

BETWEEN GOGOL' AND ŠEVČENKO: POLARITY IN THE LITERARY UKRAINE: 1798–1847. By *George S. N. Luckyj*. Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, vol. 8. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1971. 210 pp. DM 38.

Few things in the study of the Slavic world are more fascinating, bewildering, and exasperating than its paradoxes about inter-Slavic relations. On the one hand there is the powerful myth of Slavic brotherhood and unity, which can be traced back at least to Herder and has produced such movements as the Brotherhood of Cyril and Methodius in the 1840s, the Slavic congresses of 1848 and 1867, and the scholarly International Congresses of Slavists in the twentieth century. But running parallel to this cult of Slavic solidarity is a series of bitter conflicts that have provided the Slavs with two hundred years of noble excuses to hate, distrust, oppress, and kill one another—the Polish Question, the conflict between the Czechs and the Slovaks, the conflict between the Croats and the Serbs, the Macedonian Question, and the conflict between the Ukrainians and the Russians.

The most perplexing of all these issues in our day is undoubtedly the Ukrainian Question. On this question, among scholars of Russian and Ukrainian background alike, and even among scholars who have no Slavic ethnic heritage at all, dispassionate objectivity is almost as scarce as hens' teeth.

Almost, but not quite. The Ukrainian-born Canadian citizen George S. N. Luckyj has long distinguished himself in scholarship for his remarkable ability to find his way through the wilderness of Ukrainian-Russian relations, even though so few existing maps of the territory correspond to what is actually there. Professor Luckyj's new book is at least as important a contribution to Russian literature as to Ukrainian. However much otherwise objective scholars in Russian literature may wish, along with Belinsky, that the Ukrainian Question would just go away, and however justifiable their impatience may be with the inflexible extremists of Ukrainian nationalism, the fact is that Russian literature from its beginning to the present cannot possibly be understood in isolation from the Ukrainians. This book concentrates on the crucial period in the first half of the nineteenth century when Ukrainian writers were struggling to decide whether to make their special contribution in Russian, as the Scots and Irish have done in English and the Austrians and Germanic Swiss in German; or whether to develop a complete Ukrainian literature in the Ukrainian language. As the title implies, Gogol made the first choice and Shevchenko the second. Luckyj's admirably balanced and highly informative discussion of both choices should be required reading for all who refuse to face the facts about the Ukraine—or think they already have them.

WILLIAM B. EDGERTON  
*Indiana University*

BELINSKIJ AND RUSSIAN LITERARY CRITICISM: THE HERITAGE OF ORGANIC AESTHETICS. By *Victor Terras*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974. vii, 305 pp. \$17.50.

In the following passage Victor Terras sums up the main argument of his study in the origins, formulations, and legacy of Belinsky's critical theory: "Belinskij's concern with 'Russian literature,' rather than with specific writers and poets, and his tendency to see a given literary figure in the context, and as a necessary product, of his age, are Hegelian traits. Belinskij invested Lomonosov, Deržavin, Žukovskij,