

republic was at stake. Though formally their existence was preserved, measures to undermine the status of the Ukrainian language and Ukrainian culture continued and reached their culmination in the postwar years.

It would not be an exaggeration to state that Shevelov's study is unique and long overdue. It reveals fully pages in the history of the Ukrainian language that were available only in unsystematized, chaotic, and scattered fragments to the postwar generation of Soviet Ukrainian linguists and interested readers. The author's profound analysis, original approach, and new suppositions and conclusions make his book a classic that will be compulsory reading for every researcher of the history of the Ukrainian language. Although Shevelov's study deals with developments that occurred fifty to a hundred years ago, in the light of recent events in Ukraine its relevance is undiminished. It provides historical proof that the language problem in Ukraine is not something that can be solved simply by decree.

Yevhen Slupsky
University of Toronto

Myroslav Shkandrij. *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: The Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1992. xii, 265 pp. \$24.95.

Modernists, Marxists and the Nation addresses the fundamental ideological tendencies in twentieth-century Ukrainian cultural history: modernism, socialism, and nationalism. The issues of national identity, literary traditionalism, and the creation of a "high" culture constitute the culturological background to its main subject, the Literary Discussion of the 1920s. The latter was not only an expression of the passions of the national rebirth: it reflected the widespread desire to develop a full-fledged Ukrainian culture and literature, but also the socialist dogmatism, Bolshevik totalitarian mind-set, and literary functionalism of the time.

English-language readers familiar with Mykola Khvylovy's *Cultural Renaissance in Ukraine: Polemical Pamphlets, 1925–1926* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1986), which was translated and edited with an introduction and notes by Myroslav Shkandrij, can now, through Shkandrij's new book, consider Khvylovy's writings within the broad contextual framework of the literary and ideological struggle that occurred in Ukraine during the 1920s. Here Shkandrij examines, perhaps for the first time, the Literary Discussion of 1925–8 as a full-fledged cultural process in all its aspects—literary, ideological, organizational, and artistic. His study resounds not only with the voice of Khvylovy, the fundamental "reflex" of the polemic, but also with the voices of Khvylovy's opponents, fellow travellers, and sympathizers. The book functions like a script. It has its own dramatis personae (the "Olympians," Neoclassicists, avant-gardists, members of Hart, and supporters of *prosvita*) and dramatic

conflicts (the "Olympians" vs. the *prosvita* supporters, the Neoclassicists vs. the nihilists). It also contains an examination of additional episodes (the chapter on "Organizational Defeat") and the author's own digressions (e.g., on parallels in art and on émigré echoes of the Literary Discussion).

The study is clearly historiographic in nature, inasmuch as its principal theme is the history of Ukrainian culture as it was shaped during the 1920s. Having conceptualized the Literary Discussion as a full-fledged cultural process, Shkandrij discusses not only its sources and chronology, but also its hidden aspects.

In light of the author's comprehensive, multidimensional presentation, his book should appeal not only to readers in the English-speaking world, whom it introduces to the political and cultural history of twentieth-century Ukraine, but also in Ukraine. It differs from the joint monograph written by a group of scholars at the Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Sciences in Kyiv, *20-ti roky: Literaturni dyskusii, polemiky* (Kyiv: Dnipro, 1991), in that it analyzes the Literary Discussion from the perspective of problems encountered in the literary process of the 1920s and correlates questions addressed in the debates with culturology, the theory of prose, and journal criticism of that decade. By generalizing the Literary Discussion and conceptualizing it as he does, Shkandrij portrays it as the principal, fundamental event in the development of Ukrainian cultural consciousness in the 1920s, an event that addressed the main issues of modern Ukrainian culture—tradition, creative freedom, and "high" and "mass" culture.

Shkandrij points out that a single purpose linked the writers of Urbino, Vaplite, and *Literaturnyi iarmarok*. It may be characterized as the development and structuralization of Ukrainian culture and literature. In this regard, it would have been worthwhile if he had analyzed Khvylovy's attitude to early Ukrainian modernism, when a discussion of national, modern, and even "proletarian" art first took place (in the journal *Dzvin*).

Compared to the early modernist period in Ukraine, the fundamentally new cultural context of the 1920s arose from the interweaving of often contradictory intellectual currents—Marxism, nationalism, and literary avant-gardism. This interweaving was manifested most markedly in the short-lived fusion of literature with Marxist ideology known as "proletarian literature."

The compatibility of Marxism, nationalism, and avant-gardism was illusory. As such it spawned a substantial intellectual and cultural polemic within the framework of the newly consolidated Soviet "socialist culture." The latter could not expand through complete, autonomous structures resembling, at a distance, the dialogues of medieval culture on the eve of the modern era. In the twentieth century a new cultural dialogue—one based on the notion of an official culture that could be regulated and systematized—took place. The nature of its literature and its subordination to political ideology (in this case, that of the Bolsheviks) are obvious. As a result the powerful cultural "explosion" expressed through the Literary Discussion, which could have given further impetus to various cultural

movements and orientations, gradually came under the control of the Party, which reduced it to the struggle between two ideologies and two opposing systems, "proletarian-socialist" and "bourgeois-nationalist."

Perhaps the underpinning of the Literary Discussion derived, on the one hand, from the antagonism that existed among the various ideologies that were artificially integrated to create Soviet "socialist culture," and, on the other, from the impossibility of developing valid autonomous structures for the various fledgling (traditional, avant-garde, peasant, proletarian, "mass," and "high") cultures. The universal, utopian model of a unitary culture based on rationalism and the Enlightenment found its affirmation, as well as its demise, in Soviet socialism.

During the Literary Discussion the artificial symbiosis created by "proletarian literature" was debated from different points of view by various, even opposing, groups (from Proletkult to Vaplite) and underwent a considerable evolution. Shkandrij emphasizes that in Hnat Mykhailychenko's conception of "proletarian literature," national and Communist traditions were still nonantagonistic. The goal was the creation of a literature that would be simultaneously national, modern, and proletarian. Hart's thesis of "proletarian literature" was already substantially ideologized, and it resulted in the emergence of the theory of two cultures: one proletarian and Russian, the other peasant and Ukrainian.

In this way the neocolonial content of the proletarian-literary synthesis and its growing functionalism were manifested. The concept of proletarian literature was gradually reduced to Communist ideology and then to organized functionalism, wherein subordination to Party resolutions was formalized through writers' organizations controlled by intellectuals who were professional Party functionaries. Shkandrij illustrates the various ways the idea of proletarian literature could be interpreted besides official functionalism. In the 1920s it was linked with the utopian ideal of collective creativity (camouflaged in Urbino's symbolism), with Pluh's "massism," and with the internationalist ideal of world unification (Serhii Pylypenko, for example, proposed the use of the Latin alphabet for writing in Ukrainian).

The Literary Discussion, which was launched by Khvylovy in 1925, also manifested the evolution of a postcolonial consciousness. The latter was represented first and foremost in Khvylovy's pamphlets. The re-evaluation of the role of the metropolitan culture, the search for other, different forms of national-cultural identity (the correlation of the Ukrainian national rebirth and the "Asiatic Renaissance"), the raising of the level of cultural professionalism, the appeal to nature ("Romantic vitalism"), and even the assimilation of European cultural ferment (the Faustian psychological type)—all illustrate not only the loud criticism of the culturally provincial, backward "Little Russian" complex, but also Ukraine's anticolonial cultural potential.

Shkandrij's study raises the issue of the clash between mass culture and elitist culture that the European *moderne* embodied. "Massism" and the "Olympians" marked the constitution of an indigenous modern structure in Ukrainian literature

as well. It is important, however, that systemic questions (i.e., of the type of culture) were leading questions in the 1920s. This is confirmed by the fact that for Khvylovy a "European" individual psychology and classical humanist ideals, and not a new form, were the principles on which a "high" national culture was to be built.

Despite his claim that the creation of a new artistic school was the central issue for Khvylovy, Shkandrij is forced to state that questions of literary form were not, after all, of primary importance. Furthermore, considering that "culturo-sophical" questions constituted the fundamental backdrop to the Literary Discussion, his monograph insufficiently elucidates the problems connected with formal searchings (pp. 63, 78, 82). I note in passing that he provides a very interesting analysis of the language Khvylovy used in his pamphlets, "the unfamiliar intonations of a young urban Kharkiv intellectual" (p. 55).

Regarding the role of futurism, Shkandrij limits himself to stating that it was an artistic practice that gradually became integrated with functionalist art and even assumed the role of political censorship. He also does not explore the question of the Neoclassicists' "grand" style. Recognition that for the Neoclassicists "the principle of the universality of art and the inner freedom of the artist" was "a *sine qua non* of any creativity" (p. 73) does not yet allow one to relegate the Neoclassicists to other neoclassical movements in twentieth-century literature. One has to bear in mind not only the ideological dimensions of this phenomenon, but also the aesthetic ones.

Shkandrij consciously set a historiographic framework for his study. After all, the Literary Discussion was conducted "within the bounds of cultural history" (p. 63). He accordingly organized his topography, with straight and intersecting lines linking Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv, and Moscow, Europe and *prosvita*, and the Communist centre (the Party) and its periphery ("red *prosvita*"). His monograph is both a travel guide to this topography and an anatomy of the cultural anti-utopia of the 1920s as it unfolded in Ukraine.

Tamara Hundorova
Institute of Literature, National
Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv

David R. Marples. *Stalinism in Ukraine in the 1940s*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1992. xix, 228 pp. \$34.95.

The history of this book is somewhat unusual. In the author's words: "In the year 1987, I had prepared my original [doctoral] thesis for publication under the title 'Soviet Rural Expansion: The Collectivization of Western Ukraine, 1944–50.' Although this manuscript had reached the camera-ready stage, I withdrew it from publication because of the spate of new information coming from the Soviet Union. My feeling was that the book would be badly outdated and would require