The "biographies" given at the back of the book are biographical footnotes at best. The two longest, on Il'f and Petrov and V. V. Maiakovskii (first names and patronymics are not given) are six sentences each. Dostoevskii is dealt with in two sentences, Tolstoi in three. Mikhail Zoshchenko died in 1958, not 1946, as indicated by Berry, p. 196.

The numerous drawings in the book are not unpleasant, but present nothing correlated with the readings. Each sketch has a forest scene, with a hut, a peasant or two, and usually an animal of some kind.

I have somehow held to the belief that Russian studies in the English-speaking world had progressed beyond the level of books which contain serious mistakes and pedagogical infelicities in such large quantities. Obviously, I was mistaken. Unfortunately, the present issue of Professor Berry's book cannot enjoy a season of usefulness as a textbook for English-speaking students of Russian.

R. E. Richardson

Boston University


Readers of the first thirteen volumes of Oxford Slavonic Papers (1950-1967, edited by Prof. S. Konovalov, with Mr. J. S. G. Simmons the joint editor of vols. XI-XIII) will welcome this first volume in the new O. S. P. series, out in hard cover and with its Russian name (in seventeenth-century Cyrillic type) appearing under its English title.

In the opening essay Gerta Hüttil-Worth summarizes different scholarly approaches to the problem of "The Church Slavonic Elements in Russian," describes current research projects in Slavic lexicography (some of them computerized) and proposes a system for the distinct classification of Church Slavonicisms and "neoslavonicisms."

Robert Auty's "The Medieval Czech Love Lyric" discusses twenty-three lyrical poems, most of them composed in the fourteenth century but not written down until the fifteenth. Largely neglected by Western scholars, these lyrics range from the Song of Záviš (influenced by the art of the German Minnesänger Frauenlob rather than the Italian dolce stil nuovo, as some have supposed?) to works springing from a Czech or Slovak peasant milieu. The poems appear unconnected and isolated, yet contain some recurrent motifs (e.g., references to "slanderers" who are trying to separate the lovers) and raise several questions of interest to Slavonic literary historians.

J. Sullivan and C. L. Drage next present a series of short poems dealing with the deaths of Russian schismatic martyrs. Was the Old Believer Semen Denislov (1682-1742) the author of these poems, which appear along with prose accounts in an unpublished manuscript of the Vinograd rossiiskii? In any event we find it ironic that the Old Believer poet owes so much to that arch-enemy of the Old Believers, Simeon Polotskii. The poems are written in the syllabic verse which Simeon brought to Russia, and even the title, Vinograd Rossiiskii, rings like a synthesis or adaptation of Polotskii titles (Vertograd mnogošvstvny, Orlı rossiiskii).

In the fourth contribution—"'The King of the New Israel': Thaddeus Gra-
bianka (1740-1807)—M. L. Danilewicz reviews the career of a colorful eccentric whose words and deeds exemplified the "Underground" or "other side" of the Age of Enlightenment—the side that was attracted to alchemy, to the ritualism and rhetoric of secret societies, to mysticism and miracles, with some erratic eroticism thrown in. A leader of the "Avignon illuminati," Grabianka and his associates called at various ports, everywhere provoking their hosts into predictable reactions: Swedenborgians in London pronounced Grabianka a popish plotter; the Vatican, on the other hand, denounced the illuminati for dabbling in dogma and for claiming direct dialogues with divinities; in France Grabianka first favored the revolutionary furor, then turned against the terror. The French civil authorities made him close his new temple in 1799. In Russia Grabianka was warmly received in private circles, but aroused the suspicions of the Tsarist authorities, who had him imprisoned as a French spy. He died in the Peter and Paul fortress while awaiting trial. Danilewicz believes that archives in Leningrad may some day yield more data on Grabianka.

Next come three essays on nineteenth-century Russian literature, beginning with John Bayley's "Pushkin's Secret of Distance." The distance is that which "divides one theme from another and which separates each individual Pushkin creates from every other one, from himself, and from us." (p. 75) Other authors—Byron, Goethe, Mickiewicz, Wordsworth—are "compulsive talkers" who "never know when to stop"; Pushkin, on the other hand, says more by saying less. Possibly inspired by Pushkin's stylistic economy, Bayley himself spares us line-consuming footnotes for the ideas and quotations he has picked up from Henry James, D. H. Lawrence, George Eliot, V. Shklovsky, D. Blagoi, I. Nusinov and others. Anyhow, in Pushkin's Little Tragedies "we seem to encounter Shakespeare face to face" (81, 83)—particularly in the rapid portrayal of psychological differentiation.

In the very next essay, "Tolstoy, Shakespeare, and Russian Writers of the 1860's," Iu. D. Levin shows that such diverse critics as Chernyshevskii, Druzhinin and L. N. Tolstoi were quaking with misgivings about the Elizabethan bard. For some, his writings were unpardonably lacking in sympathy for the masses (they were, in current U.S. leftist jargon, "so irrelevant"); for others, Shakespeare's language and methods were disturbingly incompatible with the canons of "realism." Yet so great was Shakespeare's reputation in nineteenth-century Russia that to have challenged him publicly would have brought charges of "ignorance" and "obscurantism" against the challenger. Tolstoi's published "onslaught" on Shakespeare did not come until 1906, with his essay "on Shakespeare and the Drama"—an essay which marked a turning point in Russian Shakespeare criticism. According to Levin, Tolstoi showed that in his day "Shakespeare's possibilities as a psychologist were already exhausted, and that any further development along Shakespeare's lines would be harmful to the development of art . . . Shakespeare does not exist if we strip him of his poetry and his world of imagery." (104)

What did the allegorical ending (particularly the words "it came . . . ") mean in Saltykov's The History of a Town? Did "it" stand for the reaction which followed Nicholas I's accession to the throne? Or did "it" stand for overthrow of the old order, perhaps even a popular revolution? I. P. Foote devotes twenty pages to this problem, surveying the views of pre-revolutionary and Soviet scholars and concluding that Saltykov had "reaction" in mind, but reaction of contemporary relevance (the work was published in 1869-70).

Those of us who still cling to our hopes that the Igor Tale was an authentic Kievan literary masterpiece will suffer further distress from J. L. I. Fennell's article "The Slovo o polku Igoreve: the Textological Triangle." Fennell analyzes—and rejects—certain "textual coincidences" which Roman Jakobson and D. S.