

withheld. A well-chosen selection of translated documents provides an appendix which, while not rivaling the collection published in Italian by Quilichi, nonetheless enriches Kopp's otherwise brief references to Ginzburg, Miliutin, and the Society of Contemporary Architects.

The accompanying text, charged with the exuberance of the period and studded with citations from the verse of Mayakovsky, is frankly apologetic. The professional conflicts that permeated and disfigured the movement are not Kopp's concern, nor are the complex relations between the new architecture and its patrons under NEP and Stalin. Attention is devoted to the ASNOVA and VOPRA groupings, though Kopp's task here was made difficult by the absence of any systematic analysis of Bolshevik attitudes toward that most public of arts. The text severely minimizes all elements of continuity between the rapidly evolving architectural profession before 1917 and the post-Civil War situation; prewar zoning debates in the Moscow and Petersburg architectural societies and the Russian garden city movement might well have been cited as antecedent developments. Just as Kopp tends to discount the importance of early professional changes and the debates around which they crystallized, he considers the architects of the twenties far more indebted to revolutionary ideology than to the broad changes in the visual arts before 1917; many of the prominent figures of the twenties, though, began their careers as painters in the prestigious Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, of which Leonid Pasternak was once director. On this point Kopp's narrative may be contrasted to that presented by Vittorio de Feo in his *U.R.S.S. Architectura, 1917-1936*.

Serious interpretation on these matters, will, of course, vary, just as it will on the relation of the movement to Western Europe and on the causes of the movement's decline. What is noteworthy about Kopp's monograph is that in it a consistent point of view is informed by thoughtful research and the visual acuity of a practiced architect. The recently published translation will surely be welcome.

S. FREDERICK STARR  
Princeton University

HISTORY OF RUSSIAN MUSIC. Vol. 1: FROM ITS ORIGINS TO DARGOMYZHISKY. By *Gerald R. Seaman*. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968. xv, 351 pp. \$9.00.

Gerald Seaman, at present senior lecturer in musicology at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, has impressive credentials in the field of Russian music history. He has studied under the guidance of Gerald Abraham, the leading British authority in this field. He has spent a year of study at the Leningrad Conservatory, where he was able to gain access to "primary sources" (according to the publisher's jacket notes). He has written and lectured extensively on the subject of Russian music. Nevertheless, the first volume of his projected two-volume history of Russian music has been received with disappointment in professional circles. Some of the criticism has been quite acid, as, for example, in the *Musical Quarterly* (July 1969, in a review by Miloš Velimirović) and in *Notes* (September 1969, by Malcolm Brown). Under attack came Seaman's method of using secondary Russian sources (mostly textbooks) with such fidelity that parts of his own book appear to be paraphrases of the Russian texts. Even where the Soviet authors made factual errors, Seaman's confidence in his sources remained unshaken: the errors reappear in his volume, though corrected data are available. It is true that Seaman did not conceal his

sources: there is full bibliographical information referring to each chapter (pp. 317–21), in which the author acknowledges his debts. Most of the chapters are “based on” KIRM, PIRM, and TIRM—abbreviations used to describe the following Soviet textbooks: Iurii Keldysh, *Istoriia russkoi muzyki*, volume 1 (1947); Mikhail Pekelis, ed., *Istoriia russkoi muzyki*, volume 1 (1940); and Nadezhda Tumanina, ed., *Istoriia russkoi muzyki*, volume 1 (1957). All three author-editors are distinguished Soviet historians who had excellent collaborators (PIRM and TIRM are cooperative efforts). The Pekelis text was sharply attacked by Zhdanov in 1948 for being allegedly too “pro-Western”; it was replaced by the Keldysh volumes (in a preface Keldysh dissociated himself from the Pekelis text, though he had contributed to it). At present only the Tumanina volumes are in circulation and represent a rather impersonal, nationalistic, “official” point of view.

But Seaman went further than merely “basing” his chapters on these sources. There are entire pages and sections that are closely “patterned” after corresponding pages in one or the other Soviet source book. Take, for example, pages 44–45 in Seaman’s book and compare them to pages 58–59 in the Tumanina text (actually written by T. V. Popova). Definitions, musical example, and footnote show close parallels. Such methods recur throughout Seaman’s book. True, he quotes his sources fully, but he seems to be the servant rather than the master of his source materials.

It must be understood that in writing a history the use of secondary sources is permissible and even necessary. No history was ever written that could rely exclusively on primary research. But secondary material has to be critically evaluated, reinterpreted, made to serve as a foil to the author’s personal point of view, and also matched against the author’s own scholarly research. Seaman has approached these problems with a nonchalance that is surprising for a scholar of his standing.

Once these reservations are made, however, it must be said that Seaman’s book will be useful to those who, because of language barriers, are unable to read the Russian texts. The materials are arranged in a readable manner; each chapter is subdivided into many shorter sections, neatly subtitled in textbook fashion. The musical examples are provided with transliterated (though not translated) texts wherever words appear. The “Sources of Musical Examples” are listed on pages 322–28 and are drawn entirely from secondary Russian sources.

The “Selected Bibliography” (pp. 297–303) is weighted heavily in favor of books in Russian. Among the Western authors, experts such as Calvocoressi, Abraham, and Mooser are easily outdistanced by the twelve entries listed under Seaman—mostly articles, some of which, it must be said, have been criticized for the same reasons as the present book. Any “selective” bibliography is apt to be controversial. Why, for example, is Razumovsky listed but not Metallov or Preobrazhensky? Why list Reese’s “Music in the Middle Ages” but omit corresponding articles on Russian chant by Panoff (in Bücken’s *Handbuch*) or Riesemann (in Adler’s *Handbuch*)? Why include Montagu-Nathan but exclude Rosa Newmarch (both are equally dated)? Why list all five volumes of Boris Asafiev’s *Izbrannye trudy*, when only volumes 1 and 4 have any reference to Seaman’s topic? Why the summary listing of Vladimir Stasov’s *Izbrannye sochineniia* (of which, incidentally, there is a newer edition of 1952) instead of guiding the reader through the 2,400 pages by pinpointing the relevant articles? (Too late to be included in Seaman’s bibliography is a 1969 English edition of Stasov’s *Selected Essays on Music*, translated by Florence Jonas and introduced by Dr. Abraham.) Some of the

musicological yearbooks published in Moscow would have deserved inclusion, such as *Voprosy muzykoznanii*, volumes 2 and 3 (1956 and 1960); also useful is *Muzyka i muzykal'nyi byt staroi Rossii* (Leningrad, 1927), a collective volume. The bibliographical guide of Sofia Uspenskaia, *Literatura o muzyke* (1948–53) has been extended by three volumes covering the period 1954–56, 1957, and 1958–59. In addition, there is a valuable volume of bibliography by Ivan Startsev, *Sovetskaia literatura o muzyke, 1918–1947* (Moscow, 1963); nor is the old volume by Georgii Orlov, *Muzykal'naia literatura* (Leningrad, 1935), entirely outdated. Additional bibliographical information can be found in the two bibliographic guides on Russia and the Soviet Union (including chapters on music) edited by Paul L. Horecky and published in 1962 and 1965 by the University of Chicago Press.

Seaman's text (236 pp.) is followed by fifty-eight pages of notes containing more detailed and scholarly information on matters touched upon in the context of the book. One wonders whether some of this pertinent material could not have been worked into the text; as it is, there is a constant need to refer back and forth.

It is to be hoped that Dr. Seaman—responding to the criticism of his colleagues—will shape the second volume of his history with greater independence of judgment and depth of scholarly research. We wish him success.

BORIS SCHWARZ  
*Queens College, CUNY*

ZOLTÁN KODÁLY: HIS LIFE AND WORK. By László Eöszé. Translated by István Farkas and Gyula Gulyás. Boston: Crescendo Publishing Co., 1969. 183 pp. \$6.50.

This book is not, as the inscription claims, a translation of László Eöszé's Kodály study that appeared in the original Hungarian in 1956 (Kodály was then seventy-four and was to live on for another decade). Rather it is an adaptation of that book for the foreign market. The original work treats the events of Kodály's life and his various achievements in chronological order. Much of the wealth of minute detail was supplied by Kodály himself. This fact and the careful documentation of other materials, and also that all the information is given in the context of a narrative, allow the reader to give the proper weight to all cited opinions, pronouncements, and so forth, both those by and those relating to Kodály. One clearly senses what was said and done by the various dramatis personae for casual, or ceremonial, or polemical purposes, and what other things for more serious ones. The Hungarian book is, in short, a biography of the kind usually termed an official biography, and has most of the virtues and few of the shortcomings of all such documents.

The situation is quite different with the English version. Biographical narrative is condensed into thirty-six pages (pp. 11–46), and materials relating to Kodály's musicological, pedagogical, and creative activities are taken out of the narrative and placed into separate sections (pp. 47–65, 66–87, and 88–166, respectively). Much of the minutiae are left out, presumably to spare the non-Hungarian reader meaningless detail. The result of this policy may be judged from a single example. On page 13 the English version begins to relate the first formal musical experiences that fell to Kodály's lot in the small town of Nagyszombat in 1892: "He began by studying the piano but later switched over to the violin. . . ." From the Hungarian we learn that piano instruction lasted a year, that the nine-year-old boy's instructor was his own sister just a few years his senior, and that they used the Lebert-Stark method book. The loss of both information and atmosphere in the English version is,