

VINOGRADOV: THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE FROM THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY TO THE NINETEENTH. Adapted and introduced by *Lawrence L. Thomas*. Madison, Milwaukee, London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969. xxvii, 275 pp. \$12.50.

V. V. Vinogradov presents a challenge to the reader—the problem of extracting extremely valuable minerals from the crude ore which conceals them. All too often his unwieldy syntax and a sort of psychedelic pseudoterminology lulls one into incomprehension. He can also be frustrating for the reader who is searching for a reference or who wants to learn the author's views on a specific question: not only is there usually no index, but even Vinogradov's chapter headings can be Delphically unrevealing. Though *Ocherki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka XVII–XIX vv.* (2nd, rev. ed., 1938) is not the most flagrant example of such Vinogradov obfuscation, Lawrence L. Thomas deserves our gratitude for the useful service he has performed in condensing the original, putting it into eminently readable English, and providing it with an index.

Vinogradov's work begins with the seventeenth-century crisis in the development of the language and takes us through to the second half of the nineteenth century. As Vinogradov himself acknowledged and as Thomas points out in the preface, "the book constitutes something of a mixed genre. . . . It is a combination of a history of the literary language and studies of the styles of individual authors." It is also "a book of essays." For these reasons there may have been, along with some inconsistencies in the attitude of the author, a certain failure, again in Thomas's words, "to make clear that the development of a literary language is a *continuous* process." But for all that, and particularly if the reader will bear these limitations in mind, he will obtain from this book a clear picture of the development of the language during the period indicated. Vinogradov's work is a standard text, and it is this which prompted Thomas's undertaking. The principal purpose of his adaptation is to make available to the student of Slavic languages and literatures a clear and scholarly account of the main events and processes in the evolution of the language during the more than two centuries covered by the book. In order to enhance further the book's pedagogical value, Thomas has written a sixteen-page introduction which gives a capsule account of the Russian literary language from its beginnings to the point where Vinogradov begins.

It is impossible to abbreviate without some loss (the paring down of examples and the drastic cutting of some sections); but Thomas has succeeded in this self-imposed task without any loss of essential ideas.

WALTER VICKERY

University of North Carolina

SELECTED TRAGEDIES OF A. P. SUMAROKOV. Translated by *Richard* and *Raymond Fortune*. Introduction by *John Fizer*. Foreword by *Henry M. Nebel, Jr.* Publications of Eighteenth-Century Russian Literature. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970. xiii, 229 pp. \$8.50.

This volume is the combined work of three scholars: the introduction is by Professor John Fizer, and poetic renderings of the tragedies are by Raymond and Richard Fortune, working from the latter's prose translations. We are given four of Sumarokov's nine tragedies: *Khorev*, *Hamlet*, *Semira*, and *Dimitrii the Impostor*;

Richard Fortune is responsible for *Hamlet* and *Semira* and, for some reason which escapes me, has contributed act 4 to his brother's *Dimitrii*.

No rationale for the choice of plays is provided, so we must assume that the translators accepted the reasoning of the editors of the "Bol'shaia seriia" Sumarokov, in which three of the tragedies (*Hamlet* is the exception) appeared: *Khorev* (1747) was Sumarokov's first tragedy, *Semira* (1751) had the greatest appeal for his contemporaries, and *Dimitrii* (1771) was his most important "political" play. It should, incidentally, have been pointed out that the translation of *Khorev* was made from the second, revised edition of 1768, a date which marks the beginning of Sumarokov's second "tragic" period. The inclusion of *Hamlet* (1748) is nicely provocative. For lovers of Shakespeare who are interested in the fortunes of his plays abroad but are deprived of a knowledge of the more "esoteric" languages in which they appeared, Sumarokov's *Hamlet*, which was based on an acquaintance with the original through the emasculated French "translation" by La Place, is an amusing curiosity, but it may also and indeed should be seen as a fully representative early Sumarokovian tragedy. *Khorev*, *Hamlet*, and *Semira* appear in English dress for the first time; the Fortunes' *Dimitrii* originally appeared in Professor Harold Segel's *Literature of Eighteenth-Century Russia* (1967) (although there are a few minor changes), but it is nowhere pointed out that in 1806 the talented A. G. Evstafiev, a member of the Russian Embassy in London, published a prose version of the tragedy which was well received by the English press. In general the Fortunes are to be congratulated on their attempt "to capture the spirit of the originals and to re-create something of their aesthetic impact in English." Lack of space allows comment neither on their occasional lapses and excessively free reading nor on their many successes.

Professor Fizer's introduction provides a fitting complement to the translations. If some of his generalizations on the Russian literary scene are more striking than just, his analysis of Sumarokov's poetics far surpasses anything hitherto available in English. He does not undertake to comment in detail on any of the selected tragedies, but ranges widely but profoundly over aspects of Sumarokov's aesthetic theory. It is writing of this caliber which contributes to the much-needed wider understanding and appreciation of the achievements of eighteenth-century Russian literature.

ANTHONY CROSS
University of East Anglia

ZUKOVSKIJ ALS ÜBERSETZER: DREI STUDIEN ZU ÜBERSETZUNGEN V. A. ŽUKOVSKIJS AUS DEM DEUTSCHEN UND FRANZÖSISCHEN. By *Hildegard Eichstädt*. Forum Slavicum, 29. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970. 199 pp. DM 38, paper.

Any discussion of Zhukovsky as a translator should be based on two premises: Russia's most prominent translator ought to be re-examined in the light of recent advances in the theory of translation, and intensified study of the many unsolved questions in Zhukovsky's life and work should be the first step in this project. Mrs. Eichstädt's dissertation is of great value in that it provides a new scholarly approach to Zhukovsky's work.

The first of her three studies investigates Zhukovsky's prose translations between 1807 and 1811 for *Vestnik Evropy* of works by Kotzebue, Wieland, Rous-