

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(Moscow, 1963); nor is the old volume by Georgii Orlov, *Muzykal'naia literatura* (Leningrad, 1935), entirely outdated.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,

unfortunately, characteristic of the entire book. Place names, names of persons, and titles of journalistic organs that served as sources are mostly omitted, presumably to avoid the necessity of closer identification. A few such data are relegated to notes, of which there are 42 in all, as opposed to the 251 much more precise notes of the Hungarian original. Lack of documentation and of data reduces the book to the level of popularization. And the treatment of various subject matters qua subject matters rather than mere events within the biographical context is too summary even for popularization. To assign a mere dozen pages to the discussion of the scholarly work of one of the greatest ethnomusicologists of the century seems less than adequate even for such a purpose. If the book still has some value, that is because its protagonist, a truly great man, had the uncommon quality that even his most casual journalistic utterances (quoted copiously throughout the volume) are impressively clear, concise, and far-reaching in their implications.

IVAN F. WALDBAUER
Brown University

DOSTOEVSKIJ ON REALISM. By *Sven Linnér*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Stockholm Slavic Studies, 1. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1967. 211 pp. Kr. 30.

This book on Dostoevsky, the first of the Stockholm Slavic Studies series, is an attempt to investigate what Dostoevsky's views on "realism" actually were. To solve this problem, Professor Linnér examines very carefully and conscientiously all of Dostoevsky's nonfictional writings (journalism, letters, and notebooks) from the time of his emergence from his Siberian *katorga* (1854) to his death in 1881. Dostoevsky's novels are excluded from consideration of this question on methodological grounds. Writers who interpret Dostoevsky's opinions in the light of his novels, Linnér argues, assume that "the kind of special realism which is found in his novels" (p. 7) is also what he meant when he wrote *about* realism. Linnér thinks that this approach is not satisfactory and results in doing little more than using "his critical views to confirm our way of reading his novels" (p. 8). One might reply that it is perfectly possible to use a writer's novels to define and particularize the significance of general critical terms—whose usage, as we know, is rarely exact or unambiguous. The world of a great writer, after all, is usually of one piece, and it seems odd to refuse to turn to his novels for help in clarifying his criticism.

The dangers and misunderstandings to which this procedure gives rise are well illustrated in Linnér's comments on Dostoevsky's famous introductory footnote to *Notes from the Underground*. Here, it will be recalled, Dostoevsky says that "such persons as the writer of these notes not only may, but positively must, exist in our society, when we consider the circumstances under which our society was formed" (p. 40). Since Dostoevsky speaks of the underground man as being a product of his society, Linnér hastens to the conclusion that "Dostoevskij's view of man may not only be called realistic; we have reason to go a step further and call it naturalistic, quite regardless of the fact that the author himself loathed the term" (p. 40).

This is what occurs when one focuses on words, and neglects the vital artistic and historical contexts in which they appear. The underground man, as an ideological parody, is a far different "product" of society than a character of Zola's; and to speak of him as "naturalistic" in any sense is simply grotesque. He is conceived precisely to embody the struggle against that moral determinism on which the theory of naturalism is based; and some reflection on the artwork here would