

mention but no significant analysis of their critical relations with the arts; because he relies too much on a single source (Nestiev), he does less than justice to Prokofiev; and because outside of his understandably limited personal experience he leans too heavily on Soviet secondary sources, especially upon the periodical press, he often develops the official version of events, quotes endlessly from speeches or articles whose authorship is questionable, and repeats (although not without reservations) the conclusions of the press. For example, he misses the underlying worry, the anger, and the threat of the 1968 All-Union Composers' Congress. This was the occasion for a severe reaction to creative reflections of the just-witnessed Czechoslovakian events, and composers were warned to police themselves with vigor and extend their ideological training to counter both the threat of the West and the growing domestic independence, especially among young people, of the musically orthodox. The ideological intolerance Schwarz discovers in 1970 was established in force in December 1968.

Schwarz is best when he exercises his musical judgment and tact in recording events he actually witnessed. He has enjoyed several stays in the Soviet Union, where he is widely acquainted and respected. He faced the difficult task of preserving both his Soviet sources *and* his Western views quite honestly and successfully, although he may yet draw some fire. His book should prove a useful complement to the still very small collection of credible books on Soviet music.

STANLEY KREBS

University of California, Santa Barbara

O STILE L'VA TOLSTOGO: STANOVLENIE "DIALEKTIKI DUSHI."

By *Pavel Gromov*. Leningrad: "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1971. 391 pp. 1.07 rubles.

Tolstoy scholarship has already yielded a number of books on the "young Tolstoy," including those by Eikhenbaum (a total of three: 1922, 1928, 1931), Kupreianova (1956), and Bursov (1960), not to mention works devoted primarily to biographical material. Pavel Gromov, whom we have known mainly as a writer on Karolina Pavlova, Apollon Grigoriev, Fet, and Blok, in this new book on the "young Tolstoy" turns his attention to certain aspects of Tolstoy's style as they developed from the trilogy through "Polikushka." The early period, including both successful and unsuccessful "experiments," is seen as formative, leading to *War and Peace*. This focus on the chronological development of style pays off and is the major merit of this new work.

It is ironic that just as Eikhenbaum's *Molodoi Tolstoi* has appeared in English, a Soviet critic, not known for any anti-Formalist bias, has chosen to level some serious and partly justified charges against Eikhenbaum. The argument centers on Tolstoy's conception of "personality" (*lichnost'*). Eikhenbaum, we will recall, claims that Tolstoy's heroes are not "personalities," but "bearers of separate human qualities and features combined mainly in a paradoxical fashion" (*Molodoi Tolstoi*, p. 42). Tolstoy's method, according to Eikhenbaum, stresses analysis over synthesis. Gromov puts this argument in historical perspective, seeing it as an example of a Futurist aesthetic which tends to dissect images into component parts; for Gromov, Eikhenbaum's book is "one of the first cases of testing the ideas" of the Futurists on nineteenth-century texts (p. 95).

Gromov sees Tolstoy differently. He singles out Chernyshevsky's abused no-

tion of the “dialectic of the soul,” and, after putting it in its historical perspective, uses Chernyshevsky’s astute observations as a springboard for exploring the role of dialectics in Tolstoy’s style and thought. Gromov postulates three kinds of dialectic: “dialectic of the soul” in the sense of internal monologue; “dialectic of behavior” (*dialektika povedeniia*), meaning the tendency to present some characters from the external viewpoint of another character; and “dialectic of authorial attitude” (*dialektika avtorskogo otnosheniia*), whereby the narrator becomes a “character” in the work, commenting on and judging the behavior of other characters, as well as gathering together the fragments of personality. Tolstoy’s style matured when he combined these three methods of dialectics with an “image of objectified time” (*obraz ob’ektivirovannogo vremeni*), which means more a sense of historical development than a simple interest in milieu after the fashion of the Natural School. With these devices in hand, Tolstoy was prepared to portray full personalities seen from within and without, in space (*gorizontal’*) and in time (*vertikal’*), in relation to themselves and the world around them. The mature Tolstoy analyzed and synthesized. Gromov’s formulations are at times sweeping and vague, and the concept of dialectics is never clearly defined or confronted. Nevertheless, the detailed analyses of individual works are often excellent. I especially recommend the discussions of *Childhood* (pp. 83–193), the Sevastopol stories (pp. 194–230), and “The Two Hussars” (pp. 231–61).

Gromov also pays attention to the relation between Tolstoy’s moral views and his psychological method. In this he follows in the tradition of Kupreianova, especially in her important work *Estetika L. N. Tolstogo* (1966). This tendency in recent Soviet criticism to reunite Tolstoy the artist and Tolstoy the thinker is most promising. Indeed, Gromov should be read in conjunction with Lidiia Ginzburg’s book, *O psikhologicheskoi proze* (1971), published virtually simultaneously with Gromov’s, for Ginzburg’s interest in the changing conceptions of human behavior as manifested in literature ekes out Gromov’s interest in formal methods of presenting human psychology.

Unfortunately Gromov has a tendency to ramble, and this makes for difficult reading. Without chapter titles or an index we are faced with pages of text not always carefully organized or to the point. Among others, there are digressions on Dobroliubov, Annenkov, Fet, and Grigoriev. But the asides destroy the flow of the argument. Nevertheless, several digressions are in themselves valuable. Gromov’s extended discussion of the pedagogical articles (pp. 309–49) in relation to Tolstoy’s historicity and his views on Hegel introduces an important point, for it challenges the cliché that Tolstoy with his “eternal truths” (*vechnye istiny*) saw the world *sub specie aeternitatis*, an opinion held by Lenin and Eikhbaum. Also, Gromov’s recurring references to the relation of Tolstoy’s fictional techniques to the film are highly provocative and deserve further consideration. The looseness of argument has allowed the author to discuss some important, if only tangential, material.

Gromov’s new book does not invalidate Eikhbaum’s excellent work on the “young Tolstoy,” but it does point to weaknesses and offers some new ways of viewing Tolstoy’s techniques. Though too long and obscure, this book has many valuable sections which should be read by all who are interested in a serious study of Tolstoy’s works.

RICHARD F. GUSTAFSON
Barnard College, Columbia University