elitist avant-garde styles of surrealism in literature and twelve-tone, quarter tone, atonal and athematic music. As a partial reaction to the local “modernists-Europeans” a new native movement in arts, named Zenithism, had appeared. It professed to embody “a new art from the Balkans and at the same time a manifestation of the freedom of the spirit.” (p. 27) A prominent composer, Josip Slavenski, composed a symphonic suite, Balkanopony, as an “unbridled Balkan antithesis to the Western decadence and the musical and esthetic speculations about dodecaphony.” (p. 29)

The rest of the book concentrates mostly on the activities of Milojković and Vučković in particular. Their work as authors-musicologists is presented in fine detail. The author always accompanies her acute analyses with knowledgeable criticism whenever necessary. In regard to Milojković, she discusses, among other things, his line-by-line method of analysis which, in her opinion, had the most consistent application in his doctoral dissertation, The Hemonic Style of Smetana and then his study on Stevan St. Mokranjac who, according to Milojković, had created the national music idiom based on the vocal folk tradition. She also analyzes many other Milojković’s understanding of music, esthetics of music, the need to approach musical works with respect in order to be able “to enhance a truthful interpretation of the musical text, suppressing the arbitrariness in the performance and interpretation” (p. 63), and other issues.

Presenting Vučković, the author points out that even the name of his dissertation, Music as a Vehicle of Propaganda, shows the influence of “the cultural and artistic life after the October revolution.” (p. 74) She then focuses on particular similarities of views between Lunacharskii and Maiakovskii on the one hand and Vučković on the other. The author writes that “Vučković believed in the social importance and benefit of a music work.” (p. 75) One of the most important ideas of Vučković was “that esthetics as a science about the beauty as expressed in arts, and as a science about the arts, due to its inability to solve these problems was replaced with sociology of arts.” (p. 75) Most of the other ideas of Vučkocić were basically in consonance with the dominant Marxist views of the time.

This book is well researched; important problems are expertly discussed; and unusually rich ideas are brought into sharp focus. The book represents a very useful contribution to the field.

Vladimir Milić

Western Washington University


The rulers and elites in a society often commemorate themselves with architectural statements. Such buildings and monuments are erected consciously to embody a certain set of values; they frequently express other
values as well, which may be less obvious to the very men and groups that
inspire them.

The former assumption underlies Albert J. Schmidt's discussion of
Classical architecture in Moscow more than the latter. He suggests that
Classicism may have been a "vehicle for awakening national consciousness"
and that "Classicism became...[the] hallmark" (p. 8) of the Russian nobility
in particular. These statements bring to light a paradox, because Classicism
was "antithetical to the old Russian building modes" (p. 3). It is not quite clear
why Classicism, alien to Russian traditions, should have been adopted as an
expression of Russianness in the traditional Russian capital.

Classicism (defined by its emphasis on severity, dignity and grandeur
and its preoccupation with the three orders of columns, the dome, and the
arch) was introduced to Russia by the imperial autocracy. Indeed, it is most
often associated with the official projects under Catherine II to adorn St.
Petersburg. Schmidt argues, however, that in the same era both public and
private initiatives were applied to a Classical rebuilding of Moscow. He sees
this as more than a mere copying in Moscow on a lesser scale of the ensembles
of St. Petersburg. The question of the values elaborated unconsciously by
Classicism is not really raised until the last chapter.

The greater part of the book describes Moscow as receptacle of Classical
buildings. Moscow of course was more difficult to restyle in Classicism than
St. Petersburg, because the existing structures, neighborhoods, and property
lines raised the costs of reconstruction enormously, and because of an innate
resistance to changing the patterns of daily life. Yet Schmidt demonstrates
that the Moscow architects Vasilii I. Bazhenov, Matvei F. Kazakov and others
did alter fundamentally the city's physiognomy. No matter that their grand-
est projects for palace complexes in the Kremlin, or for transforming the
Neglinnaia River into a series of canals and pools were never brought to
fruition. By erecting numerous churches, plazas, private houses, and public
buildings, they recast Moscow’s appearance.

Classicism also benefited from the tragic losses in the fire of 1812, which
Schmidt uses as the organizing fulcrum of the book. The fire permitted many
of the public spaces projected for reconstruction in comprehensive city plans
of 1775, 1786, and 1806-08 finally to be transformed, although frequently
according to newer designs. A younger generation of architects, best exempli-
ified by Osip I. Bove, was responsible for the Classicism wrought after the fire.

In making his case for a Classical Moscow, Schmidt typically leads the
reader chapter by chapter on a spiral tour of the city from Kremlin to
outskirts. As it progresses, the description of the specific structural and
ornamental features of building after building tends to become somewhat
tedious. This work is clearly a labor of love on Schmidt's part, but for the
reader the repetitiveness of description might have been replaced by a greater
degree of cultural analysis.

In subtitling the book a “cultural history,” Schmidt intends to juxtapose
his approach against one based purely on the aesthetics of architecture.
Except for a few comments in the introductory chapter, however, this