

Bogoslavsky's superbly edited and much more exhaustive *Pushkin-kritik* still being available on most of our university library shelves—how many readers this collection will have. Viewed in this cold, pragmatic light, Proffer's book looks—to one reader at least—a little like a well-designed and solidly constructed samovar which has been shipped at considerable time and expense to Tula.

RICHARD GREGG
Vassar College

TJUTČEV'S KURZLYRIK: TRADITIONSZUSAMMENHÄNGE UND INTERPRETATIONEN. By *Almut Schulze*. Forum Slavicum, vol. 25. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1968. 99 pp. DM 18.

This essay (which was submitted as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Heidelberg) is devoted to Tiutchev's shorter lyric verse, a genre in which the poet was an innovator in the context of Russian letters.

Part of the author's purpose is to place Tiutchev's shorter poetry against the background of the European poetic tradition. Opening with a discussion of this *genus humile* as used by Tiutchev, Frau Schulze takes Iurii Tynianov to task for too hastily applying certain concepts to Tiutchev in his essay "Vopros o Tiutcheve" (reprinted in *Arkhaisty i novatory*). Examples of such critical-aesthetic concepts misapplied by Tynianov in this connection are "fragment" and "microscopic ode." The author points out that in contrast with Pushkin, who did essay the fragment as a deliberate and valid device, Tiutchev uses a strict form. Considering the shorter lyric of Tiutchev as a "microscopic" replica of the eighteenth-century ode, she suggests, is misleading; and she detects some further flaws in Tynianov's argument. She shows that Tiutchev's aesthetics is not reducible to any eighteenth-century genre, and cannot be accounted for by reference to critical standards borrowed from eighteenth-century rhetoric. Instead, she connects the development of shorter poetry as practiced by Tiutchev with the renewal of interest in the Greek epigram exemplified by Goethe and Heine (two poets with whom Tiutchev was perfectly familiar) and various Russian literati of the 1820s.

In her analysis of Tiutchev's short poems, the author pays more attention to form than to theme or content. Her conclusion is that these poems are structurally dissimilar to the odes and songs of Russian poetry at that time; they are related to the epigram, the madrigal, the short elegy, the short German *Lied*, and should be thought of as continuing the Greek and Latin tradition of shorter poetry.

Although it retains much of the character and format of a doctoral dissertation, this study represents a notable contribution to the discussion of Tiutchev's poetry, both from the textual and the historical-comparative viewpoints.

GUY DE MALLAC
University of California, Irvine

DOSTOEVSKIJ AND THE BELINSKIJ SCHOOL OF LITERARY CRITICISM. By *Thekwall Proctor*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969. 198 pp. 32 Dutch guilders.

This volume attempts to study the literary criticism of Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobroliubov, Pisarev, and Mikhailovsky, representatives of the socioliterary criticism "which, in a somewhat different form, continues to be predominant in Soviet

criticism" (p. 9), with particular reference to the treatment accorded by these critics to the works of Dostoevsky.

The title of the book is misleading—not much is said about Dostoevsky, the bulk of the running exposition being devoted to a detailed presentation of the critics' respective ideological positions. In the chapter on Chernyshevsky only three pages of twenty-four concern the critic's attitude toward Dostoevsky's art; and only twelve pages of thirty-one in "Vissarion Grigorevič [*sic*] Belinskij (1811–1848)" describe Belinsky's criticism of the novelist. Even those chapters that more or less directly concern Dostoevsky as a writer (on Dobroliubov, Pisarev, and Mikhailovskiy), though indicative of Mr. Proctor's excellent research and profound knowledge of facts, contain very little evaluation of the critics' treatment of Dostoevsky's work.

There are also some oversimplifications in the book, an example of which is an alleged analogy between Dostoevsky and the "utilitarian" critics whom he opposed (p. 106). Dostoevsky indeed encountered some problems similar to theirs by wanting literature "to promulgate what he considered to be truth" (p. 106), but Dostoevsky's truth differed so greatly from theirs that it formed the very basis of their frequently vociferous attacks on the novelist.

I have my doubts that "the news of Belinskij's death seems to have provoked one of Dostoevskij's early epileptic attacks" (p. 63); or that Dostoevsky recommended Belinsky as a model literary critic to an adolescent reader (p. 63); or that L. B. Dubelt of the secret police expressed "violent regret that Belinskij was dead, adding, 'We would have rotted him in prison'" (p. 65).

Proctor's study includes a good selected bibliography, conveniently divided into several sections, but there is no index. The book will in all probability be more useful for students of Belinsky and his school of literary criticism than for Dostoevsky scholars.

TEMIRA PACHMUSS

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

CHEKHOV: A COLLECTION OF CRITICAL ESSAYS. Edited by *Robert Louis Jackson*. Twentieth Century Views. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1967. ix, 213 pp. \$4.95, cloth. \$1.95, paper.

THE ISLAND: A JOURNEY TO SAKHALIN. By *Anton Chekhov*. Translated by *Luba* and *Michael Terpak*. Introduction by *Robert Payne*. New York: Washington Square Press, 1967. xl, 375 pp. \$6.95.

In his introduction Robert Jackson sees as a fundamental philosophical orientation and basic theme in Chekhov the clash of will and environment, freedom and necessity, as revealed through his unheroic minor personalities. The introduction also includes a brief history of Chekhov criticism which is concise but suffers from some important omissions. Thus significant recent studies carried out in the Soviet Union in connection with the preparation of the academic edition of Chekhov's works are not mentioned. An assessment of the textual criticism of E. Polotskaia and A. Chudakov and some discussion of Chudakov's structural approach to Chekhov would have been particularly appropriate. Jackson's discussion of Chekhov's relation to Pushkin is interesting and points to an important problem. Chekhov's return to the moderation, rationality, sobriety, and economy of Pushkin is viewed as an antidote to the moral and spiritual extremism of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. Chekhov's affinity to Pushkin is indeed comprehensive, and bears