

because the book is written from the perspective of the Jewish religious and intellectual figures who emphasized their struggles, their particular attempts at constructing a negotiated identity, and an existence acceptable to the Greeks. The Greek state was unavailable for such compromise, however, and by the time of the Nazi invasion in 1941, the state had successfully completed the task of “otherization” of the Jews, the Greek Orthodox Church and the mob having been complicit in this task. This is an important book, especially as it bestows the Jews of Salonica the agency, dignity, and vibrant communal history that they once had.

KAREN BARKEY
University of California, Berkeley

From the Bible to Shakespeare: Pantelejmon Kuliš (1819–1897) and the Formation of Literary Ukrainian. By Andrii Danylenko. Brighton: Academic Studies Press, 2016. xii, 447 pp. Bibliography. Index.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.301

Andrii Danylenko’s monograph examines Pantelejmon Kuliš’s Ukrainian translations of the Bible and some works by William Shakespeare, comparing them to other nineteenth and the early twentieth century-translations. According to the cover text, the book traces “the contours of a full and complete picture of the development of literary Ukrainian in the two historical parts of Ukraine—Galicia and Dnieper Ukraine—from the mid-nineteenth century onward.” However, while even an ideal examination of Ukrainian Bible and Shakespeare translations can barely fulfill such an ambitious mission, the present book clearly remains within narrower confines.

In his introduction, Danylenko characterizes Kuliš in such a sketchy way that unprepared readers will feel lost. Particularly, they will not understand that Kuliš had made a considerable contribution to the intellectualization of the Ukrainian language even prior to the Bible translations. At the same time, it comes as a surprise that according to Danylenko’s vision of the history of the Ukrainian language, “the written language in Russian-ruled Ukraine . . . theoretically was the standard language of the entire country” (xx), whereas below he contends—much more correctly—that it was not always “clear whether the Dnieper variety would ultimately serve as the literary language of all Ukrainians” (9).

The first chapter immediately switches to an analysis of Kuliš’s translation of the Book of Psalms. Most problems of this chapter are symptomatic for the entire book: while orthography is a key topic, some texts appear in non-original, adapted versions, without any hint to the reader (7). Several forms are erroneously listed as “obvious Church Slavonicisms,” such as *zlyi* (6); others are labeled as “Kulišisms,” without any further comments; see for example, the comments on *zloreččja* and *zlorika*, without any hint to the Polish *złorzeczyć*, *złorzeczenie* (22). Quite a few “neologisms,” such as *процентувати* (35), can barely be regarded as such; compare the Russian *процентовать* and Polish *procentować*, while other assessments are extremely misleading: Danylenko praises the replacement of “the traditional Church Slavonic form *blažen*” in one of the translations, but the new form *blaho*, is, of course, Church Slavonic as well (33). In light of recent publications, the assessment that “it is possible that [Pylyp Moračevs’kyj’s] translation of the Bible was never a pretext for launching repression of the Ukrainian language in 1863” (55) is obsolete; the fact that the Ems Ukaze is nowhere discussed in detail is problematic.

The book has some serious mistakes: Danylenko translates *Didyščyna* as “the apéry à la . . . Didyk,” (48) (Bohdan Didyc’kyj, not “Didyk,” was a very prominent

figure in Galicia in the second half of the nineteenth century); he speaks about “a labialized phoneme x^w” (80) in nineteenth-century Ukrainian (a phenomenon unheard of); he labels *hlahole* as an “old aorist” (194), or characterizes the form *zeliznyj* “as a result of old distant assimilation of *zalizo* (197).”

Danylenko attempts to prove and, in fact, repeats several times that Kuliš allegedly “managed . . . to work out a balanced use of vernacular and bookish, although not necessarily Church Slavonic, elements” (for example, 152). This assessment remains highly subjective, and many speakers of modern Ukrainian will disagree. So did some contemporaries, including Ivan Puljij, who had all reason to “complain” of “the excessive use of Church Slavonicisms in the translation of his friend” (179). On the other hand, the conclusion that “the contribution of Kuliš to the formation of new Ukrainian orthography appears minimal” (230) comes as a true surprise; it is the result of a particularly unconvincing line of reasoning.

Only on page 280, Danylenko begins analyzing the Shakespeare translations, on no more than about ninety pages. As with reference to the translations of Shakespeare, it is interesting to see how Danylenko attempts to present Kuliš as “a versatile normalizer who was apt at experimenting with various stylistic devices,” (313) although the impact of these works on the “normalization” of Ukrainian was in fact minimal. Comparisons with other translations are often biased; some statements—for example, “Kuliš differed from Staryc’kyj in that his innovative approach was deeply rooted in romantic and populist ideals, thus appearing more evolutionary and natural” (344)—in fact contradict Danylenko’s own outline.

The conclusions (374–85) surprisingly introduce new ideas, for example, a discussion of Kuliš’s “*Dvi movi, knyžnja i narodnja*,” and will not convince everyone. A more thorough analysis of Kuliš’ role for the history of the Ukrainian language still has to be written.

MICHAEL MOSER

University of Vienna

Péter Pázmány Catholic University, Budapest

Tadeusz Kantor: Portrait Multiple. Polyphonie, Inspirations, Renaissances. Ed. Kinga Miodonska-Joucaviel. *Slavica Occitania*, No. 42. Toulouse, France: Slavica Occitania, 2016. 410 pp. Appendix. Notes. Index. Plates. Photographs. €25.00, paper.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.302

This is a unique collection of essays, interviews, and memories compiled at the University of Toulouse by Kinga Miodonska-Joucaviel. They are concerned with one of the key twentieth century artists and theater makers who have influenced the making of theater pieces in our time. The fact that he was Polish meant that his work was only spasmodically seen during the communist period in Europe, when Kantor’s work was either underground or ignored by the authorities. It was finally discovered in the UK and shown at the Edinburgh Festival in the 1970s, under the auspices of Richard Demarco, where it won awards.

Kantor always had strong links with France. He spoke French as his second language and he recognized the importance of the key French artists of his time when he was finally permitted to visit Paris in 1946. The Theatre Garonne in Toulouse was the place where his last show, “Today is My Birthday,” was shown. This book therefore presents a unique collection of material, most of which has never been collated and published before. The scope ranges from academic insights to the personal