MAWR, Ya. V. Zhurawlyow, an appreciation: Po, 5, 178–82.
TANK, M. L. Dmyterko, an article on T.: Vit, 6, 166–9. See also p. 587 above.
VYALYUHIN, A. An autobiog. essay, Po, 3, 138–49.

4. **FOLKLORE**

I. Hutoraw writes on WR folklore study, contemp. folklore (EzL, xviii, 2, 85–8) and workers' folklore (NTE, 2, 75–7). A. Fedosyk traces atheistic motifs in old and contemp. folklore: NTE, 1, 12–18. Н. Барышев, etc., Беларускі народны тэатр 'Батлейка' і яго ўзаеамасуваці з рускім 'вяртэпам' і польскай 'шопкай', АН БССР, 42 pp.: on the vicissitudes of the puppet *vertep* theatre which came from the Ukraine into White Russia, and from both these countries found its way to Russia. P. Akhrymyenka finds some songs of Ukrainian origin in 3 WR MS. cols: NTE, 1, 97–100. See also Id., under LITERATURE, GENERAL, and BAHIDANOVICh above.

---

**APPENDIX**

**RUSSIAN LITERATURE, 1800–1917**

By Georgette Donchin, Lecturer in Russian Language and Literature at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in the University of London

1. **GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY**

K. D. Muratova's fundamental bibliography of 19th-c. lit. (see *YWML*, xxiv, 565) has been complemented now by a most valuable volume covering the turn of the century. The bibliographical importance of История русской литературы конца
Russian Literature, 1800–1917

XIX–начала XX века. Библиографический указатель, под ред. К. Д. Муратовой, М, Л, ИД (rev. SIO, xii, 1, 97–100) cannot be over-emphasized; it knows no precedent in scope or magnitude, and will open entirely new vistas to the student of the period. Anybody who has ever touched upon this field will have realized the great stumbling-block that the lack of a comprehensive bibliography has hitherto proved. The 20,000 entries are organized on similar lines to the 19th-c. bibl., and the Personalia cover 159 writers. The inclusion of printed epistolary material dispersed in various newspapers is an interesting feature. The ed. does not claim to be exhaustive; nevertheless it is a pity that M. based her selection of authors on the X vol. of the Academy history of Russian lit. publ. in 1954. The limited treatment of émigré writers is also to be regretted, as well as the incomplete listing of the writers’ works (the difficulties of the latter problem are discussed in the preface). The omission of Konevskoy is an unfortunate lapsus, and there are some errata in the indexes. These blemishes, chosen at random, should not however detract from the general excellence of that most painstaking opus collated by a well trained group of the ИРЛ (ПД) research workers who struggled their way through scattered anthologies, miscellanies, periodicals, newspapers and personal files to produce an incomparable reference work of lasting value.

The annotated R. N. Krendel’, main ed., Русские писатели второй половины XIX–начала XX вв. (до 1917 года). Рекомендательный указатель литературы, ч. III, М, Гос. Б-ка СССР им. Ленина, catering for a different type of reader, is devoted mainly to Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy. The stress is on the newest Soviet critical material; only the most important pre-war works are included, and very few pre-revolutionary ones. The series is not intended for the research worker, but is useful as a popular guide.


See also A. A. Zaytseva, ‘Работы по зарубежным славянским литературом, опубликованные в СССР в 1961 г.’ in LSN, 8,