

Solzhenitsyn as a symbol of dignity and supreme honesty tested in his own homeland by a whole arsenal of government agencies and information media, yet never compromised. But they also show him as a human being—impatient, cautious, incredibly self-disciplined, a clever man who, amid great moral pressures made immediate and real in this book, observes, learns, and survives.

There have been objections to this book, even an attack by one of the authors' collaborators on the allegedly "irresponsible manner" in which it was written (Veronika Turkina in the *New York Times Book Review*, September 17, 1972; answered by George Feifer, *NYTBR*, October 8, 1972). But Burg and Feifer are far from irresponsible. Their book is not only a worthy tribute to Solzhenitsyn's talent and literary achievement, but a moving description of a man of profound religious faith and patriotism, and finally a convincing explanation of how that man has come to be a significant ethical force today in Russia and in the world.

ROGER HAGGLUND
University of Washington

STANICA U PUSTINJI. By *Joseph Brodsky*. Translated by *Mića Danojlić*. Preface by *Milica Nikolić*. "Biblioteka Orfej." Belgrade: "Nolit," 1971. 140 pp.

In the introduction to this Serbo-Croatian translation of Joseph Brodsky's *Ostanovka v pustyne* Milica Nikolić remarks that Brodsky is a "modern" poet, outside the contemporary Russian poetic tradition which is based on nineteenth-century aesthetics. Nikolić conjectures that Brodsky, who emigrated to the United States in 1972, would not be popular in the USSR even if his works were published there, because "his poetry has something which is not in tune with the taste and sensibility of the times" (Soviet "times," presumably). Nikolić feels that in the USSR Brodsky will always remain the poet of only one stratum of readers, "those marvelous aficionados of art, the sort to be found nowhere else but in Russia."

It might seem a relatively simple task to translate poetry from one Slavic language into another, but quite the opposite is true. Danojlić's translation, when compared with the original, provides a good example of the difficulties in translating, for example, from Russian into Serbo-Croatian. It is true that both languages have similar morphological systems, as well as a common lexical inventory. But the Serbo-Croatian sounds are substantially different from the Russian (particularly with respect to the pureness of Serbo-Croatian vowels, the highly palatal quality of some consonants, and the absence of palatalized consonants). This all means that it was impossible for Danojlić to duplicate the rich masculine texture of Brodsky's verse. A further handicap which he faced, and perhaps even more crucial, was the difference between the stress systems in the two languages: Serbo-Croatian stress tends to be fixed and predictable, whereas Russian stress is highly mobile. This difference made it almost impossible for Danojlić to duplicate the rhythm of the Russian original. A great loss, indeed.

These inadequacies aside, Danojlić's translation may be considered reasonably accurate. His work is obviously a labor of love, done with much care. He takes few liberties with the original, and this is a blessing, because Brodsky is a strongly intellectual poet. There *are* some minor mistranslations, here and there, and one would wish Danojlić had translated the same word the same way each time it is used in a poem.

The introduction by Milica Nikolić (32 pages) should perhaps be translated into English.

THOMAS J. BUTLER
University of Wisconsin, Madison

THE LITERATURES OF THE SOVIET PEOPLES: A HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY. Edited by *Harri Jünger*. Based on a translation by *Vladimir Nekrasoff*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1970. xiv, 482 pp. \$12.50.

THE NON-SLAVIC PEOPLES OF THE SOVIET UNION: A BRIEF ETHNOGRAPHICAL SURVEY. Edited, translated, and introduced by *Konstantin Symmons-Symonolewicz*. Meadville, Pa.: Maplewood Press [P.O. Box 90, 16335], 1972. xiii, 168 pp. \$4.50, paper.

In the publisher's preface to Harri Jünger's volume, American readers are cautioned that the reference work, originally published in East Germany, contains some ideological bias: "Throughout, its approach is from the viewpoint of 'official' criticism oriented to the school of socialist realism. The evaluation of writers such as Boris Pasternak and Boris Pilnyak, who are known to the Western reading public, is thus quite different from that of Western critics." Still, the publishers believe, "With this understanding in mind, readers will find here a useful guide especially to contemporary Soviet writing, offering an excellent opportunity to see Russian [?] literature past and present as the citizens of the Soviet bloc nations see it." The East German compiler of the volume, Harri Jünger, apparently an emotional man, concludes his preface with an expression of hope that the volume "will nurture friendship toward our Soviet brothers."

If such were indeed the reasons for the book's appearance, then its contents offer grounds for suspicions that a cunning gang of anti-Soviet saboteurs has wormed its way into East Germany's publishing industry. Not only have these enemies of Socialist Germany succeeded in bringing out a book the *partinost'* of which, even if measured by demanding Soviet standards, verges on the ludicrous, a device of the *reductio ad absurdum* category that makes the volume rather counterproductive. No, the wreckers and saboteurs, as well as their bosses, whoever they are, resorted to more insidious devices. They divided the book's five hundred pages into two parts. The first is a series of fifteen entries for fifteen literatures, one for each of the country's union republics. The one hundred pages devoted to all of them were distributed in a manner that was quite clearly designed to fan ethnic tensions. Thus, Russian literature was allocated almost half of all the space available, Ukrainian received only seven pages, and the others were allocated between three and five pages each (i.e., roughly between 6 and 10 percent of the space given to Russian literature). As a result, there is an article on Moldavian literature, even though the Moldavian language is simply Rumanian written in the Cyrillic script, and therefore the separation of Moldavian literature from the rest of Rumanian literature is artificial; indeed, prior to 1939 the two were simply, at the most, regional literary groupings within a single country, both written in the same alphabet. Similarly, there is a separate article on Tadzhik literature, even though three quarters of it deals (as it should) with Persian writing. On the other hand, there is no entry at all for Tatar literature. The book's guiding principle seems to have been quite simple. Every Soviet union republic has a literature. Conversely: no republic, no literature.