

City of No," "Early Illusions," and "The Mark of Cain.") Why are most of the poems old ones, written between 1955 and 1967? Only six date later than 1968 and none is more recent than 1972. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that there were no new ones to include.

For quite a few years now the name of Evtushenko, who was never a notably innovative poet, has been permanently tarnished by his philosophy of expedience. The rebellious young man of the mid-1950s has been irretrievably lost to an older, more circumspect one, who cautiously walks the political tightrope, ever mindful of the comfortable life he would jeopardize by taking a serious misstep. In this light, *From Desire to Desire* may be seen as the poet's attempt at self-redemption. After all, are not most of us receptive to the universal theme of love? We joyously anticipate new beginnings, peacefully live through "love's maturity," painfully endure separation. Dominated naturally enough by a strong male persona, Evtushenko's love poems reflect the gamut of these experiences. One does not challenge the inspiration or sincerity of the poems, only the largely mediocre manner of expression.

As was aptly pointed out in reviews of *Stolen Apples*, if translations consistently improve upon the original, something is seriously wrong. Something is also wrong if translations themselves do not work as poems. In this collection the reprinted adaptations by such well-known American poets as Kunitz, Dickey, Wilbur, and Ferlinghetti on the whole more than rival Evtushenko's originals. In turn, they contrast sharply with the new translations by Anthony Kahn and Michael Glenny, both of whom are too preoccupied with retaining the regular meter and rhyme of the Russian, thus producing lines that often approach doggerel. A supreme example is found in "A Dog Is Sleeping at My Feet," Kahn's translation of "Byvalo, spit u nog sobaka" (the tense shift in the title immediately arouses suspicion): I wandered to the foggy shore, / I wandered through the night / and everything looked false to me / and there was nothing right [Pobrel ia beregom tumannym, / pobrel odin v nochnuiu t'mu, / i vse kazalos' mne obmannym, / i ia ne veril nichemu]. Similarly trite lines appear in Glenny's compulsively regular metrical versions. With such shortcomings, the poems appearing here in translation for the first time cannot be considered a significant contribution.

If this volume at least contained a few exciting new lyrics, some might find it worth reading. Instead, its meager contents once again remind us of Evtushenko's circumscribed talent.

ELENA SOKOL

University of Washington

A HISTORY OF UKRAINIAN LITERATURE (FROM THE ELEVENTH TO THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY). By *Dmytro Čyževs'kyj*. Translated by *Dolly Ferguson, Doreen Gorsline, and Ulana Petyk*. Edited and with a foreword by *George S. N. Luckyj*. Littleton, Colo.: Ukrainian Academic Press, Libraries Unlimited, 1975. xii, 681 pp. \$25.00, cloth. \$15.00, paper.

Among Čyževsky's numerous works, his *History of Ukrainian Literature* occupies a special place. It represents a milestone in Ukrainian literary criticism in general, and among historical works of Ukrainian literature in particular, because it presents in an original way, based on scholarly research methods, a comprehensive description of the literary periods with their principal trends and an analysis of the works of their representatives. This study also has its own long history, tracing its beginning back to the early 1940s.

Čiževsky's methodology, and particularly his periodization of Ukrainian literature, has its predecessors: M. Zerov's *Nove ukrains'ke pys'mentvo: Istorychnyi narys* (*New Ukrainian Literature: A Historical Survey*) (Kiev, 1924) and especially Mykola Hnatyshak's posthumous work, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury. Knyzhka I* (*History of Ukrainian Literature. Part I*) (Prague, 1941), with its original periodization based primarily on literary styles. In his work, Hnatyshak (perhaps because of his illness) was able to give only a schematic description of the first three periods of the history of Ukrainian literature. Continuing Hnatyshak's *Istoriia*, Čiževsky wrote the second part as his own study and published it under the title *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury. Knyzhka II* (*History of Ukrainian Literature. Part II*) (Prague, 1942). It covered the next two periods—the Renaissance and Reformation, and the Baroque. In the preface to this work, Čiževsky stated that, in general, he shared many of Hnatyshak's views, attaching great importance to the formal analysis of literary works and paying attention to their elevated contents as well. However, Čiževsky added that in his study he inclined more toward the Structuralism of the Prague Circle's "Slovo a slovesnost" (Word and Literature) than to Potebnia's theory which stressed the structural connection between a literary work and the word. (Hnatyshak derived much of his approach from Potebnia's theory.) Čiževsky further emphasized that he disagreed with his predecessor on many separate points and that he conducted his research according to his own approach and working methods (p. 3).

After publishing the second part of the *History of Ukrainian Literature*, Čiževsky continued his research on separate literary periods, especially the Baroque, which had been neglected by the representatives of the Populist trend in Ukrainian literary criticism. Indeed, it was Čiževsky who actually discovered this central period in the history of Ukrainian literature and showed its significance. His research resulted in the publication of his most comprehensive work, *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury, vid pochatkiv do doby realizmu* (*History of Ukrainian Literature, from its Origins to the Realistic Period*) (New York, 1956), in which he applied the same methodology used in his 1942 study. The thoroughly revised 1942 edition was included in the corresponding chapters of the 1956 *Istoriia*. The English translation under review, published in 1975, is a revised and enlarged edition which includes an analysis of the period of Realism. Thus, this book, which features an original approach by "an eminent Slavist, and without question the greatest living Ukrainian scholar" (as stated by G. S. N. Luckyj in his foreword), is the first (and a truly needed) scholarly history of Ukrainian literature in English.

In the first part of the introduction to his *History*, Čiževsky reviews the historiography of Ukrainian literature from the first half of the nineteenth century to the late 1920s, and describes certain linguistically ornamental devices as they relate to poetic figures and apply to the Ukrainian literary language. The second part of the introduction is devoted to an explanation of the theoretical basis of his critical approach, including the following central statement: "Only after an analysis of the form, content, and main idea of a work can its place in the historical evolution of literature be defined. This is the goal of the 'synthetic' approach to literary evolution. In this respect, the question of periodization becomes very important" (p. 13). The result is a division of his *History* into the following periods: the prehistoric period; translated and borrowed literature (prior to the eleventh century); the period of monumental style (eleventh century); the period of ornamental style (eleventh to the thirteenth century), fourteenth and fifteenth-century literature; the Renaissance and Reformation (end of the sixteenth century); the Baroque, including literature written in Latin (seventeenth and eighteenth century); Classicism (end of the eighteenth and the first forty years of the nineteenth century); Romanticism (from the end of the 1820s to the beginning of the 1860s); and Realism (from the 1860s to the early 1900s).

The characterization of most of these periods and their representatives is based strongly on literary analysis. At the same time, it is far from being narrowly formalistic, because it has been composed with a regard for deeper cultural and social influences, as well as for world-wide philosophical and literary trends. According to the editor of the translation, Čiževsky's analyses of the Ukrainian Baroque and of the Romantic period demonstrate his great erudition and his capability of logically relating these periods of Ukrainian literature to world literature in general, and to Slavic literatures in particular. Čiževsky's *History* does contain some flaws. The author does not cover the whole development of Ukrainian literature. He does not include the characterization of the last and richest period, twentieth-century Modernism, which was defined in his periodization formula. (A description of this period could be the subject of a separate volume, prepared by several other literary scholars, as Luckyj suggests.) His analyses of such original genres in Ukrainian literature as *dumy* and *vertep* (the Christian puppet theater), as well as of the whole period of Realism, are presented rather schematically and do not give a complete picture of their development. Some of these shortcomings were discussed by G. Shevelov in his review of the Ukrainian edition published in *Ukrains'ka literaturna hazeta* (1956, no. 6) and are also mentioned by Luckyj in his foreword to the English translation. None of these drawbacks, however, can minimize the monumental nature of this work, a work that can rightfully be considered one of the masterpieces of this great scholar.

The translation of the work into English is faultless, making it very useful for English-speaking scholars and students, especially those specializing in Slavic literatures in general and in Ukrainian literature in particular. The extensive bibliography and the index of names and titles, carefully prepared by Alexandra Chernenko-Rudnytsky, effectively complete this first scholarly and comprehensive history of Ukrainian literature.

DMYTRO M. SHTOHRYN

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

BOLESŁAW LEŚMIAN: THE POET AND HIS POETRY. By *Rochelle Heller Stone*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976. xii, 364 pp. \$15.95.

Dr. Stone has given us the second book length Western-language study (after Marian Pankowski's *Leśmian: La révolte d'un poète contre les limites* [Brussels, 1967]) of this poet, who had a group of ardent admirers during his lifetime, but who was considered by most a marginal oddity. Since his death in 1937, however, Leśmian has won recognition as one of the greatest poets in the language. The author has carefully mapped out the philosophical background of Leśmian's poetry and has devoted considerable attention to his links with later Russian Symbolist poetry. The study of these connections is the most valuable part of the book. Her findings, however, would have been much more convincing had she known where to stop. One is startled, for example, to read that a common Polish military order "*Na kon!*,"—which reappears in so many battle descriptions and in one of the most frequently quoted poems by Słowacki, *Agamemnon's Tomb*—is adduced as an instance of Russian influence because of the parallel *na lohad'* (p. 228). *Bestia nieczysta* is explained as "the Russian connotation of the devil" (p. 239); had she consulted the *Słownik polszczyzny XVI wieku*, she would have learned that Polish has been familiar with that particular connotation since the sixteenth century. A quite common poetic word *wid*, attested in the works of Słowacki, Konopnicka, Staff, and others, is considered to be "of Russian origin" in Leśmian's poetry (p. 224). She further misreads Russian parallel words listed in Linde's dictionary as evidences of borrowing from the Russian.