"cultural" element seems somehow lost until the concluding chapter, where a convincing argument is offered for the eclipse of Classicism in Russia after the first quarter of the nineteenth century. The reasons for Classicism becoming so prominent in the first place are not set forth as lucidly. Although the summary of views of various Soviet historians of art and architecture is valuable, it fails to satisfy. It would be useful to know more about the origins of the cultural tastes of the patrons of Moscow's Classical architects. Was their outlook more "Russian" or "Western?"

Schmidt's point that the patronage of Classicism by a number of private persons in Moscow, principally nobles, may have constituted a nascent expression of nationalism draws inspiration from the fact that the favorite architects of this school at that time in St. Petersburg, the foreigners Giacomo Quarenghi and Charles Cameron, received few commissions in Moscow; on the other hand, Moscow's Classical architects were Russian or russified, and few of them ever worked extensively in St. Petersburg.

Both author and publisher are to be commended for the number of visual helps included in the volume. The reader would be lost without the two city maps locating the major streets and the principal examples of Classical architecture. The large number of illustrations, including many recent photographs accompanying the prose descriptions of extant buildings, assist one in visualizing the buildings not depicted. Readers are directed to specific pages in various works from the extensive bibliography for additional illustrative material. This clearly would be a useful book to have in hand while strolling the backstreets of old districts in Classical Moscow.

George E. Munro  
Virginia Commonwealth University


This expensive and rewarding book is one half reprints of classic essays (or would-be classics), one half conference proceedings (of a symposium at the University of California-Davis in 1987). The editor Rancour-Laferriere, an erudite and indefatigable advocate of the method, marks out generous boundaries for "applied psychoanalysis." So capacious, in fact, are his "four modes of interaction" between literature and psychoanalysis (they include analyzing Slavists who write on literature as well as analyzing their critical work and the primary literature itself) that many things Laferriere mentions in passing as self-evident grounds for the legitimacy of the enterprise might strike the outsider or non-believer as decidedly odd. For example, we read that Raskol'nikov murdered the pawnbroker out of matricidal impulses, self-evident because "the matricidal wish is a pre-Oedipal given in any linguistic contest" (p. 4); and that Nabokov's brilliantly vicious swipes at "the Viennese quack" must indicate "a sore spot of some kind" deserving of closer (psycho
analysis, self-evident because “such a playful manner of refutation cannot be taken seriously as counter-theory” (p. 16)—indeed, one essay undertakes to expose Nabokov as “a Freudian in spite of himself” (pp. 353-68).

As if every silly thing we dismiss out of hand requires a counter-theory to do so! The present reviewer is no believer. For such an audience, a book of critical essays promising to rediscover endlessly what it already knows (the endemic risk of psychoanalytic readings) could be pretty tedious fare. Happily such is not the case. It is true that smart people looking at great literature from even the most eccentric angle are bound to produce some provocative readings, and the reader will find them here. But the volume contains a great deal more of value.

In Part I (“Previous Contributions”), that inevitable Freudian curio “Dostoevsky and Parricide” is followed by Richard Rosenthal’s eloquent, clinically persuasive essay on The Double as a literary exploration of “projective identification.” Rosenthal considers this early work a founding test in Dostoevskii’s gallery of “omnipotent rivals,” whose delineation requires exquisite control over narrative voice and its power to seduce, disorient, and terrify the reader. (Rosenthal is a practicing psychoanalyst who writes about Dostoevskii, and of his own profession’s rich vocabulary for reading Dostoevskii, lucidly and with a fine sensitivity to literary form.) Hugh McLean contributes a genuine classic: his unorthodox and scandalously sensible paper, first delivered in Moscow in 1958, on the regressive erotic plots of Mirgorod (as McLean argues Gogol’s creativity: “the more primitive the form of libidinal expression depicted in a given work, the more mature and better his art”[p. 107]). Henry Kucera examines Pushkin’s deadly serious play with the Don Juan theme, in the context of the poet’s marriage and his miserly father: the superstitious side of Pushkin’s otherwise translucent genius gives psychoanalytic criticism just the opaque troubled waters it needs. Laferriere himself closes Part I with a thoroughly balanced discussion of Solzhenitsyn’s ambivalence toward the Jews and his “shadow identity” as a Jew. It is a good essay, but one wonders, after all the evidence has been sifted, whether most of us are not similarly ambivalent toward any real-life category that is full of complex human beings and experiences, without any special “complex” needed to explain it.

The new contributions (Part II) are of varying depth and scope. Some are psychoanalytically informed discussions of authors and whole oeuvre (Brett Cooke on Pushkin’s erotic and anal images of the creative process; Sarah Pratt’s very productive use of the Jungian anima-animus concept to analyze gender shifts in poem-clusters of Tютчев and Akhmatova; Olga Cooke on Freudian family dramas in Belyi’s novels). A second group concentrates on single works. James Rice, in a tour-de-force of “eroticized pathology” (p. 257), reconsiders versions and drafts of the “Peasant Marei” plot within the context of epilepsy and prison life—rehabilitating, in the process, parts of Freud’s essay on Dostoevskii. Through motifs of rebellion and food-fetish in Before Sunrise, Krista Hanson examines the unconscious underside of Zoshchenko’s almost utopian fidelity to Soviet power. Judith Mills offers the captivating, if