

tend to be compilations of fairly well-known facts and critical opinions. A. I. Pavlovsky's work is something of an impressionistic appreciation; E. Dobin's, although a more serious effort, lacks the apparatus that would be of use to scholars. The present reviewer's contribution is very general and introductory in nature. A study such as Kees Verheul's is welcome indeed.

Akhmatova was one of a generation of extremely time-conscious poets, like—in their separate ways—Pasternak, Mandelshtam, and Mayakovsky. The author's principal thesis has to do with that peculiar time perspective, a kind of fusion of past, present, and future, which was characteristic of her later verse and central to the *Poem Without a Hero*. Since Verheul's book also includes under the general theme of time such important related themes as memory, the past, and history, it is therefore quite comprehensive, ranging over the whole of Akhmatova's work. This inclusiveness, which makes the book so valuable as a resource, also constitutes its major weakness. One must readily agree about the significance of the peculiar time perspective for the later poetry, but not all poems with time-related themes employ that special perspective. This is particularly true of the early work (through *Anno Domini*). Moreover, poems from the early period are, often as not, characterized by their fixity in time and place. The short lyric "Tri v stolovoi probilo" comes to mind, or the poem "Pod kryshei promerzshei pustogo zhil'ia," in which the time-span of a brief love affair is fixed in the symbolism of the poem. Although there is a great stylistic consistency throughout Akhmatova's work, one feels that her special treatment of time, as in *Poem Without a Hero*, began to evolve only after the early verses. The few examples cited in support of Verheul's thesis on this point are not entirely convincing.

The second section of the book is highly interesting, with conjectures on the uncompleted *poëma* "Russkii Trianon." There is a good deal of first-rate academic sleuthing here, and there are also some arresting and quite plausible speculations. The remainder—and main portion—of the study deals with the thirties and after, especially that remarkably productive year of 1940. Here, the thesis is entirely consonant with the material. Further studies of Akhmatova's work will certainly depend in good measure on this book.

There are some problems with style. One is less bothered by such eccentricities of vocabulary as the often-used verb "to abstrahize" than by the syntactical problems. The sentences are often long and complex, and difficult to understand on first reading. Still, this is a minor matter in view of the value of the book, and we should be grateful that Professor Verheul has chosen to write it in English.

SAM DRIVER
Brown University

TWENTIETH-CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE: A CRITICAL STUDY.

By *Johannes Holthusen*. Supplement by *Elisabeth Markstein* on "Censorship, Samizdat, and New Trends." Translated by *Theodore Huebener*. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1972. xii, 320 pp. \$9.50.

This book is a translation of two small volumes, *Russische Gegenwartsliteratur I, 1890–1940* and *Russische Gegenwartsliteratur II, 1941–1967*, published by the Francke Verlag, Bern, in 1963 and 1968 respectively. The two "Introductory Notes"

by the author in the German editions were omitted and substituted by one "Publisher's Preface"; and a "Supplement" of thirteen pages was added. The substitution can hardly be approved of, since the author's notes give a more detailed idea of the purely literary, formalistic method (in the broadest sense of this term), which he intended to follow; the addition was a necessary and lucky choice (the article is very informative), counterbalancing the sometimes a little too calm political attitude of an author writing about a literature shaped by political ideology.

Everything I said in my review of the first German volume in this journal (March 1965, pp. 154–55) about the clear judgment and refined taste of Professor Holthusen is equally valid for the second (starting here with part 3, p. 149). We do not get an enumeration of names and works (so difficult to avoid in a short survey), but a pertinent, intelligent, and well-organized sequence of characterizations of Soviet authors and works in a well-founded selection, showing the author's complete command of the material. The second volume had to refrain entirely from treating the Soviet theater because of lack of material, so it concentrates strictly on prose and poetry. The author divided it into three parts ("The Postrevolutionary Generation," "The Generation of the Older Literary Avant-Garde," and "The Critical Heirs"). The translation should have left it that way, instead of breaking the three parts into four by singling out "New Tendencies in Soviet Poetry" as part 4, and by renaming the first part "World War II: New Orientations," the second part "The Older Literary Avant-Garde," and the third part "The Revolution's Critical Heirs." It was exactly the "conception of differences in contemporary literary life conditioned by generations," as the author says in his omitted "Introductory Note" of the German edition (1:8), which motivated him to divide the book as he did. This idea justifies the structure of the book; it disappears, however, in the English version. The number of authors and works discussed is impressive, despite the choice. The summaries of works and the presentation of their main ideas are done with precision and obvious originality: Vera Panova, Alexander Tvardovsky, Nikolai Zabolotsky, Vasilii Aksenov, Vladimir Tendriakov, and Vladimir Soloukhin may be singled out as having received an especially successful critical evaluation; but the characterizations of such uneven poets as Junna Moritz, Viktor Sosnora, Novella Matveeva, and certainly Evgenii Evtushenko are also quite persuasive in their detached yet incisive approach.

But intelligent and rewarding as the author's treatment of what he chose to include may be, there is one fact which makes the title of the book *Twentieth Century Russian Literature: A Critical History* (the dust jacket and title page differ!) sound like a complete misnomer: a book on the subject which utterly disregards Russian literature outside of Russia, which does not even mention Vladimir Nabokov, Mark Aldanov, Mikhail Osorgin, Antonin Ladinsky (who, by the way, returned to Soviet Russia and wrote very good historical novels), Nadezhda Teffi, Boris Poplavsky, Anatolii Shteiger, Nikolai Morshen, Igor Chinnov, to name only a very, very few, and which drops older writers, as if they had died, at the moment they went into exile—such a book is simply *not* a book on twentieth-century Russian literature but a book on Soviet Russian literature and its antecedents. Georgii Ivanov's early poetry gets a few lines, his great poetry in exile is ignored; one of the greatest works of Russian literature, Bunin's *Zhizn' Arsen'eva*—published and republished, even if with cuts, in the Soviet Union—goes unnoticed. I do not think there is any excuse for this procedure, unless the author intends to write a third

volume, which is not indicated anywhere. If he did not want to include émigré literature, its existence and its most outstanding works should at least have been mentioned.

Obviously one cannot ask of the German edition, which clearly states on the title page that it will end with the year 1967, to include works that came out after that year; the English version (1972!) does not contain such a statement. I am afraid some readers will be disappointed not to find a discussion of Solzhenitsyn's novels (published in 1968, 1969, and 1971) and not even of Bulgakov's *Master and Margarita* (published in November 1966 and January 1967 in the periodical *Moskva*).

It might be to the point to close with a quotation from Elisabeth Markstein's "Supplement," discussing problems which Holthusen does not emphasize clearly enough in his certainly highly valuable but sometimes too dispassionate presentation of the material: "It is simply not true to say that nothing can hold up the march of progress. The censor can intervene, can forbid, distort and conceal. He can destroy live babies, but equally he can permit thalidomide babies to grow crippled in their mother's womb. He can draw up maps with blank spaces (each of which might be a new America). And—to make things even more difficult—he can set the signposts on the existing portion of the map pointing in the wrong direction" (p. 282).

VSEVOLOD SETCHKAREV
Harvard University

MODERN SLAVIC LITERATURES. Vol. 1: RUSSIAN LITERATURE.

Compiled and edited by *Vasa D. Mihailovich*. A Library of Literary Criticism. New York: Frederick Ungar, 1972. xii, 424 pp. \$15.00.

In format this book is a dictionary of twentieth-century Russian authors, sixty-nine of whom have been included. The word "dictionary" does not, however, adequately convey the richness of the information compiled. Professor Mihailovich has examined a wide range of materials concerning each author—articles, book reviews, textbooks in various languages—and selected from these materials excerpts that are pithy and stimulating. Many of the selections are translated from Russian for the first time, and the translations read well. Other selections have been rescued from undeserved oblivion in old periodicals. For those who do not know Russian, this book will be invaluable, providing for the first time access to important opinions and data. But even specialists in the field will find here many items interesting and previously unknown.

RICHARD SHELDON
Dartmouth College

D. H. LAWRENCE'S RESPONSE TO RUSSIAN LITERATURE. By *George J. Zytaruk*. Studies in English Literature, vol. 69. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971. 193 pp. 25 Dglds.

The extent to which literary works are assigned in the classroom is not the best token of their vitality as literature. Far better is the degree of intensity with which other writers respond to them. D. H. Lawrence's almost obsessive love-hate for the