

and E. M. Forster are among the perpetrators—which leads criticism to exclamations about the Russian soul and the ability of Russian writers to express “life.” Freeborn is mercifully touched only lightly by this “exclamatory tradition,” and when he feels its pressure he turns it into a kind of admiration for the novelistic tradition that almost justifies those English excesses of “life” and “soul.” This is a good book.

EDWARD WASIOLEK  
University of Chicago

RANNIE ROMANTICHESKIE VEIANIIA: IZ ISTORII MEZHDUNAROD-  
NYKH SVIAZEI RUSSKOI LITERATURY. Edited by *M. P. Alekseev*.  
Leningrad: “Nauka,” 1972. 295 pp. 1.55 rubles.

K ISTORII RUSSKOGO ROMANTIZMA. Edited by *Iu. V. Mann, I. G. Neupokoeva*, and *U. R. Fokht*. Moscow: “Nauka,” 1973. 551 pp. 2.48 rubles.

In the second of these collections of studies on Romanticism, E. M. Pulkhritudova reminds us that Realism was once so sacred in Soviet scholarship that “it was often considered direct evidence of progressive social views, a fact which stimulated willy-nilly searches for realistic elements” (p. 39). And this is true. A few short years ago serious study of Russian Romanticism was confined to a small band of scholars in Europe and America, and the number of significant Soviet studies could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Not so today. As Pulkhritudova has also noted, “the exaggeration of realistic tendencies . . . proved to be a temporary phenomenon” (p. 40). The number of Soviet specialists in Romanticism has now grown into an army, and it is difficult to keep up with developments from month to month.

These books—the first one published by the Institute of Russian Literature, the second by the Gorky Institute of World Literature—are new indications that Romanticism has become a major concern in the Soviet Union. The first contains four monographs on key subjects of early Russian Romanticism, and is “the third in a series of efforts undertaken by the Sector of Comparative Russian and Foreign Literatures of Pushkinsky Dom aimed at the systematic study of the history of Russo-European literary relationships” (p. 2). (The two previous collections are *Epokha prosveshcheniia* and *Ot klassitsizma k romantizmu*.) The second contains a thorough introductory review of recent Soviet scholarship, nine articles under the heading “From Zhukovsky to Lermontov,” and another seven under the heading “Later Development of Romanticism (a Few Trends and Tendencies).” Both books have indexes, and the second has a bibliography of works published in the Soviet Union from May 1968 through January 1972 (184 separate listings!). The first is confined to highly specialized studies of early Romanticism, and the second ranges through Romanticism as a period and on to Romanticism as a viable literary practice of later Russian literature. The authors in both works may be counted among the best-known specialists in this literary area. The temptation here is to comment on every contribution; I will limit myself to a few.

After reading R. Iu. Danilevsky’s “Shiller i stanovlenie russkogo romantizma,” it is hard to believe he has left any archival materials untouched, or any other primary or secondary sources unread. He is thoroughly familiar with previous works on this important subject (Peterson, Passage, Kostka, Tschizewskij, Raab, Harder, Gukovsky and Lotman, Smolian, Zhirmunsky, Veselovsky, Tynianov),

and the new information he offers is of immeasurable value. Although he gives us a great deal of data with little or no interpretation of it, his handling of complex materials demands professional respect, and his research (215 informative notes to buttress 95 pages of text) is an estimable scholarly contribution. Less thoroughly researched is P. R. Zaborov's "Zhermena de Stal' i russkaia literatura pervoi treti XIX veka," but even here we have a significant contribution to knowledge.

In the second collection, Pulkhritudova's article, "Romanticheskoe i prosvetitel'skoe v dekabristskoi literature 20-kh godov XIX veka," is a successful attempt to loosen V. G. Bazanov's too rigid definition of Decembrist Romanticism as preponderantly Enlightenment in character. She understands, I think, that a literary period accounts naturally for the survival of elements of previous periods, and is correct when she states that "the 'Enlightenment preponderance' in the Decembrist writers' world outlook and creativity does not remove them from Romanticism" (p. 48). She demonstrates this through a close examination of three Civic Decembrists—Ryleev, Küchelbecker, and Bestuzhev-Marlinsky—and she concludes convincingly that their creativity, including their orientation to the Enlightenment, "was an organic and necessary part of the general Romantic movement of their time" (p. 72). I. E. Usok's "Filosofskaia poeziia liubomudrov" is a welcome appreciation of the neglected "Schellingists" in Russian Romantic poetry, but the article suffers from a serious shortcoming. The author considers Schelling's philosophy to be the very basis of Russian Romantic metaphysical poetry (pp. 108–11), but gives no indication of ever having read Schelling. (Nor, so far as I am aware, has any other Soviet literary scholar in recent times.) A. N. Nikoliukin's article, "K tipologii romanticheskoi povesti," is a study of reality and fantasy in the Russian and American Romantic prose tale. The article is quite unusual in that the author chose these two largely unrelated Romantic literatures to demonstrate that "certain properties of the Romantic prose tale are not specifically national . . ." (p. 260).

The growth of Soviet scholarship in Romanticism is, of course, a healthy development; but, with few exceptions, these and other Soviet scholars seem unaware of Western scholarship in their subject, or even of the well-known debate over Romanticism conducted many years ago in Europe and America. Romanticism as a unity versus pluralistic romanticisms, the organic period concept of literary history, Romanticism versus romanticism, the Romantic period in relation to the Neoclassical period which preceded and the Realist period which followed—it is a bit unsettling to witness so many productive scholars debating and resolving questions which have already been debated elsewhere and resolved in uncannily similar ways. Perhaps some reading in English, French, German, and Italian could be recommended here.

LAUREN G. LEIGHTON  
*Northern Illinois University*

VLADIMIR IVANOVIČ DAL' AS A BELLETRIST. By *Joachim T. Baer*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 276. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1972. 204 pp. 42 Dglds.

One can only express pleasure at the appearance of a monograph devoted to Vladimir Dal, an often-mentioned but seldom-studied secondary figure whose ca-