

ARION 9: NEMZETKÖZI KÖLTÖI ALMANAC. NUMÉRO SPÉCIAL, ATTILA JÓZSEF (1905–1937). Commission Nationale Hongroise pour l'Unesco. Budapest: Corvina, 1976. 79 pp. Paper.

Published under the aegis of UNESCO, *Arion*—a multilingual magazine—is a beautifully produced propaganda brochure, albeit occasionally an interesting one. The ninth issue is devoted partly to a major modern Hungarian poet, Attila József, who committed suicide in 1937, at the age of thirty-two. Translations into French, English, Russian, German, letters and documents by Thomas Mann, Benedetto Croce, Tristan Tzara, and so forth all give a vivid and interesting insight into the short, unhappy life of this unique poet. Soviet critical praise is effusive and widely quoted, although not a word is said about his suicide—the result of a Soviet-led witch hunt after his expulsion from the Communist Party on the grounds of Freudian-bourgeois deviations. The rest of the magazine offers the reader a panoramic view of contemporary Hungarian poetry—from the doyen of Hungarian poets, Gyula Illyés (born in 1902), to the youngest member of the generation, Judit Kemenczky (born in 1948). But again, regrettably, the introduction to this useful selection is an exercise in evasions, omissions, and distortions in an almost indecipherable jargon of party aesthetics. Closing the issue, we find—quite incredibly—an unpublished manuscript by Pablo Neruda, celebrating “the banners of Lenin and Stalin” as they “flutter in the Soviet wind” in the “country of freedom and peace.” An affront to the memory of Attila József, it illustrates fittingly the editorial concerns and ambiguities of *Arion* in the name of UNESCO.

TAMAS ACZEL

*University of Massachusetts, Amherst*

HISTORIA LITERATURY POLSKIEJ: RENESANS. 2nd rev. ed. By Jerzy Ziomek. K. Wyka, series editor. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1976. 554 pp. 90 zł.

The book under review belongs to a series, *Historia literatury polskiej*, published under the auspices of the Institute of Literary Studies of the Polish Academy. In the Anglo-American world its closest counterpart would be the *Oxford History of English Literature*, a voluminous venture with each tome devoted to a specific period and written by a specialist. The years 1972–73 saw the appearance of the volumes on the Renaissance, the Baroque (by Czesław Hernas), and the Enlightenment (by Mieczysław Klimowicz). A recent newcomer, *Pozytywizm* (by Henryk Markiewicz), deals with literature between 1864 and 1890. By 1976 a second edition of the three volumes on earlier literature had been sold out; plans for a third edition have already been announced. The series has obviously answered an acutely felt need.

The scope of Ziomek's book is larger than the title would indicate. Roughly speaking, it covers literature in Polish and in Latin throughout the sixteenth century. In the first half of the century, Polish literature in the vernacular was, unlike its Latin counterpart, still medieval in spirit, and, even in later decades, the same was true of some literary genres, especially of the popular novel which consisted mostly of adaptations of medieval texts. The material in the book is divided into genres, but four writers—Modrzewski, Rej, Kochanowski, and Szarzyński—are treated differently, each of them the subject of a special chapter devoted to the totality of his production. The last one, Szarzyński, is also discussed in Hernas's volume on Baroque literature—the period in which he actually belongs. Ziomek, however, as the majority of Polish literary historians, is reluctant to admit this fact, out of concern, one would guess, for the neatness of the divisions of literary periods: the “anomalous” Szarzyński died in 1581, three years before Kochanowski.

In the sixteenth century, the boundary between literature *sensu stricto* and para-literature (political and religious tracts put into fictional settings) was more fluid than it is today. Ziomek's treatment of that marginal, and in Poland amazingly abundant, field is rather traditional. He devotes a special chapter to Modrzewski, an important social and religious reformer, whose Latin, however, lacked literary distinction; but he neglects the vast body of political and religious literature which, as stimulating studies by the Belgian scholar Claude Backvis have amply proved, is highly inventive and interesting from a strictly literary point of view as well. Otherwise, Ziomek's treatment of the subject deserves high praise: his presentation is clear, judicious, lively, rich, original, and full of aptly chosen quotations. It has nothing of the staleness of the manuals of literary history. The introductory chapters provide the reader with ample background information. Especially fresh and interesting are the pages dealing with the function of the printed book in sixteenth-century Polish culture.

The second edition is larger than the first by some eighty pages, but this is attributable not to any additions to the text, but to the inclusion of about one hundred illustrations. The book also contains a detailed selective bibliography. Along with Julian Krzyżanowski's well-known history of older Polish literature, Ziomek's volume is the best available introduction to the period.

WIKTOR WEINTRAUB  
*Harvard University*

MOSCOW: MONUMENTS OF ARCHITECTURE. EIGHTEENTH-THE FIRST THIRD OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, 2 vols. Introduction by *M. Ilyin*. Photographs by *A. Alexandrov*. Translated by *I. Ivyanskaya*. Moscow: "Iskusstvo," 1975. Vol. 1: 114 pp. Illus. 3.20 rubles. Vol. 2: 356 pp. Photographs. 12.52 rubles.

PAMIATNIKI ARKHITEKTURY MOSKOVSKOI OBLASTI, 2 vols. By *B. L. Al'tshuller* et al. Moscow: "Iskusstvo," 1975. Vol. 1: 384 pp. 2.13 rubles. Vol. 2: 376 pp. 2.46 rubles.

Russian architecture is best known outside the Soviet Union in terms of the surviving treasures of medieval Russia, the Moscow Kremlin, and rococo and classical St. Petersburg. The two works reviewed here exceed these limits and, in so doing, offer the reader new and important dimensions of architecture that are essential for understanding not only Russian art but Western art as well. Il'in's narrative, for example, focuses on classical Moscow, an important theme largely neglected in the Western literature of romantic classicism. Al'tshuller's work also gives ample space both to the architecture of classicism and to other styles, as they pertain to provincial Russia, and specifically to the Moscow oblast. A study of the architecture of this region has long been overdue.

Classical Moscow had its origins early in the reign of Catherine II. Her dread of residing, even for the briefest time, in the Old Capital led her to appoint planning bodies and to encourage construction of new buildings to replace the clutter of the marketplace and the deteriorating churches, palaces, and government buildings. That the architect Bazhenov endeavored to replace the Italianate Kremlin of Ivan III and Ivan IV with a classical one could only delight her. Even though she lost either interest or the means to finance construction, Catherine continued to encourage Matvei Kazakov to embellish central Moscow with classical edifices. The nobility who flocked to Moscow after their emancipation by Peter in the early 1760s also contributed to the spurt of classical building. One commission appointed by Catherine even produced a plan for a coherent city, the Project Plan of 1775. Although much hedging, inaction, and numerous modifications prevented realization of the plan, it remained