

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:

Novikov was not the author of the *Dramaticheskii slovar'* (1787)—probably it was A. Annenkov; Radishchev's blind beggar is not the fool-in-Christ Alexei, but the singer of a song about him; Arzamas never met under Karamzin's presidency—it had a different president for each session and Karamzin was not one of them; Benediktov was hardly the "laureate" of the Pushkin Pleiade. There are occasional mistranslations (for example, "The unknown singer flowering far from the vales of Germany" for Glinka's "Daleko ot Germanii tsvetushchei") but more frequently, embellishments (see particularly pp. 62–63, a description of Pushkin's father, attributed erroneously, incidentally, to Vigel). A passage from Vigel is used earlier in an extensive paraphrase-cum-translation, which thoroughly distorts its sense (cf. pp. 8–9 and Vigel, *Zapiski*, Moscow, 1928, 1:327–28).

Finally, a word about the transliteration, if only because the author himself makes much of it. He uses his chosen Library of Congress system so waywardly that it becomes a nonsystem. From an *embarras de richesse*: *poezia chustva*; *Ostapevski*; *bibliotheka*; Tomachevski; *romanticism dvatsatykh godov*; Aleksander. B. S. Meilakh becomes Meilakha and Mailakha, regaining his sex in the index, but with two separate entries; and I. N. Medvedeva becomes a Medved.

A. G. CROSS  
University of East Anglia

RUSSIAN LITERATURE AND MODERN ENGLISH FICTION: A COLLECTION OF CRITICAL ESSAYS. Edited, with an introduction, by Donald Davie. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1965. vi, 244 pp. \$1.95, paper.

THE NOVEL IN RUSSIA: FROM PUSHKIN TO PASTERNAK. By Henry Gifford. London: Hutchinson University Library. New York: Hillary House, 1964. 208 pp. \$3.00.

THE RUSSIAN NOVEL. By F. D. Reeve. New York, Toronto, and London: McGraw-Hill, 1966. vii, 397 pp. \$7.50.

INTRODUCTION TO RUSSIAN REALISM: PUSHKIN, GOGOL, DOSTOEVSKY, TOLSTOY, CHEKHOV, SHOLOKHOV. By Ernest J. Simmons. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1967. x, 275 pp. \$6.50, cloth. \$2.65, paper.

SOVIET RUSSIAN LITERATURE. By Marc Slonim. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964. 337 pp. \$7.50.

The growth of Western scholarship and criticism in the field of Russian literature has been rapid during the last few decades. D. S. Mirsky's *History of Russian Literature* (1926) and *Contemporary Russian Literature* (1927) were undertakings which a man of Mirsky's talent and erudition could tackle with reasonable confidence. Today, anyone who writes a book of even remotely comparable scope must not only survey a huge amount of additional critical literature but must also consider that his Western readers are familiar with the Russian critics and scholarly commentators on the Russian classics and expect a scholarly treatment of Russian literature to be on the same level of sophistication as any comparable discussion of their own literature. To write a comprehensive treatise on any aspect, branch, or period of Russian literature that is more than an undergraduate text is a challenging undertaking. Many failures are already on record.