and rock identification guides, the directions accompanying various contraptions which must be assembled, dictionaries, etc."

As one can guess from this limitation, what we have here is an account of the phenomenon that can only be described as far-ranging. Chapter 1 provides a general introduction to the concept of estrangement, which Professor Stacy illustrates with examples from a wide variety of sources. Chapter 2, entitled "Victor Shklovsky and *Ostranenie*," describes the critic's use of the concept and the reactions of other scholars and critics. Both of these chapters are lively and interesting. The following two chapters—called "Forms and Varieties of Verbal and Phrasal Defamiliarization" and "Prose and Poetry"—become engulfed in a welter of names and titles that occasionally threaten to transform themselves into pure lists. About the only masterpiece of world literature not mentioned is *Bambi*, where His rifle is rendered as a third hand. The last chapter, "Literary History," shows, too briefly, that "types of defamiliarization are especially prominent in certain post-classical, Alexandrian, baroque, decadent or silver ages of literature, i.e., during periods when writers rely chiefly upon a réchauffage and foregrounding of those devices formerly used by greater artists, but used by them as secondary elements, as means to an end and not as ends in themselves."

Apart from the assumption underlying the word "greater" in the preceding paragraph, I have two quibbles with this book: one concerns the word "defamiliarization"; the other concerns the discussion of Brecht.

The word "crime" cannot capture the higher register of Dostoevsky's *prestuplenie*. The word "evil" captures only the higher register of Solzhenitsyn's *zloi chelovek* in the rhesus monkey scene from *Cancer Ward* (in the Burg and Bethell translation), whereas the word "mean" captures only the lower register (in the Rebecca Frank translation). The word "estrangement," however, besides containing the significant root, neatly incorporates a more abstract meaning than that which it conveys in everyday usage. Why, then, do we resort to "making strange," "bestrangement," and "defamiliarization" when we have a perfectly good English word that works? The word "defamiliarization," besides being offensive English, is not even a translation of *ostranenie* but a definition of it.

The second quibble concerns the discussion of Berthold Brecht's *Verfremdungseffekt*. No mention is made of the probability that Brecht developed his theory out of what he heard about *ostranenie* when he visited Moscow in 1935. Although Brecht seems not to have met Shklovskii at that time, he undoubtedly heard about the theory from Sergei Tretiakov and Sergei Eisenstein.

A more profound and succinct exploration of Shklovskii's concept can be found in Daniel Laferrière's article, "Potebnya, Šklovskij and the Familiarity: Strangeness Paradox" (*Russian Literature*, April 1976). Nevertheless, everyone will find in Professor Stacy's book things that are new and interesting.

Richard Sheldon
Dartmouth College

DAS PROBLEM DER VERSSPRACHE: ZUR SEMANTIK DES POETISCHEN TEXTES. By *Jurij N. Tynjanov*. Edited and translated by *Inge Paulmann*. Theorie und Geschichte der Literatur und der schönen Künste, Texte und Abhandlungen, vol. 25. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1977. 168 pp. DM 28, paper.

In this day and age when values are seen to be relative or when—as in the case of "Marxist" criticism in the Soviet Union—they are seen to be inadequate and obsolescent, the literary critic or scientist can take refuge in the study of literary technique and form. Here, at least, one can make meaningful and even scientifically demonstrable statements without the necessity of defending an entire value system. (Indeed, by

https://doi.org/10.2307/2496767 Published online by Cambridge University Press

implication, such an emphasis suggests a rejection of values as they apply to criticism.) These are the (largely unspoken) assumptions which appear to underlie the current interest in Structuralist poetics and its predecessor, Russian Formalist poetics of the 1920s. This interest has been expressed in the reprinting, both in the West and in the Soviet Union, of the work of Formalist critics, especially Iurii Tynianov.

So far, most of the reprints have been of the Russian originals, and the reflection of Formalist work in Western Structuralist poetics has therefore been largely indirect. The volume under review—a scholarly translation into German of Tynianov's *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*—brings one of the classical statements of Russian Formalist poetics to a wider audience. The introduction by the translator gives a useful sketch of the history and issues of Russian Formalist poetics. The detailed footnotes are frequently illuminating (although oriented toward the German reader), and the bibliography of Tynianov's works on literature (including translations) is very welcome. The translation itself is of a high standard, especially in the precision with which terminology is handled. Quotations are taken from their original sources (with discrepancies in Tynianov's versions given in footnotes).

Tynianov's text—now over fifty years old—is at times dense and lacking examples, but it still reads as a stimulating and corrective statement on the nature of poetic language. In particular, Tynianov's view of poetry as a dynamic system rather than a static construct and his distinctions between poetry and prose still retain their pertinence and force. Although of obviously limited use in the North American context, Paulmann's translation may be considered a competent and useful addition to Western Tynianoviana.

J. Douglas Clayton
University of Ottawa

FIVE RUSSIAN POEMS: EXERCISES IN A THEORY OF POETRY. By *Daniel Laferrière*. Foreword by *Victor Terras*. Englewood, N.J.: Transworld Publishers, 1977. xvi, 154 pp. $9.50, paper.

Laferrière's book contains a number of original and highly provocative ideas, most of which, unfortunately, are carried to absurd conclusions. The introductory chapter offers a new "psycholinguistic" theory of poetry, a synthesis of Jakobsonian linguistics, Freudian psychology, and some terminology from recent studies in semiotics. In the chapters that follow, the new theory is applied to five well-known Russian poems: Pushkin's "Ia pomniu chudnoe mgnoven'e," Tiutchev's "Son na more," Fet's "Mesiats zerkal'nyi plyvet po lazurnoi pustyne," Blok's "Neznakomka," and Mandelstam's "Tristia."

The idea governing Laferrière's theory is that, for both the reader and the writer, poetry is a kind of controlled schizophrenia. Thoughout the poem (text), the poet (addresser) and the reader (addressee) share the experience of *Ichspaltungen*, or split ego. The chief function of form in poetry is "to help protect the ego (of both addresser and addressee) against the potentially dangerous death fantasies [or other appropriate traumas] being elicited by the poem." The function of "the various semantic, syntactic, morphological, and phonological devices of a poem's structure," the object of Jakobsonian analysis, is to defend us from the "underlying semantic material," the raw terrors known to Freudians. By delving sufficiently deeply into the poem, Laferrière hopes to find the point where linguistics and psychology meet. The task, then, of "psycholinguistic" analysis is to uncover the poem's hidden "teleology," the psychosis behind the form.

Laferrière's theory is bold, interesting, and well argued. But in the exercises that issue from it, the "synthesis" of Freud and Jakobson seems more of a misalliance. With the aid of charts, Rube Goldberg diagrams, and citations from the poets' letters,

https://doi.org/10.2307/2496767 Published online by Cambridge University Press