

author's speculative and subjective indulgences. Beyond the first third of the book lies a very useful approach to Stravinsky's kaleidoscopic career, but it is an interpretation directed more to those interested in twentieth-century music than to students in the Russian area. For a more substantial and fully documented account of Stravinsky's Russian period one must still turn to the study by the translator himself.

EDWARD V. WILLIAMS  
University of Kansas

ISTORIIA RUSSKOI POEZII. 2 vols. Edited by *B. P. Gorodetsky*. Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii dom). Leningrad: "Nauka." Vol. 1: 1968. 560 pp. 3.34 rubles. Vol. 2: 1969. 459 pp. 2.66 rubles.

In a four-page preface this collective work (twenty-five authors) is described as the first attempt at a systematic history of the development of Russian poetry from its beginnings to 1917; its intent is to interpret poetry from a Marxist point of view and to serve as a counterbalance to the interpretation of some contemporary bourgeois scholars (1:5).

Considering the multiplicity of authorship, the resulting variety in approach and quality of individual contributions is not surprising. Some chapters are well written, others are cliché-ridden, some give an original interpretation of the subject, others are too much like those "official" introductions from which one can learn nothing. A certain diversity is inherent in the scope and the plan of the work: there are monographic studies—whole chapters or separate sections within a chapter devoted to individual poets—and chapters that deal with specific periods. But more careful editing could have eliminated some repetitions and contradictions. To mention only one, but perhaps the most glaring contradiction, Koltsov's poetry is described as having "podlinnaia narodnost'" (1:534) and "zhiznennaia pravda" (1:535); it is stated that in his poetry "pesnia . . . vpervye sovershenno utratila cherty stilizatsii" (2:96), but elsewhere his poetic world is called "uslovno-romanticheskii" (2:22).

A more significant aspect of editorial powers concerns the decision regarding the space to be devoted to a particular movement or poet, and whether a poet deserves a chapter (or a section within a chapter) of his own. Some disagreement about such choices in a work of this scope is inevitable, but certain points here can be disputed.

In a work that discusses not only the poetry of N. P. Ogarev and I. S. Nikitin but that of A. I. Podolinsky and I. Z. Surikov as well, one would expect to find some discussion of V. A. Ozerov and Denis Davydov, but one does not. Apollon Grigoriev fares a little better: half a page devoted to his poetry is sandwiched between A. K. Tolstoy and Karolina Pavlova; he is given another paragraph in the chapter on Blok. Nor is Fet given a chapter or a section to himself; the discussion of his poetry is good, as is the chapter in which it appears (by L. M. Lotman), but he is allotted fourteen pages compared with A. K. Tolstoy's twenty-three and L. A. Mei's ten! On the other hand one wishes that the chapters devoted to democratic and revolutionary poetry were more brief. There are instances when it is *almost* acknowledged that the greater part of this poetry has little poetic value (2:114, 116–17, 240, 243, 247–48). It seems that the idea of its social importance could be conveyed in fewer pages.

As the history gets closer to our time, it is difficult to agree with the presentation of different movements and individual poets, although I suppose we should be grateful that the poetry of Mandelshtam and Gumilev is discussed at all. The chapter on Symbolism (L. K. Dolgoplov) concentrates on the Symbolists' views of reality, social change, and revolution; their achievements in the sphere of poetic language and form are all but overlooked. The poetry of Zinaida Gippius is not discussed at all. Futurism fares far worse than Acmeism (both by V. V. Timofeeva); it is given only half the space accorded Acmeism (Mayakovsky's prerevolutionary poetry is allotted a separate chapter); some basic information about Futurism is not provided—thus, for example, we never learn who the members of "Tsentrifuga" were. Futurism's positive and lasting impact on the poetry of the twentieth century is only hinted at.

The monographic chapters on Pushkin (B. P. Gorodetsky), Lermontov (K. N. Grigorian), and Nekrasov (F. Ia. Priima) are among the least successful. All three are descriptive rather than analytical. Nekrasov the poet is drowned in the accounts of his ideological and civic virtues and in the retelling of many of his longer poems. Exceptionally fine is the chapter on the poetry of 1800–1810 (Iu. M. Lotman). Among the more successful monographic chapters is the one on Zhukovsky (N. V. Izmailov), which is perhaps the best in the work, and the ones on Tiutchev (N. V. Koroleva) and Baratynsky (I. M. Toibin).

It is characteristic, however, that the tragic sense of Baratynsky's late poetry is attributed mostly to the "reactionary reality of the post-Decembrist years" (1:356). Are we to believe that if the policies of Nicholas I had been more liberal, the poet would have turned into an optimist at peace with his time? Belinsky's devastating article on *Sumerki* is referred to simply as "izvestnaia stat'ia" (1:358, 367); the reader is enjoined to believe that the critic's disagreement with the poet was confined to questions of the philosophy of history.

The general impression of the work is rather contradictory. It can be useful, provided the reader does not take every statement on faith.

OLGA RAEVSKY-HUGHES  
*University of California, Berkeley*

LITERATURE AND NATIONAL IDENTITY: NINETEENTH-CENTURY  
RUSSIAN CRITICAL ESSAYS. Translated and edited by *Paul Debreczeny*  
and *Jesse Zeldin*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1970. xxv, 188 pp.  
\$8.50.

This volume contains five essays and an introductory article by Paul Debreczeny. The essays, all translated into English for the first time, are by Ivan Kireevsky (on Pushkin's poetry), Stepan Shevyrev (on Gogol's *Dead Souls*), Apollon Grigoriev (on Turgenev's *A Nest of the Gentry*), Nikolai Strakhov (on *War and Peace*), and Vladimir Soloviev (on Dostoevsky).

The Russian authors represented in this anthology are linked to one another by their espousal of religious values and, with the exception of Soloviev, their identification with Russian national traditions and attitudes. As such, they contrast with the Westerner and radical literary critics—the school of Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobroliubov, Pisarev, et al. Despite this divergence in world view, in the essays included in this book one does not directly encounter polemics with the writings of Westerner critics. In fact, in common with the Belinsky school, these five authors, to