

to serve and be away on active military duty for long periods of time without severely affecting the economic well-being of the other members of the household-community. The *Zadruga* thus readily integrated in the general organization of the *Grenze* and facilitated a permanent military force without placing an excessive burden on state finances and on the general population of the country. In this connection, v. Preradovich quotes the remarks of a contemporary observer of the different parts of the military border, each organized in accordance with local customs and habits, which is worth repeating here: «Bei keiner dieser Völkerschaften gedieh das Grenzinstitut in solcher Weise als bei den Serben und Kroaten, wo nicht bloss natürliche Anlage und Neigung dem Kriegsdienste günstig waren, sondern wo auch in der Institution der Hauskommunion die Basis zur Entwicklung des militärischen Permanenzdienstes sich vorfand, ohne welche Grundlage dieser Dienst für das Grenzvolk zur unerträglichen Last werden musste».

In the last two paragraphs of the text v. Preradovich takes issue with the Serb and Croat critics (and, one may add, with their sympathizers) and rejects their accusations: that the *Militärgrenze* had produced only a raw soldateska, that the men were degraded to unwilling instruments of militarism, that the border had served to suppress all political freedom, that the Slavs were subjugated to the service of Germanism, and that the elimination of the border-institution was the triumph of the free spirit of the modern era. «Dass die Granitscharen nicht in einem Institut für höhere Töchter lebten», responds v. Preradovich, «darüber besteht kein Zweifel. Wenn aber von Freiheit gesprochen wird, so ist diese in der vojna kraina erheblich besser gepflegt worden als an vielen anderen Orten - beispielsweise in der jugoslawischen Königsdiktatur». Or in today's Yugoslavia!

An institution like the *Militärgrenze* could not have survived over three and a half centuries had it not been of advantage to both the hundreds of thousands of Slav refugees from Ottoman oppression and to the Habsburg rulers. The historical record shows that it was. And that the views of the modern Serbian critics of Austria were not shared by earlier generations of Serbs and their leaders is attested to by an extremely interesting episode in the relations between Serbs and Austria, which is generally not known to historians and which is conveniently overlooked or suppressed by Serbs and their sympathizers: Kara-George's offer to Emperor Francis I in 1804 to place the entire Serb nation under Habsburg rule. Von Preradovich discusses this event in some detail as well as the sorry story of rejection of this offer by the monarch on grounds of political morality—an action that has been decried by Austrian (including v. Preradovich) and other writers on the subject. Although we will never know the answer the question may be asked: had Austria accepted the offer, would there have been a Sarajevo with all its catastrophic consequences?

Brooklyn, New York

ARTHUR LEON HORNIKER

Charles A. Moser (Special Editor), *Russia: The Spirit of Nationalism*, St. John's University, Review of National Literatures, vol. III, no. 1, Spring 1972, pp. 261.

This study—a collection of essays by several American scholars—is a comparative critical analysis of the growth, character, and nature of Russian nationalism, tracing its origins from a variety of literary sources. Specifically, it examines the writings of the Russian writers, poets, and novelists of the last century to the present: from Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and the Symbolist poets, to Solzhenitsyn and other con-

temporary Soviet Russian writers. The central questions which the study raises are related to Russia's historical identity and her relations to Western Europe—two issues that have been debated by the Russian intellectuals throughout the 19th century, and, with certain variations, still continue to the present. This controversy resulted from the fact that among Russian scholars the question of the origin of the Russians and of the Russian state has been a matter of dispute for a long time, out of which two distinctive schools of historical interpretation emerged: the so-called Normandist and the Slavophile. The supporters of the first school claimed that the Russians were descendants of one of the Scandinavian or Varangian tribes that founded the first Russian or Kievan state. The Slavophile school, on the other hand, refuted the assertion of the Normandists and maintained that the Russians had been associated with the Slavic tribes which dwelled in the plains of the Dnieper region.

This crisis of historical identity had a major impact on the works of the Russian writers, poets, and novelists, who began to ponder Russia's destiny. Was Russia, or should she become, an integral part of Europe? Was she a distinctive world by herself with her own peculiar characteristics? Should she adopt Western culture and values, or was she to remain conscious of her profound difference from Europe? What should her historical role *vis-à-vis* Europe be?

This strange amalgam of nationalist feelings and often irreconcilable views found expression in the works of the Russian intellectuals. There were numerous shades of Russian nationalists: the Slavophiles, Pan-Slavists and imperial conservative bureaucrats who became repugnant and hostile toward the West, and idealized Russia's past and future in extreme nationalist terms; and the more liberal and progressive intelligentsia, the Westerners, who looked upon Russia not as a unique case but merely as a member of the European family of nations. They advocated that Russia should adopt the values and standards of the West, that she should follow the same path of progress, development, and modernisation, and become an equal partner with the rest of the world nations.

The study begins with a critical evaluation of Pushkin, the greatest national poet and nationalist. The author (Walter N. Vickery) delineates two periods in Pushkin's literary career: the liberal and the conservative one. During his early life he was imbued with liberal ideas and was a convinced Westerner. But after 1823 he became disillusioned with the revolutionary movements in Western Europe and the failure of the Decembrist movement at home. He abandoned his early liberalism and admiration of the West, and turned to conservatism. He adopted a critical attitude toward Western Europe and championed Russian nationalism. The second essay deals with Gogol's historical, literary and political ideas. The author (James M. Holquist) remarks that Gogol's concepts were «fundamentally religious». He expressed his feeling for Russia in a «kind of Platonic messianism». Yet this very contradiction made him a peculiar personality in the history of Russian letters, whose influence was felt upon the entire generation of the realist school.

Turgenev, unlike many of his contemporary writers, was a convinced Westerner. He spent most of his life in Western Europe as an expatriate, and became the unofficial ambassador of Russian culture in the West. His profound knowledge and admiration of Western Europe made him a «cosmopolitan nationalist», as the author (Charles A. Moser) characteristically calls Turgenev. Although critical of the radical revolutionaries and the Slavophiles, he nevertheless remained, deep in his heart, a sincere Russian, and his writings bear the imprint of Russia's national character.

Dostoevsky, on the other hand, did not share many of Turgenev's views. The author (Robert L. Belknap) points out that he regarded Western Europe with contempt and sus-

picion. He idealized Russian culture and considered it to be superior to the West. Russia's manifest destiny, according to him, was to unite and rule the world. Like Tolstoy, Dostoevsky strongly believed in the Russian common people —the peasants— and saw in them the incarnation of the Christian virtues of goodness, beauty, and truth. He viewed the Orthodox Church as the only institution necessary for strengthening Russia's power. Religion for him was synonymous with nationalism, and Russia and Orthodoxy formed an inseparable entity.

Tolstoy was a unique personality in many respects. He was critical of Russian society and autocracy. He despised the idea of revolution, condemned the state system, which he regarded as «superfluous and unnecessary», attacked the Orthodox Church, for which he was excommunicated, criticized the evils of modern civilization, and advocated the famous doctrine of «non-violence». A religious preacher and moral philosopher, Tolstoy fought for the renovation of mankind. He was a universalist in this regard. He advocated that man should not consider himself a member of any state. His mission in life should be to serve God and humanity. The essential element of Tolstoyan religion, the author (Nicholas Oulianoff) points out, was brotherly love of all men which, in turn, excluded love of one's own country. Nationalism was thus replaced with universalism. But despite Tolstoy's rejection of nationalism, his historical novel *War and Peace* is a national epic which glorifies the patriotic struggle of the Russian people against Napoleon. And although he regarded war as brutal and cruel, he nevertheless justified only that war which is fought for the defense of one's own country against foreign invasion.

The author of the essay on the symbolist movement (Robert A. Maguire) examines the diverse concepts of its protagonists —Bryusov, Balmont, Sologub, Bely, Blok, and Ivanov. A radical departure from the conventionalities of the realist school which dominated the Russian literary scene in the second half of the 19th century, the Symbolist poets stressed «art for art's sake» and the musicality of the verse. Like Tolstoy, however, they emphasized the universality of art. Some of the Symbolists assimilated the political and socialist ideas of the Russian intelligentsia and combined their artistic and aesthetic concepts with radical and Slavophile inclinations. Others joined the Bolsheviks and hailed the October Revolution of 1917, while still others expressed in their works a kind of revolutionary messianism, and spoke of Russia as the savior of the world.

Solzhenitsyn, on the other hand, is a product of the Soviet era, although he does not share the political views of his contemporary writers. His nationalist feelings, the author (Rosette C. Lamont) remarks, bear no political emotions. Solzhenitsyn's nationalism is a «spiritual» one, divorced from ideological considerations, and closer to Christian ideas. This departure from the official policy of the party makes his writings unacceptable and often dangerous to the present regime.

In the essay «Nationalism and Ruralism in Recent Soviet Russian Literature» the author (Deming Brown) examines the various facets of nationalism in the writings of contemporary authors and the representation of the workers and peasants in fictional works. The study ends with a critical bibliographical essay of works in English on modern Russian literature since 1960 (Robert T. Whittaker) and a review article (Richard C. Clark) on the approaches to the history of Russian literature.

The authors of this selection of essays on Russian nationalism provide the reader with a variety of views and interpretations of Russia's past and present, with the complexity and ambiguity of her historical role, and her struggle for self-identity as a nation. This quest for the meaning of Russia's destiny, which had been augmented by the fact that she

entered Europe during the period of the great social and political revolutions of the 19th century, pitted and antagonized the Slavophiles against the Westerners who sought, each one, to provide the answer to Russia's future role. Like many 19th century Russian nationalist thinkers who considered Moscow, and implicitly Russia, to be, in the Russian tradition, the Third Rome, the center of true Orthodoxy, the protector and savior of the world, and the nucleus of future civilization, contemporary Soviet Russian writers, too, emphasize in their literary works the superiority of the Communist system, of Soviet ideology and culture, and consider the Soviet Union as the center of world socialism. But while this attitude has been slightly altered since the death of Stalin, the search for Russia's historical self-identity as a nation, the controversial point which beset the Slavophiles and Westerners alike in the 19th century, remains still a crucial issue without as yet reaching a definite solution.

This collection of studies in such an important and controversial subject is a valuable contribution to the understanding of Russian nationalism through the medium of literary works of the Russian writers and poets. It is an indispensable source to any literary man or historian who seeks to understand Russia's past and present spirit of nationalism.

*University of South Carolina  
Coastal Carolina College*

JAMES J. FARSOLAS

George Ivask, *Konstantin Leontiev: Zhizn' i Tvorchestvo* (Konstantin Leontiev: Life and Work), Bern and Frankfurt, Herbert Lang and Peter Lang, 1974, pp. 430.

Konstantin Leontiev (1831-1891) served the Russian Empire as physician, diplomat, and censor. Between these assignments and concomitant with them he wrote fiction, literary criticism, and politico-philosophical articles. In literature he had more in common with the trends which preceded and followed him than with contemporary realism. In politics Leontiev was an inveterate enemy of the bourgeois, liberal, tendencies that prevailed in European and Russian society. Consequently he was little-known and without significant influence during his lifetime. Posthumously he began to attract attention when some of his critiques and predictions became vindicated by new literary trends and momentous political events. George Ivask, Professor of Slavic languages and literatures at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, is the leading contemporary authority on Leontiev and in the biography under review he incorporates all his previous scholarship on the subject.

Professor Ivask emphasizes Leontiev's aestheticism. In Leontiev's view the value of any given phenomenon was commensurate with the beauty he detected in it. He referred to this criterion as the aesthetics of life. With respect to societies, the more heterogeneous their inhabitants the more beautiful; the more homogeneous the uglier he considered them. The epitome of ugliness was the European civilization whose inhabitants Leontiev contemptuously called «average Europeans». By contrast, he found much attraction in the areas of the Ottoman Empire where he served during the period 1864-1874. He spent most of this decade among the Greeks of Turkey with assignments to Crete, Adrianople, Ioannina, and Salonika. The diversity of these people —geographically distributed on islands, mountains, and in plains, and historically subject to Byzantine, Venetian, Turkish, and western influence—strongly appealed to Leontiev's aesthetic criterion. And thus he became an aesthetic phil-