

specific works such as Raynal's *Histoire philosophique* and de Tocqueville's *De la Démocratie en Amérique*. Boden gives some attention to the influence of domestic politics and foreign policy on the development of the Russian image of America; but this aspect of his study is not sufficiently developed. Especially illuminating, on the other hand, is his analysis of the impact of the debate over Russia's relationship to Europe on the formation of the Russian literary image of America, which—as he correctly emphasizes—became intertwined with the general problem of the state in Russian philosophy of history. (Thus, for example, Russian writers used the American Indian, the “noble savage,” as a literary device to criticize the evils of European civilization.)

One of Boden's major contributions is his carefully documented analysis of the increasingly negative posture of Russian literature toward America in the course of the nineteenth century—a posture which reflected some of the underlying themes of de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* and which at the end of the nineteenth century resulted in a strange alliance between the Slavophiles and the Westerners, who turned out to be united in their criticism of the “merchant mentality of the Yankee” (p. 189) and their rejection of the materialistic way of life of the “land of the almighty dollar” (p. 184). Boden's work is an exceedingly significant contribution to an aspect of Russian-American relations that to date has been very much neglected.

ROLF H. W. THEEN
Iowa State University

LITERATUR UND POLITIK IN DER SOWJETUNION NACH STALINS

TOD. By *Alexander Steininger*. Veröffentlichungen des Osteuropa-Institutes München, vol. 26. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965. 236 pp. DM 28.

The developments in Soviet literature from the end of World War II through approximately 1957 have been dealt with in several books. However, no one, it seems, has attempted to trace within the pages of a book the far less clear-cut events that followed the second “thaw.” Alexander Steininger's *Literatur und Politik in der Sowjetunion nach Stalins Tod* has the merit of carrying the story of Soviet literature systematically forward as far as 1963.

As the title suggests, much attention has been devoted to the shifting political background. This is as it should be. The author does, however, at times emphasize unduly the hare-and-hounds aspect of the game played between Soviet writers and party bureaucrats. Not that the picture he paints is false. Rather, the lines separating the “heretics” and the “orthodox” are drawn with a somewhat heavy hand. We are apt to forget that different “heretics” at different times have been convinced that they were implementing party policy as it should be implemented.

Passing chronologically beyond the second “thaw,” the author demonstrates convincingly the widening of the range of spiritual and social problems—having nothing to do with strictly party issues—which are reflected in literature. A Soviet citizen would probably feel that the author is unhealthily interested in unearthing “problems”—and opinions may vary on how much emphasis should be given to individual manifestations which are represented as problems to the regime. This is not to suggest that the author has allowed his imagination to run riot. On the contrary, the book is well documented, and the author's viewpoints are presented in a sober and balanced manner. One cannot but agree with what is perhaps the

major conclusion, namely, that the party's ideological influence is on the decline and that this trend is in the long run irreversible.

This book should make good reading not only for the student of literature but also for anyone interested in Soviet society. Its contents, it may be noted, have a bearing upon the situation in the Soviet Union today.

WALTER N. VICKERY
University of North Carolina

ISTORIIA UKRAÏNS'KOÏ LITERATURY U VOS'MY TOMAKH, vols. 1, 2, 3, and 5. Edited by *Ie. P. Kyryliuk*. Kiev: "Naukova dumka," 1967–68. A publication of the Akademiia nauk Ukraïns'koï RSR, Instytut literatury im. T. H. Shevchenka. 539, 483, 514, 522 pp. 1.90 rubles each.

For decades students of Ukrainian literature have been deprived of any extensive history of that literature. Short histories, published in two volumes in 1954 and 1957 by the Academy of Sciences in Kiev, and in two volumes (1964–66) by the Kiev State Pedagogical Institute, were not very satisfactory. Although freed by and large from the Zhdanovist blinkers imposed on literary history in 1946 (after the publication of the history by Maslov and Kyryliuk), these attempts to survey Ukrainian literature demonstrated a biased interpretation of its development and a reluctance to divorce literature from ideology. They were, in a sense, a Soviet antidote to Dmytro Chyzhevsky's history of Ukrainian literature published in 1956 in New York, which was an example of a combined formal and comparative approach.

The new eight-volume publication does not significantly differ from its predecessors in its interpretation of Ukrainian literary developments. All roads still lead to realism and eventually to socialist realism. Every event or work in the past is evaluated from the point of view of this preconception: has it or has it not aided in the development of realism? The pattern that emerges is predictable. It is extremely simplistic and not in the least convincing to anyone holding different premises. But it would be a mistake to reject this publication on that ground alone. It offers something of much greater value, that is, the factual scaffolding, the historical and literary material on which the entire structure rests. It must be granted that in these volumes the Ukrainian scholars have amassed a wealth of data that for the last three decades have been forgotten or were unknown. True, these facts have been woven into a Soviet, quasi-populist fabric, but they are clearly discernible in themselves and will be valued by the researcher and the uninitiated reader alike.

Four volumes of the history have appeared so far. In volume 1, after a short review of the Kievan period (by Makhnovets, Myshanych, Krekoten), there follows an extensive survey of the literature of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. This important period has often been neglected in earlier histories. Of particular interest is the chapter on school drama and *intermedia*. Volume 2, even more original, begins with a detailed analysis of conditions in the second half of the eighteenth century. It contains a good chapter on the *vertep* by Makhnovets. The same author is responsible for a lengthy (eleven pages) discussion of *Istoriia rusov*, a work that only thirteen years ago was dismissed as "reflecting the nationalist longings of the Ukrainian nobility." It is followed by a long and tendentious chapter on Skovoroda. A valuable analysis of the Ukrainian burlesque tradition is offered by Chaly. In the "pre-Shevchenko period," Shabliovskiy does not make a sufficiently