

receives the longest treatment, is analyzed as a compelling expression of the communication gap between the sexes. "Lisova pisnia" is interpreted as an example of the damage that a fanatical attachment to material interests can wreak on the individual and collective soul. Aheieva shows that Lesia Ukrainka is concerned with the denial of individual personality and voice, a process that women must endure either from the colonizing power or their own "native" patriarchy. Lesia Ukrainka's opposition to authoritarianism and her refusal to cancel the individual personality is therefore consistent across the "imperial" and "national" spectrum.

The book also incorporates a rare discussion of the writer's prose and a comparison of the early poetry to the mature works. Aheieva demonstrates that Lesia Ukrainka broke free of her "patriotic pseudonym" (p. 8) in a difficult but determined struggle. It was a struggle that, under the influence of a reading of Nietzsche, led to her negative reassessment in "Oderzhyma" of Christianity's impact on society. Readers often have not fully grasped the complexity of Lesia Ukrainka's works and their iconoclastic impact because her early "patriotic" writings have been the ones anthologized and canonized and because the more "problematic" issues that she raised in her dramas have been ignored.

Collectively, Solomiia Pavlychko, Tamara Hundorova, Oksana Zabuzhko, and Vira Aheieva have now produced a body of work that reinterprets the discourses of modernism and feminism within Ukrainian writing. They see writers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries struggling with positivism and bending language and literature to a subversive purpose. This purpose involved the advancement of aesthetic activity as a superior form of moral discourse, which could illuminate the dilemmas of the modern consciousness and transform it. Aheieva has provided the best close reading of Lesia Ukrainka. Her book, which is essential reading for all students of the writer, has also captured the imagination of a broader public.

Myroslav Shkandrij  
University of Manitoba

Natalyia Dudash, comp. *Rusynsky/ruski pisni*. Novi Sad: "Ruske slovo" and Organizatsiia Rusyniv u Madiarsku, 1997. 272 pp.

This book is a convergence of opposites: a big, bold, brightly coloured coffee-table book that encloses a modest, stoical, understated, and sorrowful poetic sensibility. The book's flashy packaging corresponds to its unique academic significance: this is the first historically and geographically comprehensive survey of the literary expression of Carpatho-Rusyn consciousness. As such, this book is a "must" for any Slavic linguist or serious student of the East Slavs. Indeed, many of the poets whose works grace the pages of this book would claim for Carpatho-Rusyns the status of a "fourth East Slavic people" alongside the Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians.

Carpatho-Rusyn poetry, as the compiler writes in her introduction, is the poetry of mountain and valley, home and abroad, heart and mind, landscape and sky. While the poets are left to explore these vast themes, Dudash herself neatly organizes the collection into six subsections, each encompassing the poetry of Rusyns living in Ukraine, Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and North America.

Preceding each section is a helpful introductory history of Rusyn literary expression in a particular country. These introductions, prepared by scholars or poets intimately familiar with their respective countries, are all written in the appropriate local variant of the Carpatho-Rusyn language. Vasylii Sochka-Borzhavyn prepared the section on Ukraine; Anna Plishkova, on Slovakia; Petro Trokhanovsky, on Poland; Istvan Udvari, on Hungary; Natalyia Dudash, on Yugoslavia; and Paul Robert Magocsi, on North America.

These six individuals were also instrumental in the selection of poetry presented in their respective sections. In addition, each of them prepared biographical data on the poets whose works are included in the anthology.

Dudash is responsible for the overall format of the anthology and is the author of a general forward, which is presented in two versions of the Carpatho-Rusyn language (spoken in Yugoslavia and Slovakia) and in English.

Earlier attempts were made to compile similar Carpatho-Rusyn literary anthologies, beginning with the work of Evmenii Sabov, *Khristomatiia tserkovno-slavianskikh i ugro-russkikh literaturnykh pamiatnikov, s pribavleniiem ugro-russkikh narodnykh skazok na podlimnykh nariiechiiakh* (Uzhhorod, 1893). An anthology structured along similar geographical lines as Dudash's is Petro Trokhanovsky's *Mamko, kup mi knyzhku* (Nowy Sącz, 1995). But this anthology is more limited in scope, focussing exclusively on children's poetry.

Other poetic anthologies, such as O. Rakhivsky's [Sándor Bonkáló], *Vyimky iz uhorsko-ruskoho pysmenstva XVII–XVIII vv.* (Budapest, 1919) and Antonín Hartl's *Pozdravení rusínů: Výbor z literatury podkarpatoruské, 1920–1935* (Bratislava, 1936)—were likewise limited by time frame. Still others were limited geographically to Slovakia (Anna Plishkova, comp., *Muza spid Karpat: Zbornyk poezii rusyniv na Slovensku* [Prešov, 1996]), Yugoslavia (*Antologija ruskei poezii* [Novi Sad, 1984]), or Transcarpathia (*Poety Zakarpattia: Antolohiia zakarpatoukrainskoi poezii XVI st.–1945* [Prešov, 1965]). All of the above compilations—with the exception of Hartl's, which is in Czech—presented works in the original language or dialect in which they were written, including the different variants of Carpatho-Rusyn and the Ukrainian and Russian languages. For these earlier compilers the issue of language was secondary to the larger concerns of literary merit.

Dudash follows the same path. She notes that Carpatho-Rusyn literary history is inextricably linked with the history, psychology, sociology, and linguistic issues of all of the countries in which Rusyns reside; in fact it reaches far beyond these. One need only recall that almost everywhere in Eastern Europe (except in Yugoslavia), Carpatho-Rusyns were not recognized as a distinct people until 1989. Perhaps more surprisingly, they are still denied legal recognition and national-minority status in Ukraine.

Faced with these challenges, Rusyn writers have historically faced two alternatives: to “write for the drawer” in their unrecognized, uncoded tongue, or to write for publication in one of the “officially approved” languages. Some did both, while others wrote only in approved languages. The latter group of writers was likely motivated by a desire to have a career. “Is that such a sin?” Dudash asks rhetorically in defence of the book's linguistic inclusiveness.

If the use of a common language does not unite the authors contained in this anthology, what does? Most of the authors share a sense of belonging to a distinct Carpatho-Rusyn nation.

“Listen, good people / to what I write / about how our oppressed nation / had to submit / I am unafraid / because I spoke only of the elemental truth / of how the Rusyn nation achieved its freedom.” (Emil Tsaptsara, “Slovo rodnym liudēm,” p. 106)

For a minority of the authors, however, the Carpatho-Rusyns are merely a branch of the Ukrainian nationality or—in the case of a few older writers—the Russian nationality. Dudash acknowledges that the inclusion of these authors in an anthology of Carpatho-Rusyn poetry might provoke criticism, but ultimately she decided to include them. And rightly so, in the view of this reviewer.

Carpatho-Rusyn writers, like all writers, live and work within a given cultural milieu and political climate that profoundly influence their direction as human beings and artists. Thus it comes as no surprise that some should obtain benefit from “becoming” Ukrainian, a nationality that enjoyed official recognition and financial largesse throughout the Communist world (although the extent and methods used to implement the pro-Ukrainian cultural policy towards Carpatho-Rusyns varied from country to country). The same can be said of the national identification of older Russophile authors who longed for unity with the Great Russian. Political expediency sometimes indicated that it was rational to “become” Russian. Despite the Ukrainophile and Russophile authors’ concessions to political expediency, both groups wrote on subjects and themes that were central to the Rusyn cultural experience.

It is not unusual for small cultures, particularly borderland cultures, to draw strength and inspiration from their often larger, more powerful, and culturally influential neighbours. This is all the more so when a demographically small, isolated borderland culture shares some cultural similarities with those larger neighbours. No one would dispute the right of these authors to seek inspiration from outside their culture. By the same token, one cannot deny other authors the right to draw from deep within the silent well of a distinct, indigenous Carpatho-Rusyn consciousness. In fact, all of these writers rest comfortably side by side on the pages of this anthology. All are members of the same nation, engaged in the same struggles, expressing the same desires, despite the different ways in which they choose to define group “identity.”

The last word should go to the Lemko poet, Ivan Rusenko, who wrote of his people that “Poverty has been our lot from the time of our fathers / So let us enrich our souls! / Let not our dignity be trampled underfoot / And our faith will not be broken by hardship” (“Lemky,” p. 131).

Bogdan Horbal  
New York Public Library

~~Salo, Ivan. *Tvory*. Vol. 1. Lviv: Kameniar, 1999. 439 pp.~~

~~Ivan Salo is a minor writer who was also an elected official for a short time in the post-independence period. Before this he worked for many years as a member of the security services and as a journalist. Since 1995 he has been the chief editor of *Militseiskyi kurier*, an organ of the armed forces. This publication brings together his short stories and a selection of his journalistic work. Roughly half the volume is devoted to each.~~