

vaniia v oblasti slavianskikh drevnostei (1974), but there is less excuse for the absence from his bibliography of their earlier *Slavianskie iazykovye modeliruiushchie semioticheskie sistemy* (1965). Indeed, the bibliography is most curious. One finds V. V. Ivanov's historical grammar of Russian listed under literary criticism, but no mention of Lord's *Singer of Tales* or any of Felix Oinas's works on the Russian epos. Had Mr. Alexander been able to consult some of these very important works, one suspects that his arguments in favor of the derivation of the *bylina* from the fairy tale would have been differently stated. As it is, his book is not very convincing.

JACK V. HANEY
University of Washington

RUSSIAN LITERARY CRITICISM: A SHORT HISTORY. By R. H. Stacy.
 Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1974. ix, 267 pp. \$15.00, cloth. \$8.00, paper.

"This book is intended for readers who do not know Russian but who would like to learn something of the nature and course of Russian literary criticism" (p. ix). Thus Professor Stacy states his intentions all too clearly; he tells his reader "something" about Russian criticism, but not nearly as much as he might have, even in a book directed at a popular audience.

As the book stands, it completely fails to do justice to Soviet criticism of the sixties. The main problem is that Stacy does not *like* Russian criticism very much. He announces at the outset that "Russian literary criticism both begins and ends badly" (p. 13). He constantly corrects, judges, and argues with the critics whom he is discussing, and since he frequently prefers to paraphrase rather than quote, the general reader will have to accept his strongly stated prejudices (as well as some extremely dubious literary judgments). He has particularly great difficulty in his chapter on "The Modernists" (from Shestov to Mayakovsky), and justly characterizes his remarks on Rozanov, Shestov, and Berdiaev as "rather harsh" (p. 125); he cannot understand, for example, why "The name of Dionysus appears again and again" (p. 127) in the work of a Nietzschean critic like Viacheslav Ivanov. While Stacy does mention most of the names, dates, and titles that the layman needs to know, he unfortunately mentions Iurii Lotman only in passing.

Russian Literary Criticism badly needed a demanding editor. I noticed only one mistake in a date, 1744 for 1774 (p. 25), but found a number of misprints and several omitted words; furthermore, on page 92, Stacy inexplicably begins giving titles in Russian as well as in English translation (although he never translates quotations in French and German). A good editor would have caught Stacy's repetitions of extraneous facts, and would have cautioned him about introducing so many peripheral quotations and comments, especially in the later chapters.

I hope the author will revise this book thoroughly before a second edition appears.

JAMES M. CURTIS
University of Missouri, Columbia