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del'shtam as talented writers in their own right. But literary specialists may find themselves disappointed in the lack of attention to the broader picture of women’s works, as the title suggests—to the tradition of women’s writing, either from a historical or synchronic perspective. The paradigm Holmgren discerns in the memoirs of Chukovskaia and Mandel'shtam was already in place by the early nineteenth century in the memoirs of Natal’ia Dolgorukaiia and Nadezhda Durova. I also found the last chapter too sketchy and too full of speculation about Chukovskaia’s and Mandel'shtam’s legacy with little proof that it was specifically their example that served as inspiration to other women as writers or activists.

These criticisms do not diminish the value of Holmgren's book, which is its interdisciplinary approach to gender roles and its emphasis on women’s contributions to Russian culture.

Charlotte Rosenthal
University of Southern Maine

Marina Tsvetaeva: Trudy 1-go mezhunarodnogo simpoziuma (Lozanna, 30.VI.-3.VII.1982).
514 pp. Index. DM 78.80, hard bound.

This collection of over 40 papers in English, French, German and Russian, impatiently awaited ever since the 1982 Lausanne symposium on Tsvetaeva took place, has emerged at last as volume 26 of the series Slavica Helvetica. Despite the unfortunate delay in publication, the collection stands up well more than a decade after the symposium itself. In some cases the sources cited have been superseded; several of the papers give more recent information in footnotes but others do not do so. A few papers that have since been published as parts of larger projects (notably, those by Jerzy Faryno and Marie-Louise Bott) are represented here only in abbreviated form. For all its temporal limitations, though, the book is much more than a snapshot of the state of Tsvetaeva studies in 1982. This is due in part to the continuing limitations on access to Tsvetaeva’s primary archive in Moscow, noted with appropriate frustration by Véronique Lossky in the first paper of the collection. More than that, the book reflects the excellent quality of the texts of almost every participant.

The papers are printed in the order originally used at the symposium, with a series of thematic divisions that very roughly indicate their contents: Tsvetaeva's biography, life and personality; Tsvetaeva and her contemporaries; metrics, poetics, structure, etc. in Tsvetaeva’s works; “general themes”; and correspondence and archival documents. The final part of the volume addresses Tsvetaeva and translation, with analyses of her own translations and a series of translations of her poem “Toska po rodine” (homesickness) into several European languages.

Many of the participants in the symposium are the very scholars who would be expected in such a setting, while others may be less familiar to an American reader, generally for linguistic reasons. The exciting range of authors includes Eve Malleret (the late translator of Tsvetaeva into French), Efim Etkind, Aleksandar Flaker and Serena Vitale, along with other Russian and non-Russian specialists from the USA, Canada and Europe. It is a special pleasure to read work by scholars who are also excellent writers themselves, such as Lily Feiler, Lev Loseff and Pietro Tsveteremich. Presentations by people who knew or met Tsvetaeva (Zinaida Shakhovskaia, Lidia Chukovskaia, Jurii Ivask, Aleksandr Bakhrakh) add a further dimension to the volume. A handful of papers drift somewhat from the point of the symposium: Gerlinde Zett-Tesche reveals quite a bit more about Paul Celan than about Tsvetaeva, while Milica Nikolic offers literary criticism more than scholarship or reminiscence, and not only because she gives no footnotes. The lack of Soviet Tsvetaeva specialists, understandable given the logistics of visas and travel in 1982, may also suggest the symposium organizers’ allergy to the typical Soviet “party line” in studies of Tsvetaeva.

The technical quality of the volume is excellent: it is well bound and clearly
printed, with a useful index of Tsvetaeva’s works referred to in the papers. Besides one glaringly incorrect line in a poem on page 312, there are hardly any typographical errors, no small achievement given texts in four languages which mix languages and alphabets much as Tsvetaeva did herself, and which often include notes in still other languages with their particular diacritical marks. Retention of the original order of papers does not fully suggest the links between various papers but otherwise the book is organized to be as useful as possible.

The volume, printed in 800 copies, is clearly intended for research libraries and specialists on Tsvetaeva, who should acquire and consult it. It would also be profitable reading for students of translation theory (the final section) and for anyone interested in comparing the work of Slavists from a variety of European countries, here conveniently available in the four languages that we are all supposed to know.

Simon Karlinsky is entirely justified in his closing remarks from the 1982 Lausanne symposium: it is a series of interesting, and sometimes simply brilliant, papers.

SIBELAN FORRESTER
Swarthmore College


Richard Taylor and Derek Spring, editors of *Stalinism and Soviet Cinema,* explain that the current volume was born in a July 1990 London conference whose theme was “Russian and Soviet Cinema: Continuity and Change.” “…The conference sub-text, almost inevitably,” continue Taylor and Spring, “was Stalinism. The papers that relate most directly to this theme are grouped in the present volume.” It is indeed fortunate for us that the editors had the wisdom to sculpt their “Stalinism sub-text” into the shape of a book, for the present volume is a real contribution to cinema studies and to the study of Soviet society and culture. Film historians, literary scholars, political scientists, historians, sociologists and the general reader with an interest in Russian and Soviet culture will all find something of interest here. This volume represents the best of what the results of a conference can be—the weaving of a single theme into a rich, multilayered fabric that is at once a cohesive whole and a combination of different, individual threads that represent different, individual histories.

The volume is that much richer because of the contributions of western Europeans, Soviets, emigrés and Americans. It is that much richer because of its truly interdisciplinary nature, with articles by film specialists, historians, political scientists and literature scholars. It is that much richer because there is not one overriding party-line, or anti-party-line approach to the subject. Rather, what we have is a number of intelligent, thoughtful assessments of many aspects of the topic, “stalinism and cinema.”

My comments, given the brief amount of space allotted to this review, can only allude to a very few of the many excellent ideas that are brought up in the essays. A short review cannot do justice to the many valuable ideas, thoughtful statements and interesting insights contained in this book. The essays brim over with useful conceptual frameworks, useful factual information and results from archival research and interviews.

Let me, then, illustrate by serving up small slices of the life between the covers of *Stalinism and Soviet Cinema.* Derek Spring provides a solid introduction with historical backdrop in his “Stalinism—The Historical Debate.” In a truly interdisciplinary way, in Rashid Yangirov’s essay, “Onwards and Upwards! The Origins of the Lenin Cult in Soviet Cinema,” a discussion of Petr Voevodin’s contributions to the history of early Soviet cinema declares some of Dmitrii Likhachev’s statements about medieval Russian literature relevant to an analysis of Voevodin’s film script about Lenin. Maya Turovskaya’s essay, “The 1930s and 1940s: Cinema in Context,” includes comments about the importance—in understanding the paradoxical nature of Soviet cultural life.