

the early eighteenth-century interpretations of Renaissance design, to the later neoclassical, and, finally, in the early nineteenth century, to a special inventive neoclassicism that was influenced by Grecian design.

Architecturally, St. Petersburg also showed strong connections with the less classicistic and more colorful German and Central European building schemes, which are shown in work by Swiss, Italian, and Russian architects of the eighteenth century. Playful, lightened repetitions of seventeenth-century baroque innovations, which are familiar in Munich and Turin, can be seen in St. Petersburg, both at the Winter Palace and several local churches.

The collections at the Hermitage are unbelievably rich, and the choice of how to illustrate them was very wise. The familiar and the relatively unknown have been combined in a selection that suggests the richness of the collections. Ancient art from areas in the Soviet Union offers a view of forms that is rarely found except in the most specialized texts. Cezanne and a few other masters of the School of Paris are represented by fine examples, which were acquired just before the Revolution.

There are good photographs to show Leningrad as it is in a book that has an emphasis on what the foreign tourist might be interested in seeing. Although the text does discuss developments from Lenin's day to after World War II, the photographer concentrated on what Catherine the Great might have enjoyed in her jaunts around the city, and this might be what interests us most.

MARVIN D. SCHWARTZ
The New York Times

VILLE ET RÉVOLUTION: ARCHITECTURE ET URBANISME SOVIÉTIQUES DES ANNÉES VINGT. By *Anatole Kopp*. Paris: Éditions Anthropos, 1967. 277 pp.

TOWN AND REVOLUTION: SOVIET ARCHITECTURE AND CITY PLANNING, 1917–1935. By *Anatole Kopp*. Translated by *Thomas E. Burton*. New York: George Braziller, 1970. xii, 274 pp. \$15.00.

During the first decade and a half of Soviet rule Russian architects, for the first time in their nation's history, created a school of building and urban design that equaled and in some respects surpassed any in Western Europe. Repressed by stages after 1928, it is only now receiving the attention it richly deserves thanks to an energetic band of devotees in Italy, France, Holland, and the Soviet Union. In this effort Anatole Kopp's *Ville et révolution* has already assumed its place as a valuable and exciting contribution.

Kopp, a practicing architect and urbanist, fruitfully exploited the brilliant and heretofore largely untapped journals of the era. From these and other sources he culled over two hundred photographs, plans, elevations, and sketches, whose publication alone would have justified his effort. These are presented in chapters divided fairly equally between chronological and topical themes. The principal sections focus on those areas in which the architects of the twenties particularly distinguished themselves: public housing, workers' clubs, urban planning, and anti-urban schemes, including the pioneering linear cities. A series of the remarkable but unrealized projects of Ivan Leonidov and numerous illustrations of the work of Konstantin Melnikov bring to those martyrs of the movement the recognition that was so long

withheld. A well-chosen selection of translated documents provides an appendix which, while not rivaling the collection published in Italian by Quilichi, nonetheless enriches Kopp's otherwise brief references to Ginzburg, Miliutin, and the Society of Contemporary Architects.

The accompanying text, charged with the exuberance of the period and studded with citations from the verse of Mayakovsky, is frankly apologetic. The professional conflicts that permeated and disfigured the movement are not Kopp's concern, nor are the complex relations between the new architecture and its patrons under NEP and Stalin. Attention is devoted to the ASNOVA and VOPRA groupings, though Kopp's task here was made difficult by the absence of any systematic analysis of Bolshevik attitudes toward that most public of arts. The text severely minimizes all elements of continuity between the rapidly evolving architectural profession before 1917 and the post-Civil War situation; prewar zoning debates in the Moscow and Petersburg architectural societies and the Russian garden city movement might well have been cited as antecedent developments. Just as Kopp tends to discount the importance of early professional changes and the debates around which they crystallized, he considers the architects of the twenties far more indebted to revolutionary ideology than to the broad changes in the visual arts before 1917; many of the prominent figures of the twenties, though, began their careers as painters in the prestigious Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture, of which Leonid Pasternak was once director. On this point Kopp's narrative may be contrasted to that presented by Vittorio de Feo in his *U.R.S.S. Architectura, 1917-1936*.

Serious interpretation on these matters, will, of course, vary, just as it will on the relation of the movement to Western Europe and on the causes of the movement's decline. What is noteworthy about Kopp's monograph is that in it a consistent point of view is informed by thoughtful research and the visual acuity of a practiced architect. The recently published translation will surely be welcome.

S. FREDERICK STARR
Princeton University

HISTORY OF RUSSIAN MUSIC. Vol. 1: FROM ITS ORIGINS TO DARGOMYZHISKY. By *Gerald R. Seaman*. New York and Washington: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968. xv, 351 pp. \$9.00.

Gerald Seaman, at present senior lecturer in musicology at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, has impressive credentials in the field of Russian music history. He has studied under the guidance of Gerald Abraham, the leading British authority in this field. He has spent a year of study at the Leningrad Conservatory, where he was able to gain access to "primary sources" (according to the publisher's jacket notes). He has written and lectured extensively on the subject of Russian music. Nevertheless, the first volume of his projected two-volume history of Russian music has been received with disappointment in professional circles. Some of the criticism has been quite acid, as, for example, in the *Musical Quarterly* (July 1969, in a review by Miloš Velimirović) and in *Notes* (September 1969, by Malcolm Brown). Under attack came Seaman's method of using secondary Russian sources (mostly textbooks) with such fidelity that parts of his own book appear to be paraphrases of the Russian texts. Even where the Soviet authors made factual errors, Seaman's confidence in his sources remained unshaken: the errors reappear in his volume, though corrected data are available. It is true that Seaman did not conceal his