

the collection of eyewitness reports. Dr. Palij's work does not answer all our questions about the Makhno movement, but it is an important step forward in the study of *Bat'ko* Makhno and the anarchist-influenced movement that he led in southern Ukraine.

Frank E. Sysyn  
Harvard University

**SHEKSPIR V UKRAINSKII LITERATURI.** By *Maria Shapovalova*. L'viv: "Vyshcha shkola," 1976. 212 pp.

Since the nineteenth century, Shakespeare has fascinated Ukrainian writers to the extent that many learned English primarily to read him in the original. In 1964, contemporary Ukrainian writers published a number of studies to mark the 400th anniversary of William Shakespeare's birth.<sup>1</sup> A recent work is by Maria Shapovalova, who in 1950 wrote a dissertation at L'viv University on Ivan Franko as a Shakespearean scholar and translator. Her book deals with leading Ukrainian writers' interpretations and translations of Shakespeare, and with his effect on their work. The author states that her study is presented "in a historical perspective" — a claim significant in view of some political inferences and gross omissions.

The study is divided into three periods: the 1830s to 1860s, the 1870s to early 1900s, and the Soviet period. For the first period analyzed, Kharkiv and its university are credited with contributing greatly to the popularization of Shakespeare, primarily because many Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish literary scholars and translators of Shakespeare (M. Kostomarov, V. Lazarevs'kyi, I. Kronenberg, A. Walicki) lived and worked there. (Kostomarov was probably the first to translate Shakespeare into Ukrainian: Desdemona's song "Willow," in the 1840s.) Yet, Shapovalova notes, it was Kiev University that produced Pavlyn Svientsits'kyi and Panteleimon Kulish, the translators of complete plays. (Svientsits'kyi's translation of *Hamlet* was published in *Nyva* in 1865, and by 1882 Kulish had translated at least thirteen plays.) In her discussion Shapovalova diligently presents contemporary criticism from the time of the translations and introduces her own (for instance, she praises Kulish's style but is critical of his reliance on words from Old Church Slavonic and his use of Ukrainian equivalents, e.g., *het'man* for baron).

<sup>1</sup> The most significant were I. Vanina, *Ukrains'ka shekspiriiana* (Kiev, 1964), and N. A. Modestova, "Shekspir v ukrainskom literaturovedenii," in *Uil'iam Shekspir: Materialy i issledovaniia* (Moscow, 1964), pp. 250–304. An article by the Ukrainian Shakespeare Society in the West should also be noted: "Dusha storichchia," *Suchasnist'*, 1964, no. 7 (43), pp. 34–63.

In dealing with the second period, Shapovalova accords Mykhailo Staryts'kyi a special place in Ukrainian Shakespeariana, since his translation of *Hamlet*, which appeared as an annotated edition in 1872, was the first book in Ukrainian about the English dramatist's work (Staryts'kyi was also the first to stage Shakespeare in Ukrainian: although the staging of plays in Ukrainian was forbidden, he had scenes from *Hamlet* performed semi-privately at the Kievan *Hromada*). Shapovalova also discusses M. Krushelnyts'kyi, I. Karpenko-Karyi, M. Voronyi, and I. Franko. The author analyzed most thoroughly is Franko, who is credited with being the greatest Ukrainian pre-Soviet theoretician on Shakespeare and on translations of his works. The recognition is well warranted, for Franko edited and published Fed'kovych's and Kulish's translations, wrote studies of ten plays, translated several plays and sonnets, and even organized a Shakespearean Fund. Shapovalova is quick to claim that in his interpretation Franko used "the principle of materialistic criticism as well as his own theory of realism" (p. 132), and that he used Shakespeare's work to "counterattack anti-realist tendencies" (p. 141). Most of the translations are compared to the original, to a literal translation, and to other translations, and then Shapovalova offers her own evaluation. Besides style, the author considers other aspects: e.g., she criticizes Kulish for being too much of a moralist, and praises Staryts'kyi for stressing social conflict. She also notes the influence of Shakespeare on the original works of the translators, and on the work of T. Shevchenko, L. Ukrainka, and several contemporary Soviet Ukrainian writers.

The Soviet period, during which only fifteen plays have been translated, is presented rather scantily. The only literary studies discussed are by S. Rodzevych, O. Bilets'kyi, A. Shamrai, A. Hozenpud, I. Vanina, and M. Modestova. Except for M. Ryl's'kyi's work, other translations are treated superficially. Only a few translators (B. Ten, M. Bazhan, and V. Mysyk) are mentioned; others are grouped together as "numerous professionals." Neither this section nor the bibliography mentions I. Kocherha (translator of *The Taming of the Shrew*), I. Khotkevych (whose adaptation of *The Comedy of Errors* was published in 1924), H. Kochur (translator of *Hamlet*), V. Ver (translator of *Hamlet*), or I. Korets'kyi (translator of *Macbeth*). No mention is made of the sonnets translated and published by S. Karavans'kyi and D. Palamarchuk. Translations and literary studies by A. Nikovs'kyi, O. Borshchahivs'kyi, and B. Varneke are omitted, as are those by the pre-Soviet writers L. Hrebinka and M. Dashkevych.

Similarly, all publications in the West are ignored (to date, they include translations of twelve plays and two collections of sonnets, by M. Orest, Y. Klen, T. Os'machka, E. Kostetzky, Y. Slavutych, B. Kovaliv, V. Barka, S. Hordynsky, O. Tarnawsky, and O. Zujewskyj). Shakespeariana published in the Western Ukraine prior to 1945 (e.g., M. Rudnyts'kyi's translation of *Hamlet*, 1943) is also left unmentioned. The emphasis is continually on Shakespeare's popularization in the Ukraine by earlier Russian works. Even for the Soviet period, Ukrainian translations are said to be based on the achievements of earlier Russian translations. Shapovalova does not compare the impact of Shakespeare on Ukrainian

literature with his reception in other Slavic literatures, thus failing to treat her subject comparatively or "in a historical perspective" as claimed.

This potentially valuable study is marred by numerous omissions and perfunctory attempts at interpretations in line with Soviet ideology and practice. Shapovalova should have been more thorough in her coverage; works on Shakespeare published in the Ukraine in the 1960s were not as self-restrictive as hers is. Also, the author fails to provide a much-needed index.

Larissa M. L. Onyshkevych  
Rutgers University

RUSSKIE SKOMOROKHI. By *Anatolii A. Belkin*. Akademiia nauk USSR, Institut istorii iskusstva. Moscow: "Nauka," 1975. 192 pp.

Although the *skomorokhi* have frequently been singled out by folklorists and cultural historians for their contribution to the literature, dance, theater, and music of the Eastern Slavs, they have to date received scant serious attention from scholars. Belkin's book is only the second attempt at a full history of these versatile minstrel-entertainers (the first was A. Famintsyn's *Skomorokhi na Rusi* [St. Petersburg, 1889]).

The book is divided into four chapters, followed by an appendix (which contains documents related to the formal proscription of the *skomorokhi* by Aleksei in 1648) and a comprehensive bibliography. Chapter one is devoted to a review of the literature. Chapter two attempts to solve the thorny problem of the origins of the *skomorokhi*. This is followed by a general account of their history from the eleventh through the seventeenth century and a concluding chapter on their role in the evolution of theater in Muscovy.

The most useful and enlightening chapters are the first two. Chapter one's review of the literature is thorough and competent, mirroring quite well the work on the *skomorokhi* of scholars in various disciplines. Chapter two focuses on the major theories proposed to explain the beginnings of *skomoroshestvo*. Belkin himself views the *skomorokhi*, in their formative period, as popular, pagan cult leaders whose roots pre-date the introduction of Christianity in Kievan Rus'. But, while tracing the phenomenon itself far back to hoary antiquity — as others, to be sure, have done before him — Belkin also maintains that the name *skomorokh* did not gain wide currency among the Eastern Slavs until the thirteenth century. Prior to this a variety of other names was used to describe the minstrel-entertainers. On this last point Belkin is less than convincing, as he does not provide sufficient proof to substantiate it.

The book has two major weaknesses. Chapter three, which attempts to trace the long history of the *skomorokhi*, is narrowly focused, superficial, and poorly