

text. Indeed, Klein makes much of this juxtaposition in his textual analysis. There is always a danger that atomizing the text, as the author has done, may tend to obscure its unity. Klein's work does not entirely lay these doubts to rest and much of his commentary strikes this reader as debatable, if not arbitrary.

Because his concern is with the *Slovo* as a narrative structure, Klein pays little attention to its possible prosodic elements, nor does he attempt any explication of the obscurities with which the text, as we know it, abounds. Unquestionably, however, this study will take its place alongside such literary treatments of the *Slovo* as those by Besharov, Wollman, and Jakobson, to mention only a few of the non-Soviet authorities who have written on it. As an analysis of the structure of this enchanting and mysterious work of Kievan literature, Klein's book raises many interesting and stimulating questions worthy of further investigation.

JACK V. HANEY
University of Washington

RUSSIAN LITERARY ATTITUDES FROM PUSHKIN TO SOLZHENITSYN.

By *Richard Freeborn, Georgette Donchin, and N. J. Anning*. Edited by *Richard Freeborn*. New York: Barnes & Noble, Harper & Row. London: Macmillan, 1976. viii, 158 pp. \$22.50.

RUSSIA DISCOVERED: NINETEENTH-CENTURY FICTION FROM PUSH-

KIN TO CHEKHOV. By *Angus Calder*. New York: Barnes & Noble, Harper & Row. London: Heinemann, 1976. xiv, 302 pp. \$17.50.

"Russian literary attitudes"? The reader's attention is immediately arrested. Perhaps that was part of the design: the design both of the book and of the series of lectures on which it is based, given in 1975 "under the aegis" of the Department of Extra-Mural Studies at the University of London.

"Russia discovered"? How about a book entitled *America Discovered*?

Reactions to these two titles may show something about the difference in the books. The first is a collection of lectures or essays, by University of London specialists in Russian literature—specialists to whom the reader will naturally look for precision of phrase. The second work is something very different: a rapid survey of the high spots in nineteenth-century Russian history and literature, presented by an obvious enthusiast of winning vivaciousness but without claims of expert knowledge or of any knowledge of Russian (although when Russian terms are introduced, they are invariably correct). The title, *Russia Discovered*, seems to refer primarily to the author's personal discovery—an excited discovery of nineteenth-century Russia and its literature, and one that Calder is now eager to communicate to his reader, in a manner that only on occasion threatens to turn breezy. The subtitle, *Nineteenth-century fiction from Pushkin to Chekhov*, is perhaps less easy to justify than his main title. True, he does discuss major authors, and he includes brief synopses of important works. But the spirit is that of a survey course (which this seems to have been originally) as much in Russian culture as in Russian literature. Calder's literary judgments are intelligent, but sometimes suffer from sweeping imprecisions, as in his reference to "the freshness and lightness of touch" in "the fiction of Pushkin, Lermontov and Gogol" (p. 73). The organization of the book is puzzling in some places: why, for example, should Lermontov be made part of a chapter on literature and serfdom? Or why does the short "aside" on Romanticism get presented as if it were appended to the chapter on fiction and politics? In the concluding "Short List of Books" the student with no knowledge of Russian will find a practical guide to the most important relevant works in English.

The serious student of Russian literature will prefer the more advanced course offered by *Russian Literary Attitudes from Pushkin to Solzhenitsyn*, although he would be wise to pass quickly over the title and settle instead for what turns out to be simply a collection of six separate chapters on the total literary careers of six authors (chronologically presented): Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy (by Richard Freeborn); Gorky (by Georgette Donchin); Pasternak, Solzhenitsyn (by N. J. Anning). In spite of Professor Freeborn's thoughtful introductory essay, "Russian Literary Attitudes from Pushkin to Solzhenitsyn," it is difficult not to suspect that the writers of the individual chapters have labored under an awkward title to which they pay only the required formal deference. In the following passage, for example, the reader may feel that N. J. Anning is working hard to fulfill the obligation of the assignment in order to get on with an otherwise excellent critical piece on Pasternak: "Though it has been stressed that Pasternak's literary attitude was essentially the product of his confrontation with an increasingly hostile environment, his evolution as a writer has its own internal coherence which justifies a more intimate perspective" (p. 109). Sometimes a shifting description of "literary attitudes" is discernible, as in Georgette Donchin's essay on Gorky, which gallantly begins with a passage from a letter to Chekhov that "epitomises Gorky's literary attitude throughout his life," but ends by quietly defining "the essence of Gorky the writer" in rather different terms. And, after all, isn't such a shift likely to occur? Or is an author to be allowed only one permanent "literary attitude"?

If I seem to belabor the problem of the title, it is for the purpose of advising the prospective reader not to take the title too seriously and to concentrate instead on the useful comprehensive essays offered in the volume. A select annotated bibliography of important works in English and in Russian increases the value of this work for the student.

HERBERT E. BOWMAN
University of Toronto

THROUGH GOGOL'S LOOKING GLASS: REVERSE VISION, FALSE FOCUS, AND PRECARIOUS LOGIC. By *William Woodin Rowe*. New York: New York University Press, 1976. x, 201 pp. Illus. \$12.50.

In his remarkable book on Gogol (*V teni Gogolia* [London, 1975]) Abram Tertz (Andrei Sinyavsky) speaks of the way in which Gogol's characters "each carried away a grain apiece from the great multitude that was Gogol, while never succeeding in being in the least a whole mirror of his 'I,' so susceptible to dispersal in all directions." Just so has Gogol's text in turn become a fragmenting mirror that sends off critical responses in all directions, each reflecting its grain of Gogolian truth while failing somehow to register the whole. Three recent books on Gogol—Sinyavsky's, Simon Karlinsky's (*The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol* [Cambridge, Mass., 1976]), and the book under review—all demonstrate what a rich field for critical manipulation Gogol's work provides. The three studies have a hierarchical relationship to each other, beginning with Rowe's study of artistic device, and proceeding through Karlinsky's study of psychosexual elements in Gogol's life and work to Sinyavsky's ambitious attempt to come to terms with Gogol's metaphysics.

Rowe begins by saying that "the critics whose views have contributed most to my own are Andrei Bely, Vladimir Nabokov, and Carl Proffer." His book is frankly a reflection of a reflection and bears the character of a pedagogical exercise. He has gone through the major Gogolian texts—from *Evenings on a Farm Near Dikanka* to *Dead Souls*—identifying and dismantling for our inspection a quantity of examples