

“criticism” in the Russian field. Monas surpasses the purely formalist or philosophical essays written on Mandelshtam by penetrating close to the essence of what the “hum of time” meant to the poet and by a sympathetic understanding of his deep religious links outside time dimensions. God was revealed to Mandelshtam in the cathedrals of Saint Sophia and Saint Peter. These poems have been noted and discussed previously. Monas also, and here he is virtually alone, notices the central place of the mystery of the Greek Orthodox Eucharist in Mandelshtam; he is right to take seriously what Nadezhda Mandelshtam has to say about this. It is obviously wrong, as one American scholar asserts, that Mandelshtam’s Christianity was a purely aesthetic phenomenon. Monas also understands Mandelshtam’s deep insight into vast Russian space betrayed by the “Judas of the future” and not yet humanized, as are the hills of Dante’s Tuscany.

As for the inaccuracies, I would not call Mandelshtam a Russian holy fool, although once he identified himself with a *iurodivyi* (poem no. 235). And the so-called holy fools had appeared earlier in Byzantium and were well known in Muscovite Russia as early as the fourteenth century. *Iurodstvo* is far more typical of other contemporary Russian poets, such as Velemir Khlebnikov and Andrei Bely. Mandelshtam hailed the “blessed, senseless word,” but there is no glossolalia in his poetry (though he did experience ecstasy akin to mystic transport). “Senseless” here means lacking common sense or the wrong sense of the clichés despised by all good poets. Derzhavin was appointed minister of justice by Alexander I and not by Catherine II. And *gorodki* is a rather democratic game which has nothing to do with the gentleman’s croquet.

Nevertheless, Monas’s Mandelshtam resembles the real one, while Raffel-Burago’s Mandelshtam possesses little by way of identity with the Russian poet, so far as I am able to judge. English-speaking readers will grasp his imagery but not his rhythms and diction—and his unspoken magic.

GEORGE IVASK

University of Massachusetts

SOLZHENITSYN. By *Christopher Moody*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books, a division of Harper & Row, 1973. vii, 184 pp. \$5.25.

Deceptively small in format, this book presents the most thorough general survey of Solzhenitsyn’s fiction that has yet appeared. It concentrates on the works themselves, reducing biographical information to an essential minimum. Although it examines the writings as individual entities, the study is abundantly laced with cross-references comparing and contrasting their thematic and aesthetic characteristics. The book’s most valuable contribution to our understanding of Solzhenitsyn is in demonstrating the multiple correlations of ideas, characters, and creative methods among his various works.

Inevitably the book is somewhat outdated by the swift developments in the author’s career over the past two years. Beliefs of Solzhenitsyn which seemed merely fragmentary or incipient, such as his Orthodox Christianity and his idiosyncratic political conservatism, now stand out in much bolder relief than the present volume is able to supply. Also, we now know that *Gulag Archipelago* is not a novelistic sequel to *The First Circle*, as Moody thought it would be. Other misinformation—for example, identification of the critic Lev Kopelev (the model for Rubin in *The First Circle*) as a poet—would seem to come from insufficiently discriminating use

of secondary sources. In the introduction to his short bibliography of secondary sources, incidentally, the author disparages most of them, although it is clear that he has used them extensively.

For the most part, the critical judgments in the volume are sound, informed, and informative. They are so numerous that one is bound to take issue with at least some of them. The author is a bit too generous. I think, in suspending an opinion on the artistic merits of *August 1914* until the appearance of its sequels: the novel has obvious and serious defects, regardless of the volumes that may follow. It is incorrect to say that the female characters in *The First Circle* are not of great importance. And the character Vadim in *Cancer Ward* is seriously misinterpreted. But these are matters of opinion; in the main, this study will hold up very well for many years to come.

DEMING BROWN
University of Michigan

ANDREI SINIAVSKII AND JULII DANIEL': TWO SOVIET "HERETICAL" WRITERS. By *Margaret Dalton*. Colloquium Slavicum, Beiträge zur Slavistik, no. 1. Würzburg: Jal-Verlag, 1973. 190 pp. DM 26, paper.

The author's express intention in this study is to provide a "literary interpretation" of works which, she believes, have been "heavily distorted" by overemphasis on their political aspects at the expense of their literary content. The volume contains, in addition to discussions of the two writers' fiction and of Siniavsky's essay on socialist realism and *Mysli vrasplokh*, a brief biographical sketch of each writer.

Professor Dalton begins with Siniavsky's essay, which, in her opinion, "laid the theoretical groundwork for his subsequent artistic work," a view that provides the only, and rather tenuous, unifying theme for the part of the book dealing with Siniavsky (understandably, the bulk of the study is devoted to him). In the following pages she describes each of the remaining works in a straightforward and unpretentious manner, prudently refraining from arbitrary or strained interpretations; identifies, often without elaboration or explanation, possible literary influences or affinities; and lists, rather casually and incompletely, salient literary devices and characteristics. If any conclusion emerges (it is perhaps significant that the book has no concluding chapter), it would seem to be that Siniavsky is a practitioner of that "phantasmagoric art" mentioned in the famous closing passage of his essay and that Daniel is something more of a "traditional realist." The study offers the attentive reader of Siniavsky and Daniel little more than he is likely to observe for himself, and something less than a full "literary interpretation"; ironically, he may well leave the book with a better sense of the political than of the literary significance of the two writers.

HAROLD SWAYZE
University of Washington

THE RUSSIAN ARTIST: THE CREATIVE PERSON IN RUSSIAN CULTURE. By *Tobia Frankel*. Russia Old and New Series. New York: Macmillan, 1972. 198 pp. \$5.95.

This is a well-written, well-organized history of the arts in Russia from the first Kievan dynasty to the present day. Although designed for students and others new