

illness." The epilogue is signed in the translation "God and Nijinsky," whereas the original reads *Bog Nizhinskii* ("God Nijinsky"). Perhaps these are only minutiae, but they cast doubts on the accuracy of the English version as a whole. Clearly the translator performed a valuable service in making the work available to the public, but one feels that the time has come for a new translation (for modes of thought change with each decade) or at least a revised edition with omissions noted and annotations provided. After all, when something so intangible as psychological disturbance is being dealt with, every word counts.

The Art of the Dance in the U.S.S.R. by Mary Grace Swift originated as a doctoral dissertation. In nine chapters, of which the first is devoted to a concise survey of Russian ballet up to the Revolution, the author endeavors to provide a broad outline of the evolution of ballet in Soviet Russia and some of the Soviet republics up to 1964. An attempt is made to describe the ideological principles underlying Soviet ballet, and there are numerous quotations from political literature and official pronouncements. Concise synopses of ballets are given where appropriate, and there are some excellent illustrations. By way of supplementary materials the Repertoire Index for 1929 is included, together with a list of ballets giving composer, balletmaster, and date and place of first performance. The work is copiously annotated, and the selected bibliography (one of the best of its kind) is thirty-three pages long.

Of course, in compiling a work of this nature, one of the great problems is deciding what is the most suitable material to include. By and large the author seems to have made a fairly comprehensive survey, although one feels that some opportunities have been missed. For instance, Chabukiani's *Othello*, with all its diverse political implications, surely deserves more than the brief mentions on pages 159–60 and 195. Likewise there is no reference to the Bolshoi reinterpretation of Bartók's *Miraculous Mandarin* under the title *Nochnoi gorod* (Town by Night), which again one would have thought was relevant to the author's theme. Ballet in the Soviet republics similarly receives only slender treatment (far more could have been said about the flourishing ballet productions at the Alisher Navoi Theater in Tashkent). However, though offering much valuable information, the book contains, regrettably, many careless mistakes, which to the language specialist are a source of irritation. On page 13, for instance, Prince Shakhovskoi is written as Shakhovsky. British readers will be disconcerted to find the politician Aneurin Bevan transformed into Bevin (pp. 156 and 392). Omission of a crucial letter in note 90, page 361, makes ludicrous the Russian title—the word *stsene* ("stage") being written as *stene* ("wall")—and notes, bibliography, and index contain many similar inconsistencies and errors. Considered as a whole, therefore, the book is a mine of information, but care must be taken in employing the bibliography, notes, and index.

GERALD SEAMAN
University of Auckland

UKRAINSKAIA SOVETSKAIA SOTSIALISTICHESKAIA RESPUBLIKA.

Kiev: Glavnaia redaktsiia Ukrainskoi Sovetskoi Entsiklopedii AN USSR, 1967. A publication of the Akademiia nauk Ukrainskoi Sovetskoi Sotsialisticheskoi Respubliki. 592 pp. 3 rubles.

In 1959–65 there appeared in Kiev, under the auspices of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, a *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia* (*Ukraïns'kaadians'ka*

entsyklopediia) in seventeen volumes. This was the first non-Russian work of its kind in the Soviet Union, and its publication must be considered an important event in the cultural life of the Ukraine.

The editors of the *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia* claim that this work is "the first encyclopedia of the Ukrainian people." As a matter of fact, in 1930 an encyclopedia in twenty volumes was planned by the old Bolshevik leader and people's commissar of education of the Ukraine, Mykola Skrypnyk. However, after Skrypnyk's suicide in 1933, this project was discontinued. After World War II, émigré scholars in Western Europe began an *Encyclopedia of Ukrainian Studies* (*Entsyklopediia Ukraïnoznavstva*), which is still in progress. It seems likely that the desire to counter the émigré publication played a role in the decision of Soviet authorities to proceed with a Ukrainian encyclopedia of their own. Although it was not intended by the editors of either encyclopedia, the two works are complementary. For fuller and more reliable information and a more balanced perspective, they should both be consulted. The *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia* and the *Encyclopedia of Ukrainian Studies* together represent an approach toward a definitive Ukrainian encyclopedia, which still remains a task of the future.

The seventeenth volume of the *Ukrainian Soviet Encyclopedia* is a separate reference work which treats in a systematic fashion various aspects of the Ukrainian SSR, such as geography, population, history, constitution and legislation, the Communist Party of the Ukraine, civic organizations, national economy, education, sciences, letters, and arts. The volume has some 270 contributors. A Russian translation of this work—somewhat condensed, brought up to date, and richly illustrated—appeared in 1967 under the title *Ukrainskaia Sovetskaia Sotsialisticheskaia Respublika*.

The editors' introduction states that "the materials of this book are presented on the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology and in the spirit of proletarian internationalism in struggle against bourgeois ideology" (p. 2). From the foreign student's point of view, the chief interest of the work lies, in addition to the useful factual information which it provides, in the insights it offers into current official Communist interpretations of the Ukraine. This, in turn, allows the reader to make inferences about the regime's Ukrainian policy.

It is impossible, in a short review, to discuss adequately a tome of nearly six hundred closely printed pages dealing with many specialized topics in which the reviewer claims no competence. I am, therefore, directing my comments to the historical section.

The treatment of Ukrainian history in *Ukrainskaia Sovetskaia Sotsialisticheskaia Respublika* is determined by two assumptions. First, historical interpretation is affected by "Marxist-Leninist methodology," in the ossified form it has assumed in the USSR. For instance, the "era of feudalism" is said to have lasted from the ninth to the nineteenth century, which makes the concept of feudalism rather meaningless. This concept is particularly inept in characterizing the peculiar social structure of the Cossack Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A second determining factor, which has nothing to do with Marxism, is a pro-Russian bias. This is illustrated, among many other examples, by the very different treatment accorded to past political connections of the Ukraine with Lithuania-Poland and Austria-Hungary on the one hand, and with the Russian Empire on the other. The first two are as a rule presented in the darkest colors, while in the case of the Russian Empire the positive and progressive factors are stressed and the negative ones are played down. Thus the extension of the rule of the Lithuanian

Gedimin dynasty over Ukrainian lands in the fourteenth century is labeled "foreign occupation," although this event amounted to a liberation from Tatar domination. The Grand Duchy of Lithuania (the "Lithuanian-Ruthenian State") possessed a federative organization, and it associated East Slavic (Belorussian and Ukrainian) elements with an ethnically Lithuanian nucleus in a free partnership. Similarly, the Austrian regime in Galicia, from 1772 to 1918, is depicted as "colonialism." In reality, Galician Ukrainians, in spite of various handicaps and limitations, enjoyed more favorable conditions of development than their compatriots in the central and eastern parts of the country under Russian imperial rule—a fact, incidentally, explicitly acknowledged by Lenin.

The book evaluates Ukrainian historical figures not on the basis of services rendered to their own people, but by their loyalty to Russia. Those Cossack hetmans—such as Ivan Vyhovsky, Petro Doroshenko, and Ivan Mazepa—who resisted Muscovite encroachments are decried as "traitors." Moreover, a subtle bias pervades the whole approach to prerevolutionary Ukrainian history: a place of honor is accorded to elemental popular movements and peasant revolts, while the attempts of the Ukrainian upper classes to build an autonomous body politic are treated in a disparaging way. At first sight, this might seem a mere expression of the Marxist propensity to identify with the "toiling masses," as opposed to their "exploiters." It is, however, well known that Soviet Russian historiography takes a positive view of the rise and consolidation of the traditional Russian state—despite serfdom, autocracy, and other unattractive features. Why this double standard? A Ukrainian history reduced to a series of popular revolts can be fitted into an "all-union," or imperial, pattern approximately on the same level as revolts of Razin and Pugachev in Russia proper. Those aspects of Ukrainian history, however, that transcend the imperial pattern, politically and culturally, are looked upon askance. It must be said in all justice that monographic Soviet Ukrainian historical literature often displays a more objective understanding of the nation's past than the one found in the official publication under review.

Of the one hundred pages of the historical chapter, a disproportionate part—about half—is devoted to the last fifty years. The treatment of the Soviet era is even more tendentious than that of pre-1917 history. The development of Soviet Ukrainian society is represented—except for the temporary interruption caused by the Nazi invasion—as a straight, ascending line, as a triumphal march leading from one victory to another. Awkward facts, which contradict this pious myth, are simply suppressed. Thus not a single word is said about the famine of 1933, which took several million lives in the Ukraine. Stalin is mentioned by name for the first time under the year 1938. The following passage about the "cult of personality" is noteworthy: "Deviations from the norms and principles of the Soviet constitution, and abuses of power, caused serious harm to the Communist Party, the Soviet country, and our people. However, the noxious results of the cult of personality, though hampering the development of Soviet society, did not stop the advance of our country toward new victories of socialism" (p. 133). The expressions "our people" and "our country" are worthy of the reader's attention. They refer not to the Ukrainian SSR but to the Soviet Union as a whole. This serves as a clear indication where, in the official view, the Ukrainian people ought to place their ultimate national identity. This, however, is a political goal of the regime and does not reflect the actual drift of modern Ukrainian history.

The bibliography appended to the historical chapter lists almost exclusively recent Soviet works, adding a few of the writings of prerevolutionary historians,

mostly of the Populist school. It does not include a single work by a Western scholar. Nor does it include any of the post-1917 Ukrainian historians active outside the USSR, either in the Western Ukraine prior to World War II or in the countries of Western Europe and North America before and after the war. It seems clear that this arbitrary selection was effected on political rather than scholarly grounds.

The final chapter, "The Ukrainian SSR in the International Arena," creates an impression of unreality. There we read that "the entrance of the Ukrainian SSR, in the capacity of a founding member, into the United Nations Organization amounted to its universal recognition as a subject in international law" (p. 573). But no explanation is given of the reason why this "subject in international law" has so far made no use of its constitutional right to entertain diplomatic relations with foreign countries. The discrepancy between appearance and reality is, perhaps, even more glaring in the comparatively harmless, nonpolitical area of international cultural relations. The book states that "Ukrainian scientists participate in international congresses, symposia, etc." (p. 583). The reviewer can, however, testify from personal observation that at the last two meetings of the International Congress of Historical Sciences (in Stockholm, 1960, and in Vienna, 1965) the Ukrainian SSR was "represented" by one or two inconspicuous members of the common Soviet delegation. This incongruity is not, of course, of the making of the encyclopedia's editors and contributors; rather, it expresses certain unresolved contradictions inherent in the very nature of the Ukrainian SSR.

In conclusion, *Ukrainskaia Sovetskaia Sotsialisticheskaia Respublika* may be consulted for reference purposes, and it will legitimately find its place on library shelves. But the prospective users ought to be warned that they are being offered a very lopsided and doctored image of the past and present of the Ukraine.

IVAN L. RUDNYTSKY
The American University

ROSIIS'KO-UKRAÏNS'KYI SLOVNYK. Akademiia nauk Ukraïns'koï RSR, Instytut movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni. 3 vols. Kiev: Vydavnytstvo "Naukova dumka," 1968. A–M: xxiii, 700 pp. 1 ruble, 83 kopeks. N–Pryiat': viii, 756 pp. 1 ruble, 87 kopeks. Pro–Ia: viii, 727 pp. 1 ruble, 82 kopeks.

I am fortunate not to be editor of the *Slavic Review*: the scruple about where to place this review is not mine. Should it be among the few linguistic topics (reputedly read by no one, except the proofreader) or among the host of reviews of current political history items (with the largest possible audience)?

The decision is not easy. The Soviet dictionaries of languages other than Russian in the USSR are not only, and sometimes not primarily, records of what words and idioms the language possesses, to be assessed by purely linguistic criteria, but are also tools for guiding the language in a desired direction by omitting certain words and expressions and promoting or introducing others. In countries where more than half the newspaper, radio, and television materials are translations from Russian, and Russian serves as the main means of communication with all the other nations of the USSR and, more often than not, with other nations and cultures, Russian-to-the-other-language dictionaries are especially effective. What appears in these is officially approved; what is not there is subject to doubt and suspicions.