

here the Croats pulled out of the dictionary project, while the Serbs went on to produce three more volumes (K–O in 1969, O–P in 1971, P–S in 1973) and may have already completed their sixth and final volume. In 1966 Miloš Moskvljević produced a handsome dictionary, *Rečnik savremenog srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika s jezičkim savetnikom*, which incurred the wrath of the authorities (among other things he forgot to include the word “Croat”) and ended up in some Belgrade shredder. Still, copies are extant (I own one), and the title should be included. Another victim of the recent nationality quarrels in Yugoslavia was *Hrvatski pravopis*, a 341-page orthographic dictionary published by Školska knjiga in Zagreb in 1971. This work, compiled by Stjepan Babić, Božidar Finka, and Milan Muguš, was judged to be a “nationalist act of sabotage” and was ordered destroyed; destruction is a relative concept in the Balkans, and so some copies found their way to London, where an émigré organization, Nova Hrvatska, financed a photo-offset reprinting in 1972. Though not offensive in any way, Kosta Grubačić’s *Enciklopedijski leksikon bibliotekarstva* (Sarajevo: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika, 1964; 337 pp.) was overlooked. Another omission, closer to home, is Thomas F. Magner, *The Student’s Dictionary of Serbo-Croatian* (Singidunum Press, 1970; 201 pp.).

My colleague, Professor Joseph Paternost, suggests the following additions for Slovenian: under Orthography (vol. 4, p. 346) add Anton Bajec et al., *Slovenski pravopis* (Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1962; 1,056 pp.); under Polyglot (vol. 4, p. 352) add Josip Pavlica, *Frazeološki slovar v petih jezikih* (Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1960; 688 pp.).

These four volumes, though awkward to use, are a valuable reference and research tool. Lewanski has made a solid contribution in making accessible to us bibliographical information on the rather impressive lexical resources of the Slavic field.

THOMAS F. MAGNER

The Pennsylvania State University

RAZVITIE REALIZMA V RUSSKOI LITERATURE V TREKH TOMAKH.
Vol. 1: PROSVETITEL'SKII REALIZM: UTVERZHDENIE KRITICHESKOGO REALIZMA. Edited by U. R. Fokht et al. Moscow: “Nauka,” 1972. 351 pp. 1.28 rubles.

This collective volume, the first of a three-volume (four-book) series, is not quite so uniformly dogmatic as its title and introduction may lead some readers to expect. True, one has come to look for better even on this topic, in view of recent excellent Soviet scholarly efforts in literary research. The sense of *déjà vu* is nonetheless at first overwhelming. As the old familiar footnotes from Lenin, Marx, and Belinsky accumulate through the long introductory chapter, one asks: do we—does anyone—really need another account of how all of Russian and even world literature culminates in socialist realism? Apparently someone does. The stated purpose of the new undertaking is to bring recent work dealing with literary structure to bear on the problem of literary evolution. If thoroughly done, this would indeed be a contribution. However, the first volume promises more than it delivers. This is not to say that there is nothing new here, though there is most certainly much that is old, if refurbished. The essays are of varying value, the most useful being the two by Iu. Mann, to be treated below.

The book's five chapters after the introduction cover the late eighteenth century through the Natural School. Chapter 2, by N. Stepanov, deals with realistic aspects of writers from Fonvizin to Griboedov, arguing for treatment of "Realism of the Enlightenment" as a period with its own artistic method. The following chapter, "The Role of Romanticism in the Formation of Critical Realism" (S. Turaev and I. Usok), offers material of literary interest, although the interpretation of Lermontov is overly dependent on Belinsky, with consequent limitations. (A curious error concerns Pushkin's well-known comment to Bestuzhev-Marlinsky that the novel requires "chatter—*boltovnia*." The sense is here completely reversed.)

The volume's "centerpiece," however, is a lengthy essay by U. Fokht, chief editor of the volume and later of the series. Entitled "The Formation of Critical Realism (Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol)," the article reads at first like a relic of the late forties, with its unregenerate Marxist-Leninist jargon and turgid style. Its seventy pages unroll mercilessly without the grace of a single subheading. The entire article illustrates that treatment of structure can be used as well as any other approach to chastise bourgeois critics (and sometimes other Soviet critics) for distortion of literary context and inattention to social reality. On the other hand, the favored concept of "typology" is strained to keep Gogol firmly in the realistic camp.

A welcome change of pace, Mann's essay on the Natural School is a sober, objective study bent on illuminating the process of deromanticization which at the same time involved assimilation of some features of Romanticism. His second article is an extremely well-documented description of the development of the theory of realism in Russia. Drawing in Pushkin, Ivan Kireevsky, Venevitinov, Bestuzhev-Marlinsky, and numerous others, Mann attempts to trace the change of taste and critical demand through the first half of the nineteenth century. (In passing, he labels Belinsky's view of Gogol as limited to exclude any perception of his grotesque qualities.) If the remaining volumes of the series include even a few articles of this caliber, this latest treatment of the much exercised theme will bring some profit to those seriously interested in the on-going literary process.

JOAN DELANEY GROSSMAN
University of California, Berkeley

LA SOCIÉTÉ RUSSE DE LA SECONDE MOITIÉ DU XIX^e SIÈCLE:
TROIS TÉMOIGNAGES LITTÉRAIRES: M. E. SALTYKOV-ŠČEDRIN,
GLEB USPENSKIJ, A. F. PISEMSKIJ. By *Jean Blankoff*. Brussels: Édi-
tions de l'Université, 1974. 248 pp.

In defining his method Blankoff says early in his study: "What we are basically interested in in our study is the testimony the writer has given in his work of a sociological process, and not in the strictly literary treatment of things." This sentence sums up very well the approach used by the author: to see how Russian life is reflected in the works of these three writers. His focus is sociological without the Marxist ideological bias to mar its value, and he can build on a long and solid European tradition in this critical methodology, if we may only recall György Lukács, Viktor Shklovsky (in the late twenties), Walter Benjamin, and Theodor W. Adorno. Literary events were seen by these critics not in isolation but in their interrelation and integration with social phenomena and social movements.