

show the influence of a secular type of travel literature, the "diplomatic report" (*stateinyi spisok*). At about the same time, the "simple faith" displayed by the pilgrim authors started to give way to more critical reporting of the wonders they saw and heard, reflecting Russian disenchantment with the Greeks after the Council of Florence and the Turkish conquest of Constantinople. Contemporaneously, judging from the company it keeps in the manuscripts, the *khozhdenie* moved from the category of private monastic reading to the class of geographical literature.

The second half of Seemann's book provides detailed individual treatments of each of the *khozhdeniia* from the twelfth through early eighteenth centuries. The book includes an extraordinarily complete and carefully categorized bibliography as well as a list of manuscripts which include texts of pilgrim tales. Anyone who studies Old Russian *Khozhdeniia* must now begin with this study. And indeed, anyone teaching medieval Russian literature should draw on the wealth of material here to prepare lectures on Russian pilgrim tales.

GEORGE P. MAJESKA  
University of Maryland

KRITIK DER LITERARISCHEN REPORTAGE: REPORTAGEN UND REISEBERICHTE AUS DER WEIMARER REPUBLIK ÜBER DIE USA UND DIE SOWJETUNION. By *Erhard Schütz*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1977. 221 pp. DM 48, paper.

Travel impressions and literary reportage belong to the oldest forms of written expression. Some critics regard literary reportage as an art in itself, equal to the art of the novel; others suggest that it is a cross between scientific exposition and artistic creation.

To the uninitiated reader, it might appear that literary reportage emphasizes primarily factual information. In fact, the bias of the reporter, his emotional relationship to his subject, and the requirements of his audience are of prime importance in the shaping of his views. Furthermore, nuances of the reporter's language often attach additional meaning to the matter under discussion. According to Erhard Schütz, literary reportage and travel impressions are complex artistic formations and the products of an intricate interaction between external factors and the internal structure of the work produced. In addition, economic and, in particular, social and political factors greatly influence a work of literary reportage.

In his book, Erhard Schütz investigates works by such famous German travelers of the 1920s as Walter Benjamin, Heinrich Hauser, Egon Erwin Kisch, and Franz Carl Weiskopf, and he attempts to illustrate that literary reportage is a peculiar genre, subject to its own rules and conventions. The study is divided into three basic parts: the first is rather theoretical and investigates the economic and sociopolitical premises of literary reportage with particular reference to the influence of technological progress on, and its connection with, specific forms of information and reportage. In the final two parts, the author attempts to amplify his theoretical premises by discussing and analyzing the works of travelers in the United States and the USSR. American reality is discussed mainly in terms of the burgeoning capitalism of Detroit and Chicago in the 1920s, and of the impact of advertising on personal and business life. The travelers' impressions of the young Soviet state, on the other hand, are rather casual and lack coherence. The author tries to draw certain parallels between the reports from the United States and the Soviet Union, and, from the texts quoted, it appears that American influence in the young Soviet republic was not limited to the official demands to emulate what Stalin called "American efficiency" (*Sachlichkeit* or, in Russian, *delovitost'*).

This well-researched study covers a great deal of ground, but it adds little to what is already known, namely, that a literary report by a foreign traveler is, in most cases, a combination of his perception of the external environment and self-projections of values and views created in the process of the reporter's past experiences. If nothing more, Erhard Schütz makes an effort to remind us that what often appears to be factual is not factual at all, and that reports of firsthand impressions often do not tell us much more than fiction tells us.

N. N. SHNEIDMAN

*Erindale College, University of Toronto*

ÄSTHETISCHES DENKEN IN RUSSLAND: KULTURSITUATION UND LITERATURKRITIK. By *Klaus Städtke*. Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1978. 378 pp.

Klaus Städtke's study of nineteenth-century Russian aesthetic thought might have been one of the best comprehensive treatments of the subject in any language if it had dealt more extensively with critics outside the camp of the "revolutionary democrats," for example, Apollon Grigor'ev, Druzhinin, and Botkin. As far as it goes, it is excellent. Städtke's consistent Marxist stance does not prevent him from considering the opinions of non-Marxist Western scholars, and he is often critical of Soviet scholars. His erudition is broad in every dimension—historical, aesthetic, philosophical, and literary. His method is sound and challenging, especially to the Western scholar.

Städtke gives Western scholars, such as René Wellek, credit for having elucidated specific connections between Western philosophical thought and the aesthetic ideas of Russian critics, but he points out—with some justification—that Western scholars have generally paid insufficient attention to the peculiarly Russian traits in the critical thought of Belinskii, Chernyshevskii, Pisarev, and others. Städtke suggests that Russian criticism after Belinskii derived its premises not only from philosophy and aesthetics, but also from the development of Russian literature, particularly narrative prose (p. 26). He tries to observe Russian literary criticism in a socio-historical, ideological, and cultural context, and deals with the economic factor in literature (publishing practices, readership, reception) as well. On occasion one cannot escape the impression that Städtke is somewhat selective in the latter respect. Thus, the socioeconomic and political background of the Decembrist movement is carefully outlined, while Pushkin's role as an exponent of the world view and interests of the landed gentry (emphatically pointed out by Belinskii) is underplayed. Gogol's aesthetic philosophy is properly and competently juxtaposed to Pushkin's, but Gogol's personal and unresolved conflict between the moral and aesthetic purpose of art is given little attention. And in general, Städtke seeks to avoid indicating an open dichotomy of *Formästhetik* and *Gehaltsästhetik*, even though his accurate account of Chernyshevskii's aesthetics describes the latter perfectly.

Städtke bases his own work on Russian scholarship to a greater degree than Western scholars and demonstrates a good command of Soviet Marxist and Formalist scholarship. He uses Russian terminology (for example, *Akzentverschiebung* = *pereaktsentovka*), his conception of "romanticism" is the Russian, not the traditional German one, and his treatment of Russian critics and scholars who are relatively unknown outside the Slavic countries (Pypin, Veselovskii, Potebnia) matches that of the "major" figures. Furthermore, Städtke follows the mainstream of Soviet scholarship by consistently seeking to find ways to match aesthetics with political philosophy. For example, he ingeniously explains the progression from Dobroliubov the "enlightener" to Pisarev the "realist" by pointing out that the former still sees