the West, of Ukrainian translations of Western works on Ukrainian history.<sup>28</sup> Frank has continuously been an active organizer of the Jacyk Centre's lectures, exchanges, and conferences.<sup>29</sup> He has also established a collaborative

<sup>26</sup> For the first English-language volume (1997) Frank wrote the inaugural "Introduction to the *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. In April 1992 the National Endowment for the Humanities, in Washington, D.C., awarded the HTP a grant toward the translation of the volumes covering the history of the Ukrainian Cossacks (vols. 7–10); consequently they have appeared before other volumes. For volume 8 (2002), Frank wrote "Assessing the 'Crucial Epoch': From the Cossack Revolts to the Khmelnytsky Uprising at Its Height," xxxi–lxix.

<sup>27</sup> Ihor Ševčenko, *Ukraine between East and West: Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century* (1996); Yaroslav Isaievych, *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine* (2006); Paulina Lewin, *Ukrainian Drama in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (2008); and Vasyl Kuchabsky, *Western Ukraine in Conflict with Poland and Bolshevism, 1918–1923*, trans. Gus Fagan (2009).

<sup>28</sup> The first publication in this series, called *Zakhidna istoriografiiia Ukrainy*, was *Istoriychni ese*, 2 vols. (Kyiv: Osnovy, 1994) by the late Ivan Lysiak Rudnytsky, the prominent intellectual and professor of history at the University of Alberta (1971–84). The subsequent volumes are my *Rosiiskyi tseentralizm i ukrainska avtonomiia: Likvidatsiia Hetmanshchyny, 1760–1830 roky* (Kyiv: Osnova, 1996); Ihor Shevchenko [Ševčenko], *Ukraina mizh Skhodom i Zakhodom: Narysy z istorii kultury do pochatku XVIII stolittia* (Lviv: Instytut Lvivskoi bohoslavskoi akademii, 2001); my *Korinnia identychnosti: Studii z rannomodernoii istorii Ukrainy* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2004); Serhii Plokhii [Plokyh], *Nalyvaikova vira: Kozatsvo ta relihiia v ranomodernii Ukraini* (Kyiv: Krytyka, 2005); and Bohdan Botsiurkiw [Bociurkiw], *Ukrainska Hreko-Katolytska Tserkva i Radianska derzhava (1939–1950)* (Lviv: Vydavnytstvo Ukrainskoho katolytskoho universytetu, 2005).

<sup>29</sup> The most recent example is a conference on Armenian-Ukrainian relations cosponsored with the Manoogian Armenian Chair at the University of Michigan, the Ukrainian

project with Russian and Ukrainian colleagues to publish documents on the Ukrainian Cossacks held in Russian archives,<sup>30</sup> a project headed by his former student, Professor Victor Ostapchuk of the University of Toronto.

The rebirth of historical studies in Ukraine has been a major focus of Frank's activities. In the early 1990s, as director of the Jacyk Centre, he established a program in co-operation with Andrzej Poppe, the noted Polish historian, to fund research visits by Ukrainian scholars to Polish archives and libraries. He wanted young Ukrainian scholars to have the experience he had enjoyed twenty years earlier, learning from Polish historians and gaining access to the vast body of sources in Polish repositories. He was also instrumental in the creation of a new Institute of Historical Studies at Lviv National University, using funds donated to CIUS by Petro and Ivanna Stelmach of Mississauga, Ontario, who in making their gift stipulated that once Ukraine became independent stipulated that once Ukraine became independent the income should be used to fund a program at that university. Recently Frank has expanded the activity of the Jacyk Centre through inauguration of the Petro Jacyk Program in Modern Ukrainian History and Society. Established through a \$500,000 donation from Nadia Jacyk and the Petro Jacyk Education Foundation that was matched by the Government of Alberta, the program is a joint venture of the University of Alberta, Lviv National University, and the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv. The program has set out to sponsor publication of the academic journal *Ukraina moderna*, establish a Ph.D. program in Lviv on modern Ukraine, and promote projects on twentieth-century history using archival resources and oral history collections in Ukraine and Canada.

Enumerating all of Frank's scholarly activities over the last two decades in Canada is beyond the scope of this essay. He has been involved in many conferences, publications, and research projects dealing with early modern Ukrainian history, Ukrainian historiography and historical consciousness, the evolution of ethnic and national identity among the Slavs, and Ukrainian-Russian relations in the past and present. A few examples should suffice, however, to illustrate the remarkable breadth of Frank's vision, organizational skills, and academic contacts, as well as the depth of his impact on the field.

---

Catholic University, and the Lviv branch of the Institute of Archeography of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, held in Lviv on 28–30 May 2008.

<sup>30</sup> *Dokumenty rosiiskykh arkhiviv z istorii Ukrainy*, vol. 1, *Dokumenty do istorii zaporozhkoho kozatstva, 1613–1620* (Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha, 1998).

One of the very first projects that Frank initiated through the Jacyk Centre was an international conference in 1991 on the Khmelnytsky era, organized jointly with Serhii Plokyh, who at that time was still working in Ukraine. Attended by scholars from North America, Germany, Poland, and Ukraine, the conference took place in Dnipropetrovsk, a city closed to foreigners until the late 1980s, and at a university named in honor of the “300th Anniversary of the Reunification of Ukraine with Russia.”

A major on-going project that Frank and I worked on together during the 1990s, in collaboration with Andreas Kappeler of the University of Cologne and Mark von Hagen of Columbia University, was a series of four international conferences on Russian-Ukrainian relations. That project, awarded funding by the NEH in the United States and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in Germany, was titled “Peoples, Nations, Identities: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter.” It brought together dozens of leading scholars from Canada, the United States, Germany, England, Italy, Switzerland, Russia, Ukraine, and Poland. CIUS Press published selected papers from the first three meetings in 2003, and the Harriman Institute of Columbia University issued the proceedings of the fourth.<sup>31</sup>

Frank has repeatedly shown his willingness to assist colleagues in any endeavor of scholarly importance to Ukrainian studies. In 1998 he helped Moshe Rossman, professor of Jewish history at Bar Ilan University in Israel, to arrange the participation of a Ukrainian contingent at a major international conference dealing with the Khmelnytsky Uprising and the Jews. Entitled “*Gezeirot Ta"h*—Jews, Cossacks, Poles, and Peasants in 1648 Ukraine,” the conference was hosted by Bar-Ilan University, Israel’s second-largest academic institution. A selection of the conference papers, including Frank’s contribution on the Khmelnytsky Uprising and the Jewish massacres, were published as a special issue of the journal *Jewish History* (vol. 17, no. 2, 2003), based at the University of Haifa. The volume’s editors, Kenneth Stow and Adam Teller of the University of Haifa, hailed the conference and publication as a major breakthrough in discussion and research on this topic, particularly in examining events in comparative ways that take into account the broader context and the varying Jewish, Ukrainian, and Polish perspectives.

Frank’s scholarly and organizational activities have long ranged far beyond the CIUS. In the last fifteen years he has been instrumental in the continued development of Ukrainian studies in Germany and the United

---

<sup>31</sup> Andreas Kappeler, Zenon E. Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark von Hagen, eds., *Culture, Nation, and Identity: The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600–1945)* (Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS Press, 2003); *Peoples, Nations, Identities: The Russian-Ukrainian Encounter*, vol. 9, nos. 1–2 (Spring 1996) of *The Harriman Review*.

States. Frank's acquaintance with German academia dates from 1989, when he spent the full year as a research fellow of the Humboldt Foundation. Since then he has returned to Germany as a Humboldt scholar on a regular basis. During these sojourns Frank has conducted research and taught at the University of Cologne and established wide contacts with German scholars, including Drs. Andreas Kappeler in Cologne (now at the University of Vienna), Edgar Hösch and Martin Schulze-Wessel in Munich, and the late Hans Torke in Berlin. In this respect he has played no small part in the remarkable growth of interest in Ukrainian history in German scholarship.

Frank's frequent stays in Germany have also given him the opportunity to become involved with the Ukrainian Free University (UFU) in Munich. Established in Vienna in 1921 and soon after transferred to Prague, where it remained until 1945, the UFU was originally staffed by émigré scholars from the Ukrainian People's Republic and western Ukraine. It was revived in Munich in 1946 and officially recognized by the Bavarian government in 1950. With Ukrainian independence in 1991, the UFU had to rethink its mission. Frank has been part of the effort to save the institution and ensure the preservation of its archives and library, based on his conviction that it should be a center of research and a cultural and academic bridge between Germany and Ukraine. He continues to serve the university as a professor, advisor, and dean of the Philosophical Faculty. In these roles he has fostered contacts between German scholars and the UFU and is helping to define a new role for the institution.

Another project dear to Frank's heart is the Ukrainian Studies Program at Columbia University in New York. When Mark von Hagen, then professor of Russian and Soviet history there and director of Columbia's Harriman Institute, began to explore the possibility of creating such a program in the 1990s, Frank offered his full support and assistance. Specifically, Frank persuaded the Petro Jacyk Educational Foundation to fund a visiting professorship at the university. With Frank's encouragement, soon two other American organizations joined the endeavor—the Ukrainian Studies Fund, which began financing a core program, and the Shevchenko Scientific Society in the United States, which funded several years of teaching history. Frank has himself taught at Columbia on a regular basis; in particular, he has helped graduate students in the Slavic and east European field to develop a knowledge of Ukrainian studies. The program at Columbia has also served as an important training ground for recent Ph.D. recipients in Ukrainian studies, providing valuable teaching and professional experience at one of the leading centers of Slavic and eastern European studies in the world.

Finally, it should be mentioned that Frank played an instrumental role in organizing the first major international Ukrainian studies conference to be held in Donetsk, Ukraine. As vice-president (for North America) of the International Association of Ukrainianists (MAU) from 2002 to 2005, he worked very closely with the then president, Mark von Hagen, and the organizing committee to plan the Sixth International Ukrainian Studies Congress held in Donetsk in June 2005, in the wake of the Orange Revolution. That congress brought together more than six hundred participants from around the world.

### *The Historian and Scholar*

Though Frank can rightly be considered one of the major builders of Ukrainian studies in the Western world for over three decades, I believe his most lasting legacy will be as a researcher and scholar. The quality and range of his scholarship and academic interests, as already indicated, are truly remarkable. As a specialist on the early modern period, Frank has made major contributions to our understanding of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, Ukrainian religious and social history, the nature of the Khmelnytsky revolt, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century historical writings, and the defining elements of early modern Ukrainian political culture. His knowledge of primary and secondary sources related to the history of Ukraine, including Polish and Russian ones, is extraordinary. Indeed, his work has often challenged colleagues, especially those who study more modern periods, to revisit their assumptions about the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries by looking more carefully at the evidence. Some of his most penetrating analysis has, in fact, been associated with the publication of source materials. His careful attention to sources, combined with an appreciation for broad general and comparative contexts, has become a hallmark of his research.

Frank's monograph *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653* was a groundbreaking work when it was published in 1985, and today it still stands as a prime example of the sweeping scale and sophisticated nature of his approach to Ukrainian history. On one level, it is a biography of a prominent seventeenth-century statesman and diplomat in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth who served as a negotiator between Orthodox and Uniates and between the Polish government and the Cossack Host. On another level, *Between Poland and the Ukraine* represents a major reinterpretation of political culture in that time, as well as a highly original synthesis of two historiographic traditions, the Polish and the Ukrainian. Through charting the course of Kysil's rise in the Commonwealth, Frank examined numerous aspects of that multinational entity and its relation to the various strata of

the Ukrainian lands. In looking at the strains and demands placed on the famous palatine Kysil, he defined what he aptly called the statesman's dilemma. Building on the work of Viacheslav Lypynsky, Frank in effect addressed and analyzed one of the most cherished concepts historians of early modern Poland have held, namely, that of the existence of a *gente Ruthenus, natione Polonus*, of which Kysil was often seen as a classic example. Essential to the interpretation of the phrase was the idea that the nobility of Ukraine and Belarus had come to identify primarily with the political "nation" of the Polish nobility (*natio*), and that Ruthenian *gens* represented ethnic origin. As Frank showed in his study, this oft-repeated phrase was not present in any of Kysil's writings or in any contemporary writings about him. Moreover, Frank's examination of hundreds of Kysil's letters and writings, as well as those of his contemporaries, convinced Frank that at this time there was a growing sense of Ruthenian identity in Ukrainian society that deeply influenced Kysil's own thinking. Even though Kysil was a Polish senator and ultimately sided with the government, he was a member and leader of the old Orthodox Ruthenian nobility, saw himself as Ruthenian, and strongly supported the Orthodox and Ruthenian cause. In certain contexts this Ruthenian identity—an allegiance to an ethno-cultural-religious community—clearly transcended estate boundaries.

Frank also discovered in Kysil's writings evidence of an emerging sense of regional identity that served as the basis for a Ukrainian political identity—a notion of *patria*, as Frank later called it, invoking a concept that the eminent early modern specialist John Elliott had employed so effectively in discussions of proto-national sentiments in the context of early modern revolts.<sup>32</sup> For example, Kysil spoke of the four palatinates of Volhynia, Bratslav, Kyiv, and Chernihiv as a Rus' that was a single territorial unit with specific rights and privileges. (The first three palatinates had been part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and were incorporated into the Kingdom of Poland by the Union of Lublin in 1569, whereas the fourth was created in 1635 from lands won from Muscovy.) That sense of territorial identity, Frank suggested, remained alive in the post-1648 "Cossack era" and played a vital role in the political outlook of the Hetmanate.

---

<sup>32</sup> Frank paid particular attention to Elliott's "Revolution and Continuity in Early Modern Europe," in *Past and Present* 42 (February 1969): 35–56, in writing his own article "Ukrainian-Polish Relations in the Seventeenth Century: The Role of National Consciousness and National Conflict in the Khmelnytsky Movement," in *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present*, 58–82, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj (Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS, 1980).

With his book on Kysil, Frank single-handedly resurrected the question of Ruthenian identity (*ruskyi narod*) and raised a number of larger problems and themes he would return to in his later work: how does one define this kind of Ruthenian identity, how were identities cultivated and transmitted from one social and cultural structure to another, and how did they manifest themselves during the time of Bohdan Khmelnytsky? As a consequence of Frank's work, these are questions that have also been taken up by a subsequent generation of specialists, including Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel, David Frick, Serhii Plokyh, and David Althoen, as well as many historians in Ukraine, especially through the prism of the teaching and scholarly work of Natalia Yakovenko.

Frank moved naturally to the study of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, the great Ukrainian revolt of 1648, and the establishment of the Cossack Hetmanate. He has written numerous articles on these topics, which together comprise a major analytical discussion of the Khmelnytsky Uprising. In numerous instances Frank has brought the historical discussions on revolts and the crisis of the seventeenth century to bear on that historical period and, at the same time, made it possible for early modern European specialists to place those Polish and Ukrainian events in a comparative context. He has looked at the structure of the uprising, asking whether it should be considered a "revolution" or a "revolt," and discussed questions of innovation and renovation within it. Frank has provided a new analysis of the social tensions leading to the uprising and has re-examined the Jewish massacres that occurred therein. He has discussed the relation of the uprising to national consciousness and Ukrainian nation building in comparison to other contemporary cases, for instance, that of the Czechs. Of Frank's discussions in this regard, I especially admire the "Discourse on the Present Cossack or Peasant War," his publication and commentary on a source written by a Polish Catholic polemicist and opponent of the Khmelnytsky revolt, which Frank himself discovered.<sup>33</sup> As in so many of his source publications, here Frank provides a masterful and meticulous examination of a source linked to a discussion of major methodological and conceptual questions.<sup>34</sup> Thus, in a

---

<sup>33</sup> "Seventeenth-Century Views on the Causes of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising: An Examination of the 'Discourse about the Present Cossack-Peasant War,'" *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (hereafter *HUS*) 5, no. 4 (December 1981): 430–66; see also his article "A Contemporary's Account of the Causes of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising," *HUS* 5, no. 2 (June 1981): 254–67.

<sup>34</sup> For other such examinations, see Frank's articles "The *Antimaxia* of 1632 and the Polemics over Uniate-Orthodox Relations," *HUS* 10, nos. 1–2 (June 1985): 145–65, cowritten with Paulina Lewin; "A Curse on Both Their Houses: Catholic Attitudes towards Jews and Eastern Orthodox during the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising in Father Paweł Ruszel's

series of smaller and larger articles, as well in his work on Hrushevsky's *History of Ukraine-Rus'*, Frank has explored various aspects of the Khmelnytsky Uprising.<sup>35</sup> Problems of historical vision, identity, political culture, and continuity sparked Frank's interest in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century history writing and historical thought. Here, too, he sought to bring the historiographic discussions underway among historians of early modern Europe to a Ukrainian topic.<sup>36</sup> His writings, like those by

---

*Fawor niebieski*," in *Israel and the Nations: Essays Presented in Honor of Shmuel Ettinger*, ix–xxiv, ed. Shmuel Almog et al. (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History and the Historical Society of Israel, 1987); and "The Buyer and Seller of the Greek Faith: A Pasquinade in the Ruthenian Language against Adam Kysil," in *Камень Краєжельнь: Rhetoric of the Medieval Slavic World. Essays Presented to Edward L. Keenan on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students* (Cambridge, Mass.: HURI, 1997), 655–70, vol. 19 (1995) of *HUS*; and "Regionalism and Political Thought in Seventeenth-Century Ukraine: The Nobility's Grievances at the Diet of 1641," *HUS* 6, no. 2 (June 1982): 167–90.

<sup>35</sup> In addition to his articles "Orthodoxy and Revolt: The Role of Religion in the Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian Uprising against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth," "A Curse on Both Their Houses," and "Ukrainian Polish-Relations," noted above, see "The Jewish Factor in Khmelnytsky Uprising," in *Ukrainian-Jewish Relations in Historical Perspective*, 43–54, ed. Peter J. Potichnyj and Howard Aster (Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS Press, 1988); "The Khmelnytsky Uprising and Ukrainian Nation-Building," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* (hereafter *JUS*), 17, nos. 1–2 (Summer–Winter 1992): 141–70; "Ukrainian Social Tensions before the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising," in *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Russia and Ukraine*, 52–70, ed. Samuel H. Baron and Nancy Shields Kollmann (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997); "The Political Worlds of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi," in *Χρῆσαι Πόλαι / Златая врата: Essays Presented to Ihor Ševčenko on His Eightieth Birthday by His Colleagues and Students 2: 197–209*, ed. Peter Schreiner and Olga Strakhov, vol. 10, no. 2 (2002) of *Palaeoslavica*; "Yevrei ta povstannia Bohdana Khmelnytskoho," in *Mappa mundi: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats na poshanu Yaroslava Dashkevycha z nahody ioho 70-richchia*, 479–88, ed. Ihor Hyrych et al. (Lviv: Vydavnytstvo M. P. Kots, 1996); "War der Chmel'nyckyj-Aufstand eine Revolution? Eine Charakteristik der 'großen ukrainischen Revolte' und der Bildung des kosakischen Het'manstaates," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (hereafter *JGO*), 43, no. 1 (1995): 1–18; and "The Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising: A Characterization of the Ukrainian Revolt," *Jewish History* 17, no. 2 (2003): 115–39. For Frank's work on the historiography about the hetman and the uprising, see his "Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi's Image in Ukrainian Historiography since Independence," in *Ukraine*, 179–88, ed. Peter Jordan et al, vol. 15 of *Österreichische Osthefte* (Vienna: Peter Lang, 2001); "Grappling with the Hero: Hrushevs'kyi Confronts Khmel'nyts'kyi," *HUS* 22 (1998): 589–609; "The Changing Image of the Hetman," *JGO* 46, no. 4 (1998): 531–45; "The Jewish Massacres in the Historiography of the Khmelnytsky Uprising: A Review Article," *JUS* 23, no. 1 (Summer 1998): 83–89; and "English-Language Historiography in the Twentieth Century on the Pereiaslav Agreement," *Russian History* 32, nos. 3–4 (2005): 513–30.

<sup>36</sup> For instance, Frank introduced the discussions conducted in *National Consciousness, History, and Political Culture in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Orest Ranum (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975) to the Ukrainian case.

all Ukrainian specialists outside Ukraine, must be viewed in the context of work done without access to all the sources. While scholars in Russia could edit and publish early modern chronicles and histories, specialists in Ukraine could not, especially after the disbanding of the Archeographic Commission during the attack on “Ukrainian nationalism” in 1972.<sup>37</sup> Hence specialists on Ukraine working in the West did not have available the sources and source studies their colleagues working on Russia enjoyed.

After several attempts gaining access to archival materials by applying for academic exchanges with the Soviet Union, Frank was finally accepted in 1980. At first he was told that during his four- to five-month stay he would not be permitted into any archives or manuscript divisions. When, in response, he threatened to leave, he was allowed a mere five days in the Central Scientific Library’s Manuscript Division in Kyiv to examine one manuscript of Sofonovych’s history, which was published (by Yuriy Mytskyk) only after the fall of the Soviet Union.

From his early days working on *Recenzija*, Frank been interested in early modern Ukrainian history writing and the terms and concepts found there.<sup>38</sup> Aware that colleagues in Ukraine were unable even to publish historical texts and could hardly discuss the histories and chronicles in any broader context, he undertook to do so. In a series of pioneering works, Frank began analyzing early modern sources, posing questions such as how did Ukrainians of the time understand historical continuity, political structures, society; what was their social, ethnic, and cultural worldview; and how were historical narratives constructed and by whom, for whom, and why? In answering these questions, Frank concentrated on a period when chronicle writing was transformed into history writing, largely under the influence of Polish historiography. These writings were usually seen as constituting two waves of literary activity: the seven-

---

<sup>37</sup> Until 1991 research on the Cossack chronicles and early modern historiography in Soviet Ukraine was very limited. In the 1921 an archeographic commission was established at the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences to publish scholarly editions of the early modern texts; it was disbanded in the early 1930s, after it had published an initial volume of Velychko’s chronicle. The commission was resurrected in 1969 but was abolished again after the study of Ukrainian historiography was officially attacked in 1972. The poor state of archeography and of publication of sources hampered study of the texts. In the 1970s and 1980s work in that area was carried on primarily at Dnipropetrovsk State University by Professor Mykola Kovalsky and his students Yuriy Mytskyk and Serhii Plokhii (Plokyh); however, despite working on texts such as the unpublished Sofonovych chronicle, they could not address major issues or undertake even the publication of sources.

<sup>38</sup> See his review of *Lvivs'kyj litopys i Ostroz'kyi litopysec'* in *Recenzija* 3, no. 2 (Spring 1973): 27–45.

teenth-century clerical chronicles and the eighteenth-century Cossack histories and chronicles.

As always, Frank cleaved closely to his sources in identifying the concepts used in the texts and their function. He also argued for a nuanced approach to trends in history writing, such as distinguishing among varying currents in clerical history writing of the 1670s represented by Teodosii Sofonovych and the author of *Synopsis* (presumably Inokentii Gizel). As Frank's research showed, in the seventeenth century some Orthodox clergy, even though their primary worldview was religious, wrote and compiled histories in defense of their faith that also enabled the Ruthenian *narod*—nobles, clergymen, burghers, Cossacks, and perhaps even the occasional literate peasant—to understand the past of their community and bolster the significance of a Ruthenian people in a time of cultural and religious conflict. These histories sought to link the Ruthenians then to eleventh- and twelfth-century Rus' and thus to confer on it the same kind of ancient pedigree, authority, and historical legitimacy the other "nations" of the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania enjoyed.<sup>39</sup> Frank also examined the second wave of historical writings that came after the Khmelnytsky Uprising and the emergence of an autonomous polity, the Hetmanate. These early eighteenth-century writings, the so-called Cossack chronicles, were produced primarily by an early modern Ukrainian lay intelligentsia and focused on the more recent past in order to glorify the Cossacks and legitimize their ancient privileges and rights. Frank's study centered on how the political and social changes in Ukraine were reflected in those texts.<sup>40</sup>

More broadly, in his study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century history writing Frank has been able to outline the emergence and developments of various political and social concepts. One of the most important of these was the significance of *patria*, or fatherland, in early modern Ukrainian political thought.<sup>41</sup> Frank's earlier work on Kysil had revealed the existence of a

---

<sup>39</sup> See his articles "The Cultural, Social and Political Context of Ukrainian History-Writing in the Seventeenth Century," in *Dall'Opus Oratorium alla Ricerca Documentaria: La storiografia polacca, ucraina e russa fra il XVI e il XVIII Secolo*, 285–310, ed. Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, *Europa Orientalis* 5 ([Salerno]: Istituto di linguistica, Università di Salerno, 1986); "Concepts of Nationhood in Ukrainian History Writing, 1620–1690," *HUS* 10, nos. 3–4 (December 1986): 393–423; and "Recovering the Ancient and Recent Past: The Shaping of Memory and Identity in Early Modern Ukraine," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 35, no. 1 (2001): 77–84.

<sup>40</sup> "The Image of Russia and Russian-Ukrainian Relations in Ukrainian Historiography of the Late Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries," in *Culture, Nation, and Identity*, 108–43, ed. Kappeler et al., 108–43; "The Nation of Cain: Poles in Samiilo Velychko's *Skazanye*," *JUS* 29 (Summer–Winter 2004): 443–55.

<sup>41</sup> See Frank's "Fatherland in Early Eighteenth-Century Ukrainian Political Culture," in

strong territorial identity at that time. In his subsequent work he has shown how, after the establishment of the Hetmanate, in the territories that this polity encompassed the concept of Ukraine as fatherland remained an object of loyalty for the elite, and how, through the Cossack chronicles, this allegiance continued to exert a powerful influence on that elite's political imagination up to the beginning of the nineteenth century. Frank has also pointed out the influence of the Cossack chronicles on Ukrainian political and national thought in the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s. In this respect, he has made a compelling case for a certain continuity of Ukrainian political culture.<sup>42</sup> Just as he had shown that an arbitrary division should not be made between Ukraine before and after 1648, so, too, he has argued against using 1800 as an arbitrary divide, while stressing the importance of the eighteenth century in understanding the political and social concepts of the nineteenth, including those of the "Ukrainian national revival."

Indeed, one of Frank's most important contributions to the study of Ukrainian history lies in his raising the matter of early modern Ukrainian nationhood and the role it may have played in the formation of modern Ukraine. He has illuminated the complexity of early modern concepts of nations and peoples and, in particular, of notions of historical continuity. Frank has drawn from the divergent but rich legacies of Hrushevsky and Lypynsky on the Ruthenian nation and applied them to discussions of nation in the Commonwealth, taking into account recent theoretical works on nation and recent scholarship on the early modern period in Europe. Along the way he has effectively contested the idea, long prevalent in Polish history, that nationhood in the Commonwealth was embodied solely by the *szlachta* (Ukrainian: *shliakhta* 'nobility'), or *naród szlachecki*, and has made a strong case for the inclusion of other social groups, such as the burghers and Cossacks, in discussions of nation. Frank has challenged the assumption that after the Union of Lublin of 1569 nation meant only one *szlachta* nation, or that there existed an all-embracing Sarmatian myth that all nobles of the Commonwealth were

---

*Mazepa e i suoi successori: Storia, cultura, società / Mazepa and His Followers: History, Culture, Society*, 39–53, ed. Giovanna Siedina (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2004); and its revised version in Ukrainian, "‘Otchyzna’ u politychnii kulturi Ukrainy pochatku XVIII stolittia," *Ukraina moderna*, no. 10 (2006): 7–19.

<sup>42</sup> See his articles "The Cossack Chronicles and the Development of Modern Ukrainian Culture and National Identity," *HUS* 14, nos. 3–4 (1991): 593–607; and "The Persistence of the Little Russian Fatherland in the Russian Empire: The Evidence from *The History of the Rus' or of Little Russia (Istoriia Rusov ili Maloi Rossii)*," in *Imperienvergleich: Beispiele und Ansätze aus osteuropäischer Perspektive. Festschrift für Andreas Kappler*, 39–50, ed. Guido Hausmann and Angela Rustemeyer (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009).

descended from the Sarmatians and thus had a distinctly different lineage from other segments of the population. He has urged us not to be limited by clichés, such as *gente Ruthenus*, *natione Polonus*, and to look fully at the sources before accepting arbitrary and exclusive definitions of the meaning of *narod*. That approach has been vindicated by recent research showing that this phrase did not occur in the early modern period and that in the Commonwealth during that time, *natio* and *gens* did not have the political-nation/ethnic-origin distinction that those using the phrase since then have attributed to it.<sup>43</sup>

Frank has urged colleagues working on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Polish history not to ignore the significance of the Khmelnytsky Uprising, for that is where the Commonwealth model failed. He has also tried to turn their attention to the Hetmanate—the partial offspring of the Commonwealth—which developed a new model. In the course of his own work Frank has shown that the sources themselves simply do not support many of the categorical views of today, and that, as in the case of Adam Kysil, notions of self-identity, loyalty, and belonging were complicated, contradictory, and changing. Most important, to my mind, is Frank’s identification of elements of early modern political culture and political thought—the idea of Ukrainians (Ruthenians, and later “Cossack–Sarmatian–Little Russian Ukrainians”) as a *narod* and Ukraine as a fatherland—that eventually came to serve as the basis for a modern Ukrainian identity.<sup>44</sup>

In many ways, Frank’s work on concepts of nationhood and national identity in early modern Ukraine and Poland anticipated, by several years, the challenge to the “modernist” orthodoxy that nations are entirely a nineteenth-century invention.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, Frank’s scholarship, as already noted, continues to find resonance among a growing number of scholars. One can certainly find echoes of his work in my own writing, as well as that of Serhii Plokhy. This is not surprising, since for over fifteen years we formed a close scholarly group focusing on early modern Ukraine and regularly exchanged ideas and written drafts of our work on this period.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> David Althoen, “*Natione Polonus* and the *Naród Szlachecki*: Two Myths of National Identity and Noble Solidarity,” *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung* 52, no. 4 (2003): 475–508.

<sup>44</sup> For the most concise discussion of Frank’s views on early modern concepts of nation in the Ukrainian lands and the link between the early modern and modern periods, see his “Constructing and Reconstructing Nations: Reflections on Timothy Snyder’s Contribution to the Ukrainian Case,” *HUS* 25, nos. 3–4 (2001): 281–92.

<sup>45</sup> In the 1990s this challenge was led by Benedict Anderson, Liah Greenfeld, David Bell, Adrian Hastings, and, most recently, Linda Colley.

<sup>46</sup> This is reflected in Serhii Plokhy’s prefaces in his monographs *The Cossacks and Re-*

Finally, any review of Frank's scholarly pursuits would be incomplete without mentioning that since the late 1980s he has also been working on a regional rural history of western Ukraine, focusing on his grandfather's village of Mshanets and the surrounding area. In the mid-1980s, when it was still impossible for Western scholars in Ukraine to conduct interview projects, Frank and his former student at Harvard, Leonid Heretz, began interviewing immigrants from that region who had emigrated to the United States and Canada. Since 1991, when Ukraine became independent, the project has expanded dramatically, for it finally became possible to conduct extensive interviews in the Mshanets area itself. Frank and Leonid are also working with the new Petro Jacyk Program in Modern Ukrainian History and Society in Lviv to publish Reverend Mykhailo Zubrytsky's collected works. Their Mshanets project offers an important and valuable view of history "from below." In this respect, for Frank it represents a logical next step in a scholarly career often spent decentering conceptions of the past through the study of minorities, rural and regional elites, and popular perceptions of national and religious identity.

For now, it is appropriate to end the story of Frank Sysyn here, in his grandfather's ancestral village, where this narrative began. By all measures, Frank's journey thus far has been an extraordinary one. The impact of his remarkable career has been directly felt in five countries and on two continents. Since Frank first began working as a lecturer in history at Harvard in the late 1970s, he has trained two, if not three, generations of graduate students. He has helped develop the two leading institutions of Ukrainian studies in North America, planning, organizing, and instituting numerous programs. He has been instrumental in establishing, developing, and sustaining contacts between historians in the West and Ukraine on both a personal and institutional level; and he has managed and participated in many important international collaborative projects. His work continues to be read and cited by a growing number of scholars. Frank is currently at the height of his academic career. As we congratulate him on his achievements thus far, let us also look forward to even greater accomplishments by him in the future.

---

*ligion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) and *The Origin of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) and in his frequent citations of Frank's works therein.

(2001), and *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine* (2006).

**ANDREAS KAPPELER** is a professor and the director of the Institute of East European History at the University of Vienna. A foreign member of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, his recent publications include *Der schwierige Weg zur Nation: Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte der Ukraine* (2003), “Great Russians” and “Little Russians”: *Russian-Ukrainian Relations and Perceptions in Historical Perspective* (2003), *Rosiiia iak polietnichna imperiia: Vynyknennia, istoriia, rozpad* (2005), and *Mala istoriia Ukrainy* (2007).

**BOHDAN KLID** is the assistant director of the CIUS and a faculty service officer in the Department of History and Classics at the University of Alberta. He is the author of articles on Volodymyr Antonovych, nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Ukrainian historiography, and rock and popular music, politics, and national identity in independent Ukraine.

**ZENON KOHUT** is a professor of Ukrainian history and the director of the CIUS at the University of Alberta. A specialist in Ukrainian early modern history, particularly of the Hetmanate, Ukrainian-Russian relations, and questions of identity, he is the author of *Russian Centralism and Ukrainian Autonomy: Imperial Absorption of the Hetmanate* (1988), *Korinnia identychnosti: Studii z ranno-modernoï ta modernoï istorii Ukrainy* (2004), *Historical Dictionary of Ukraine* (co-author, 2005), and *Making Ukraine: Studies on Political Culture, Historical Narrative, and Identity* (forthcoming 2010).

**NANCY SHIELDS KOLLMANN** is the William H. Bonsall Professor in History at Stanford University. She is the author of *Kinship and Politics: The Making of the Muscovite Political System, 1345–1547* (1987) and *By Honor Bound: State and Society in Early Modern Russia* (1999). She is currently studying the practice of criminal law in seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Russia.

**VOLODYMYR KRAVCHENKO** is a professor of history at Kharkiv National University, the head of its Department of Ukrainian Studies, and the director of the Kowalsky Eastern Ukrainian Institute there. The president of the International Association for the Humanities and founding editor-in-chief of the journal *Skhid-Zakhid*, he is the author of *D. I. Bagalei: Nauchnaia i obshchestvenno-politicheskaia deiatelnost* (1990), *Narysy z ukrainskoi istoriohrafii epokhy natsionalnoho vidrodzhennia (druha polovyna XVIII–seredyna XIX st.* (1996), *Poema volnoho narodu: “Istoriia Rusiv” ta ii mistse v ukrainskii istoriohrafii* (1996), and *Kharkiv/Kharkov: Identichnosti ukrainsko-russkogo pogranchia* (forthcoming).

**PAUL ROBERT MAGOCSI** has been the professor of Ukrainian history and holder of the Chair of Ukrainian Studies at the University of Toronto since 1980. Among his many publications are over thirty books, including *The Shaping of a*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.