and his frustration hardly varies in tone or degree from 1970 until his last illness sixteen years later, when he battled for his son Andriusha to be allowed to join him abroad. The "most important thing of all — being able to work without asking anybody's permission" (September 3, 1970) eluded him as long as he stayed in the Soviet Union.

Beginning with Andrei Rublev, completed in 1966 but released only in 1971, he had to fight for every movie. When he finished Solaris (1972), he jousted with Goskino's chairman, Aleksei Romanov, who sent him a list of "required" cuts. Tarkovsky refused to make them. Miraculously, if in typically arbitrary fashion, Romanov then accepted Solaris without a single alteration. Two years later, when Tarkovsky screened Mirror, Goskino's chairman had changed, but its attitude stayed pretty much the same: "Again all hell has been let loose — over the film. On Thursday Yermash rejected it: he found it all incomprehensible ('Make it comprehensible!'), some bits he didn't like ('Cut them out! What's the point of them?') and so on." The story repeated itself, fugue and variations, for each film and for each project, and it makes depressing reading.

So do other reminders of the period: the request that Tarkovsky denounce Solzhenitsyn after the latter's expulsion (luckily, Tarkovsky was out of town); the expectation that roughly half of all foreign currency earnings would be turned over to the state; Tarkovsky's fear of repercussions when a foreign journalist attributed to him "anti-Soviet" remarks he was far too cautious ever to make in public; the agony that emigration was (then) irreversible.

All bureaucratic systems — Goskino, Cinecitta or Hollywood — are inhospitable to sharply individualistic artists, and Tarkovsky found Western cost-accounting pressures hardly less discomfiting than Party demands. Nevertheless, Time within Time makes plain that the constraints imposed on Tarkovsky by the Soviet system scarred him. Whatever their impact on his work — and film scholars will be arguing about that for years — they substantially poisoned his life. A greatly gifted artist, Tarkovsky was a deeply unhappy man. Time within Time reveals both sides of him.

Josephine Woll
Howard University


Democratic changes in Russia, the process that started in April 1985, summoned Freud's "return" to Russia and the revival of psychoanalysis, once branded as part of "bourgeois ideology." The signs of this "return" are the appearance in 1991 of the first issue of Rossiiskii psikhologicheskii vestnik, a journal dedicated to issues in psychoanalysis; the opening of the Institute of Psychoanalysis in St. Petersburg; and the increasing availability of Freud's, Jung's, Rank's, and Adler's works in translation. A comprehensive history of psychoanalysis in Russia, however, has yet to be written.

Eros notvozmozhnogo is the first serious attempt of this kind, a book of indisputable value both for Russian and Western scholars. Etkind's approach, by and large, is determined by the nature of the vast archival materials he is using. These materials are overwhelming because of both their relatively recent availability and their sometimes almost detective-story-like tangle of passions, facts, snares, and intrigue. Material of this sort, in which facts might often seem less plausible than their interpretation, poses a great temptation for a scholar, let alone a fiction writer. This in part explains the structure of the argument, which is far from linear, as well as
Etkind's occasionally semi-fictional treatment of the subject. But the book's weaknesses paradoxically turn out to be its strengths, a point made by other reviewers as well.

The book is loosely structured as an alternating sequence of specific chapters devoted to famous Russian analysands and analyses (Lou Andreas-Salome; Pankeev, Freud's famous "Wolf-Man"; Sabina Spielrein, and others), and overview chapters on the history of Russian psychoanalysis and its context from Symbolism to Mikhail Bakhtin.

The stories of personalities that Etkind offers resemble short biographical fiction; they are intelligently divided into mini-chapters, which maintain suspense and the readers' interest throughout the narrative. But the absence of an index and table of contents makes this an inconvenient reference work. These shortcomings reflect not on the author, but rather the haste and carelessness that mar much publishing in Russia today and are partly compensated for by a comprehensive bibliography and commentary at the end of the book. One hopes that this flaw will be eliminated in the English edition to be published soon.

By far the most interesting "biographical" chapters are "Sergei Pankeev, the Wolf-Man" and "Between Power and Death: The Psychoanalytic Interests of Lev Trotsky and Other Comrades." The first pays tribute to Lacan's idea of the unconscious structured as language, by offering a new interpretation of the Wolf-Man's dream based entirely on knowledge of the Russian language, inaccessible to Freud. Etkind amends Lacan: "Unconscious is structured as a native language." (p. 110. Italics mine). The analysis develops a very interesting and provocative conclusion on the specifically Russian phenomenon of a strong "nanny's presence" in national culture and consciousness, which, by relocating and "dispersing" the elements of the mother figure, redistributing them among the figures of elderly women, those of nannies and babushkas (hence relocating Pankeev's/any Russian's libido), transforms the father (Oedipus) into pure symbol.

The chapter on Trotsky and comrades explores the fascinating link between the rise and fall of Russian psychoanalysis and shifts in political power. Mini-chapters investigate the connections of Max Eitingon, Freud's friend and an influential figure in European psychoanalysis, and his brother Naum Eitingon with Stalin's secret police. Etkind also explores their role in the political assassinations of Ignacio Reiss, Lev Sedov, and eventually Trotsky himself (Naum Eitingon, an NKVD general, is said to have been the lover of Carridad Mercader, Ramon Mercader's mother) and convincingly concludes that as a result of complicated political intrigue, Vienna psychoanalysis in the 1920s was financed in part with Soviet money.

The shift from sexuality in Freud's psychoanalysis to a specifically Russian focus on questions of power is one of Etkind's most developed and original ideas. He demonstrates how psychoanalysis in Russia was gradually edged out by reality itself, which was too disparate and incongruously horrible to be explained by a focus on the unconscious and by Freud's "good-natured atrocities," such as "Oedipal nonsense" (a quotation from Nadezhda Mandel'shtam; Etkind, p. 380). Or, as Mikhail Etkind pointedly wrote, "... consciousness is much more frightening than any unconscious complexes." (Etkind, p. 380). Using diverse Russian materials, Etkind even attributes the origin of Freud's idea of the "death drive" to the collective effort of Russian intellectuals.

In general, the exploration of the specificity of Russian psychoanalysis and emphasis on Russia as the Other and on its peculiar position between Europe and Asia (in terms of psychoanalysis being a mediating position between consciousness and the unconscious) are perhaps the finest and most original contributions by the author. And this originality is due precisely to what Etkind interprets as the reason for Andreas-Salome's originality: "... the Russian sources,