

pieces show the influence of the best literary scholarship of the first quarter of the century.

Most of the articles (twelve of the seventeen) are essentially literary history. Of special interest are N. N. Rozov's study of possible West Slavic sources for the work of Metropolitan Ilarion, A. I. Ivanov's estimate of the influence, both topical and stylistic, of Savanarola on Maxim the Greek, and the joint effort of N. S. Demkova and N. F. Droblenkova on Slavic acrostic verse. A second category would include studies of artifacts of the fine arts (frescoes, hagiographic icons, and glazed tiles) which bear some relationship to literary questions, similar to contributions in volume 22.

Scholars of medieval Russian literature will find much interesting material here. At the same time they will find reason to hope that the quality of Soviet scholarship in this field will continue to improve.

RICHARD H. MARSHALL, JR.
University of Toronto

THE TRILOGY OF ALEXANDER SUKHOVO-KOBYLIN. By *Alexander Sukhovo-Kobylin*. Translated and with an Introduction by *Harold B. Segel*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1969. xlix, 264 pp. \$6.95.

Harold B. Segel's translation of the *Trilogy of Alexander Sukhovo-Kobylin* makes available in English for the first time a fascinating work of Russian drama from the mid-nineteenth century. Add the thorough and interesting introductory essay, and we have indeed reason to be grateful for Professor Segel's work. Anyone familiar with the trilogy must have lamented that heretofore only *Krechinsky's Wedding*, the first of the plays, has been in print in English.

Segel's introduction testifies to his years of interest in Sukhovo-Kobylin. In it he covers the relevant scholarship, Russian and English, analyzes the dramatic and philosophical structure of the trilogy, and writes in an attractive, nonpedantic style. Soviet works on the playwright (including the recent sketch *Sud'ba Sukhovo-Kobylina* by Isidor Kleiner, Moscow, 1969) slight Sukhovo-Kobylin's connections with the contemporary French theater. Segel's essay remedies this neglect and points up as well the anticipation of the theater of the absurd in the third play of the trilogy.

The translation itself reads well. One is grateful for the decision to leave "speaking" names in Russian, with explanatory notes, rather than to try for English approximations. A similar decision is no doubt responsible for the toning down of numerous colorful, spicy idioms. In a text of this kind the translator must usually take this course or risk affronting the reader with outrageous "equivalents." The reader of Russian will inevitably question some of these choices. He will question more seriously the correctness of certain translations. For example, in *The Death of Tarelkin* (act 2, scene 4) the disguised archvillain Varravin, mistakenly believing that Tarelkin has died, exclaims: "Zarezal. Bez nozha, a kinzhalom udaril." In Segel's translation Varravin announces: "He cut his throat. With a dagger yet, no ordinary knife." The sense of the idiom is actually that Tarelkin has put Varravin in a terrible situation by dying at this moment. Further on (act 2, scene 6), Varravin claims that the deceased Tarelkin has made off with his watch, translated as "Brigette." Any reader of *Eugene Onegin* will recognize this as the striking watch by the famous French watchmaker Bréguet, a *breget* in Russian.

Imperfections of this kind occur in some number, so that one hopes that Professor Segel will find the opportunity to revise his translation for a second edition. This wish is all the stronger because his book is of very considerable value to scholarship on Sukhovo-Kobylin and to the fund of Russian literature in translation.

JOAN DELANEY

University of California, Berkeley

THE RUSSIAN IMAGE OF GOETHE: GOETHE IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE OF THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By *André von Gronicka*. The Haney Foundation Series, no. 3. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1968. ix, 304 pp. \$6.50.

Professor von Gronicka's book, although it breaks important new ground in the recent American tradition of studies on aspects of Russo-German literary relations, has an outstanding Russian predecessor in V. M. Zhirmunsky's *Gete v russkoi literature* (1937), which remains the classic study. Von Gronicka takes his theme up to about 1850 and is preparing a second volume to continue the story up to the present. He devotes six increasingly larger chapters to the image of Goethe as fostered in the work of outstanding individual writers and critics (such as Zhukovsky, Pushkin, Lermontov, Belinsky, and Herzen), and of other writers somewhat arbitrarily associated with literary groupings (the Pushkin Pleiade, the Decembrists, and the Russian Romanticists). The organizational difficulties in a comprehensive coverage are clearly realized by the author (pp. 4-5) but not always satisfactorily solved. This problem is most evident in his first chapter, "Early Russian Reaction to Goethe and His Work," which treats the early period in an excessively sketchy and uneven manner and is concerned principally with Alexander Turgenev and S. S. Uvarov, whose pronouncements are meaningful only in a much later context.

In his introduction von Gronicka acknowledges his indebtedness to Zhirmunsky and S. Durylin, and Zhirmunsky's shadow lies long. Von Gronicka does succeed in giving Western scholars without Russian "a verbatim record *in extenso* of Russian authors' acclaim and critique of Goethe, the man and the poet" (p. 4); he does introduce new materials and original findings, particularly in his discussion of links between Lermontov and Goethe, where he might justifiably say, "Ia ne Zhirmunskii: ia drugoi," but in many ways he is influenced by the Russian's scholarship and judgment. He accepts the unnecessarily negative appraisal of Karamzin's reaction to Goethe and intensifies Zhirmunsky's antipathy toward Uvarov (not always a reactionary minister of national enlightenment) to the point of writing of the "glib perfection" of his German (p. 24), thus suggesting a linguistic mastery qualitatively different from that of a more sympathetic Russian such as Zhukovsky or Lermontov. He tends to take to task the same critics Zhirmunsky does (cf. pp. 65-66 and Zhirmunsky, p. 640; pp. 259-60 and Zhirmunsky, pp. 132-33) and to employ similar criticisms and reasonings in discussing Russian versions and reactions (cf. p. 94 and Zhirmunsky, pp. 143-44). Such parallels may originate in an identity of viewpoint, but in one instance the similarity is disturbing. Discussing O. P. Kozodavlev's introduction to his version of *Clavigo* (1780), von Gronicka attributes to the translator reasons for choosing *Clavigo* in preference to *Egmont*, *Stella*, or *Götz* which are not his but Zhirmunsky's (cf. p. 94 and Zhirmunsky, pp. 143-44).

Von Gronicka's book contains a string of factual and interpretative errors: