

provisations, commedia dell'arte, agitprop, and Symbolist and Constructivist staging to biomechanics and a rewriting of the classics—all in an effort to fulfill his search for “an organic form for the given content” of a drama.

Symons gives us an orderly analysis of the plays Meyerhold staged, together with an attempt to find the artistic and political motives behind his work. Most important, we get a glimpse of his laboratory methods—the brilliant trials and errors seeking a workable theatricalism that broke with the Stanislavsky method of theatrical realism. The author describes in detail the devices Meyerhold used in staging, sets and decors, costumes, and acting technique. Often contemporary press releases are cited. The reader may be grateful for this valiant book, and yet the true excitement and creative fervor, the daring novelties, and the red-hot enthusiasm surrounding each production are not captured. Perhaps theater history never can be. The greatest tribute to Meyerhold is Peter Brook's staging in the seventies of *Midsummer Night's Dream*, in which so many of Meyerhold's inventions are brilliantly employed at a time and place more favorable to nonrealistic productions.

NORA B. BEESON

*Metropolitan Museum of Art*

**MUSIC AND MUSICAL LIFE IN SOVIET RUSSIA, 1917–1970.** By Boris Schwarz. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972. xii, 550 pp. \$13.50.

This is a longish (500 pages) chronicle of Soviet musical life and the ways of the Soviet musical establishment; there is only cursory discussion of the music itself. The five main parts (further divided into nineteen chapters) are called “Experimentation” (1917–21), “Consolidation” (1921–32), “Regimentation” (1932–53), “Liberalization” (1953–64), and “Collective Leadership” (1964–70). Western scholars of Soviet affairs will recognize the dates easily enough but will be puzzled by Schwarz's historical approach, or lack of it. Schwarz is an impressively accomplished musician (a violinist and conductor as well as a scholar), and he brings that discipline to bear on the problem, not that of the historian.

The book is choked with facts, and Schwarz's task was to find, review, select, and discard from among what must have been a nearly overwhelming mass of them. On the other hand, he is reluctant to reflect, conclude, or analyze. Although he is quick to criticize a foolish Soviet propaganda stance or an equally foolish Western misreading of events, he seldom goes beyond the surface in the delivery of opinions. His style varies with his sources and with his enthusiasm for a composer or a period. He apparently finds the twenties the most interesting of times in Soviet music. He wonders, as have other Western observers, where—after Prokofiev and Shostakovich—are the truly significant Soviet composers, especially the younger ones. Unlike the less expert observer, he is not misty-eyed about the Soviet musical future because of the glory of the Russian musical past. He acknowledges the potential but is aware of the pitfalls, including the political ones. He essays to discover and announce these pitfalls afresh, ignoring many Western writers on Soviet literature and music who have preceded him. A warning to the nonspecialist reader: the peculiar difficulties of indexing a musical chronicle may demand that the reference user will have to become familiar with this volume's format for best service.

For one reason or another there are critical lacunae in this account of Soviet music. Because he apparently is not well read in Soviet sociopolitical history, Schwarz brushes by many items, such as the Nazi-Soviet pact of 1939, with a dutiful

mention but no significant analysis of their critical relations with the arts; because he relies too much on a single source (Nestiev), he does less than justice to Prokofiev; and because outside of his understandably limited personal experience he leans too heavily on Soviet secondary sources, especially upon the periodical press, he often develops the official version of events, quotes endlessly from speeches or articles whose authorship is questionable, and repeats (although not without reservations) the conclusions of the press. For example, he misses the underlying worry, the anger, and the threat of the 1968 All-Union Composers' Congress. This was the occasion for a severe reaction to creative reflections of the just-witnessed Czechoslovakian events, and composers were warned to police themselves with vigor and extend their ideological training to counter both the threat of the West and the growing domestic independence, especially among young people, of the musically orthodox. The ideological intolerance Schwarz discovers in 1970 was established in force in December 1968.

Schwarz is best when he exercises his musical judgment and tact in recording events he actually witnessed. He has enjoyed several stays in the Soviet Union, where he is widely acquainted and respected. He faced the difficult task of preserving both his Soviet sources *and* his Western views quite honestly and successfully, although he may yet draw some fire. His book should prove a useful complement to the still very small collection of credible books on Soviet music.

STANLEY KREBS

*University of California, Santa Barbara*

O STILE L'VA TOLSTOGO: STANOVLENIE "DIALEKTIKI DUSHI."

By *Pavel Gromov*. Leningrad: "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1971. 391 pp. 1.07 rubles.

Tolstoy scholarship has already yielded a number of books on the "young Tolstoy," including those by Eikhenbaum (a total of three: 1922, 1928, 1931), Kupreianova (1956), and Bursov (1960), not to mention works devoted primarily to biographical material. Pavel Gromov, whom we have known mainly as a writer on Karolina Pavlova, Apollon Grigoriev, Fet, and Blok, in this new book on the "young Tolstoy" turns his attention to certain aspects of Tolstoy's style as they developed from the trilogy through "Polikushka." The early period, including both successful and unsuccessful "experiments," is seen as formative, leading to *War and Peace*. This focus on the chronological development of style pays off and is the major merit of this new work.

It is ironic that just as Eikhenbaum's *Molodoi Tolstoi* has appeared in English, a Soviet critic, not known for any anti-Formalist bias, has chosen to level some serious and partly justified charges against Eikhenbaum. The argument centers on Tolstoy's conception of "personality" (*lichnost'*). Eikhenbaum, we will recall, claims that Tolstoy's heroes are not "personalities," but "bearers of separate human qualities and features combined mainly in a paradoxical fashion" (*Molodoi Tolstoi*, p. 42). Tolstoy's method, according to Eikhenbaum, stresses analysis over synthesis. Gromov puts this argument in historical perspective, seeing it as an example of a Futurist aesthetic which tends to dissect images into component parts; for Gromov, Eikhenbaum's book is "one of the first cases of testing the ideas" of the Futurists on nineteenth-century texts (p. 95).

Gromov sees Tolstoy differently. He singles out Chernyshevsky's abused no-