

debate on the subject. Some see the future in terms of "purely businesslike" relations involving existing institutions, while others see a new path to socialist relations (or to peasant economic and political power?) through the voluntary associations of private peasant producers permitted under the 1974 constitution.

DENNISON RUSINOW
American Universities Field Staff

FROM RECOGNITION TO REPUDIATION (BULGARIAN ATTITUDES ON THE MACEDONIAN QUESTION): ARTICLES, SPEECHES, DOCUMENTS. Compiled and edited by *Vangja Čašule*. Skopje: Kultura, 1972. 272 pp.

There are no disinterested books on the Macedonian question coming from any author or institution even remotely connected with the contending parties. So it was before the Balkan wars when Bulgaria, Serbia, and Greece were staking out their respective and conflicting claims; from the second Balkan War to the Second World War when the boundaries had changed but the disputes, the methods, and the use of scholarship in the service of national claims remained the same; and since 1944 when the boundaries remained the same but the political map, with the coming of Communists to power in Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, was new. Under the new dispensation, ethnic and territorial quarrels (the creation of bourgeois society) were to be sublimated by fraternal proletarian internationalism. And so it was, on the surface, for a few years. It was to be Macedonia for the Macedonians: as a constituent republic of federal Yugoslavia (and maybe of a South Slav federation including Bulgaria) to which "Pirin Macedonia," which was in Bulgaria, would eventually be attached. Then came the Tito-Stalin break in 1948, Stalin's mobilization of Yugoslavia's Communist neighbors against the Tito regime, and the revival of the Macedonian question in classic form.

This Yugoslav documentary publication has a transparent purpose but is unique in its attempt to confound the enemy with his own phrases. Almost all the material in it is of Bulgarian origin, translated and reprinted for Western readers to show how Sofia, in repudiation of its commitments and declared policies, changed everything from interpretations of history to census statistics and moved from acceptance of the Macedonian nation as a reality, with a proper claim to Bulgaria's own Macedonians, to the assertion of a claim to Yugoslavia's Macedonian republic as Bulgaria irredenta. All this the collected documents clearly show. But they are material that has already been published, mainly articles from the Bulgarian press and from an extensive "scholarly" paper put out by the Academy of Sciences in 1968 to buttress the Bulgarian case. Unfortunately, documents on the wartime contacts between the two Communist parties, the crucial Kardelj-Kostov conversations in 1944, and the Tito-Dimitrov talks and the Bled agreement of 1947 do not appear.

JOHN C. CAMPBELL
Council on Foreign Relations

HAMLET: A WINDOW ON RUSSIA. By *Eleanor Rowe*. New York: New York University Press, 1976. xvi, 186 pp. Illus. \$15.00.

Hamlet is far more than a special chapter in the study of Shakespeare in Russia. The character, even more than the play, has appealed to the Russian imagination in many ways: it has been appropriated, transformed, and naturalized to take its place in a pantheon of Russian literary heroes, and has become a touchstone for aesthetic, cultural, and even political attitudes. Rowe's work is the first published book-length elaboration of this phenomenon in English. The study begins in the eighteenth cen-

tury with Sumarokov's adaptation and the play's disappearance from the stage between 1762 and 1809. The last chapters deal with *Hamlet* on the Russian stage and in the movies in the twentieth century (it again disappeared during the last dozen years of Stalin's rule), with the collaboration between Kozintsev and Pasternak, and with recent critical approaches to the play. In between are chapters that essentially catalog references to the play in the works of major nineteenth-century Russian writers, with Turgenev as the most important instance (*Hamlet of the Shchigry District* and other seminal works). Rowe has conveniently gathered a great deal of information on translations, changes and variations in scenic representation and in criticism, all of which suggest the pervasiveness of the theme. Yet since *Hamlet* is more than a question of penetration and influence, it requires considerably greater critical and historical gifts than the author of this useful book demonstrates.

In the central section of the book there is little distinction between the significant and the superficial, or between the historically important and the merely factual. Much of the work labels rather than analyzes. The author mechanically enumerates specific references to *Hamlet*, whether in Turgenev, where it is vital, or in a single letter of Gogol's, where it is insignificant, in Fet's four lyrics "To Ophelia," Olesha's machine, "Ophelia," in *Envy*, and so on. Moreover, she ignores the obvious presence of the play when not explicitly indicated and neglects the rest of Shakespeare, so that while all the rather unimportant citations of *Hamlet* in Pushkin are given, the more pervasive impact on Pushkin's work is omitted. There is a brief quote from Herzen but no indication of the enormous reverberations of *Hamlet* in Herzen's life and work. Rowe includes a comparison of Karatygin's and Mochalov's performances, and of Belinskii's views, but does not discuss their relationship to other drama at that time, particularly Schiller's, and the reason for the enormous popularity of the play then. There is a chronic failure to see beyond the surface, to adduce appropriate material from the play when it is not specifically quoted, and to investigate the significance of the use of *Hamlet*. Such function is left to others' pronouncements, which are given but not discussed. Indeed, the disturbingly recurrent formula "As X. (or Y. or Z.) has noted (or observed, or remarked)" indicates the derivative nature of the study.

Material is represented primarily through secondary sources, particularly from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Generalizations about the Russian personality are bolstered by frequent reference to one pseudocultural history. There seems to be little difference in the weight given to opinions of writers and scholars of varying stature—there is a heavy reliance on secondary and tertiary articles, especially by American scholars—and these opinions, like the author's personal experiences in the Soviet Union, are offered as proof.

A mundane count of translations, publications, and performances of the play, or the frequency of critical comment, or a bibliography might have provided an insight into the reasons for the extraordinary vitality of the play in the Russian imagination. But the larger failure is one of literary sensibility. It is perhaps for this reason that the problem has been placed in better perspective and is more engagingly presented in the twentieth century, when it is largely a question of describing actual performances, modern staging and dramatic theories, and political implications. A great deal remains to be done. This book should provide an impetus for further investigation.

RALPH E. MATLAW
University of Chicago