

agree with Lindstrom (and some others) that *Selected Passages* indicates that Gogol had never really shifted from his deeply conservative ideological position. With respect to an intrinsic analysis of the creative works themselves, Modernism and Existentialism are often encountered, particularly in stories such as "The Diary of a Madman" and in *The Inspector General*. It is here, too, that the device known as the "grotesque" (previously mentioned by Eikhenbaum, Günther, Erlich, et al.) is highlighted. Another dimension is brought out by the title of this chapter, "The Theater of the Absurd," and parallels are drawn with Ionesco and Beckett.

In her overall critical approach Lindstrom seems to favor the Formalists but also fairly presents the thought of Symbolists, Freudians, and even (albeit begrudgingly) the Belinsky-Chernyshevsky-Marxist line now orthodox in the Soviet Union. Her book, in fact, could be termed "eclectic," and perhaps this way is best in approaching its will-o'-the-wisp subject.

Lindstrom's text is followed by reasonably complete notes, a well-annotated, selected bibliography, and an index. Of course, only a few books and articles could be mentioned, but it is puzzling to note the omission of such important twentieth-century Gogol monographs as those by Pereverzev, Danilov, Mashinsky, Lavrin, Iu. Mann, Gerhardt, and Günther. Robert Maguire's collection of diverse modern essays on Gogol (Princeton, 1974) obviously came out too late for inclusion. Typographical errors are rare—for example, the misspelling of "Razboiniki" (p. 21) and "by" (p. 54), as well as the addition of a gratuitous "s" to the name of F. D. Reeve (pp. 177, 207, 215).

Because of its largely synthetic nature, I would rank Lindstrom's study somewhat lower than the three books analyzed by McLean, but it is definitely superior to the prolix, superficial works by Magarshack and Troyat. Her brief monograph is closer in scope and merit to Janko Lavrin's book (1951), though of course more up to date and, I think, better written. We all hope for a Gogol study someday which will be both lengthy and profound.

ROBERT L. STRONG, JR.

*Macmillan Educational Corporation*

E. A. BARATYNSKY. By *Benjamin Dees*. Twayne's World Authors Series, no. 202. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1972. 160 pp.

IVAN KOZLOV: A STUDY AND A SETTING. By *G. R. V. Barratt*. Toronto: Hakkert Ltd., 1972. viii, 252 pp. \$12.00.

A central problem in dealing with the Russian poetry of the first third of the nineteenth century is its relation to the poetry of the eighteenth century, especially French Neoclassicism. Much of the Russian scholarship and criticism on the subject, until recently, tended to equate the eighteenth century with Neoclassicism and to take the position that Romanticism came into Russia only when the Liubomudry imported Schelling's transcendental aesthetics. On the other hand, especially since World War II, Russian scholars have more and more seen Romanticism—as most Western scholars and critics have long seen it—as being centrally involved with the poet's *self* and with the nonrational and irrational, not necessarily including the transcendental. From this point of view, Zhukovsky's translations, even of Preromantic poetry, are adaptations that reflect his own inner world, and the small but excellent body of his mature original poetry is Romantic.

Similarly, Batiushkov can be seen as focusing and sharpening his adaptations of mainly late eighteenth-century French poetry (itself Preromantic in sensibility) to reflect the poet's own inner world. Seen thus, the generation of Russian poets of the 1820s—whatever its continuing ties with the eighteenth century—is a generation of Romantic poets, as, indeed, they saw themselves. This is not the place to argue these matters in detail, but the problem can hardly be avoided here, in that both books under review reflect, and in my view show the limitations of, the old Russian view.

Benjamin Dees's *Baratynsky* is a carefully done, extremely succinct piece of work that merits the close attention of the specialist in the period and in Russian poetry. Curiously for a book in this Twayne series, it is not written so as to be accessible to the general reader of poetry or even the general Russian specialist. It is a highly condensed scholarly monograph (showing its origin as a dissertation) rather than a work of criticism or even of scholarly criticism. It merits—and requires—that the reader have an edition of Baratynsky handy, read a particular poem, and only then consider Dees's explication. After a brief biographical account, Dees gives a running analysis and commentary on Baratynsky's poems, in chronological order except for a chapter on the narrative poems (which he considers inferior to the lyrics). The analyses trace themes and succinctly explicate poems, rather than give, or even imply, an appreciation of the individual poem or of Baratynsky's poetry as a whole. The interpretation of Baratynsky's development is that in his early period (1820–28 or so) he was essentially a follower of French Neoclassicism, until he met the Liubomudry, after which, under the influence of their propagandizing Schelling's aesthetics, he became a Romantic poet and produced his greatest works. Even in his early period, he is seen as mainly a poet of disillusionment—perhaps the greatest Russian poet of disillusionment. His personal disillusionment (which is interpreted as growing out of his biography) is in the later poetry lifted to what might be called cosmic disillusionment. However, one must point out that there is no clear dichotomy between the poetry of Baratynsky's two main periods as thus seen—all his poetry can be read as a piece, with a single main line of development rather than any radical change. In poets of the Romantic period, Romantic disillusionment is by no means an untypical attitude, in contrast to the rationalism (often stoic) of Neoclassicism and the Enlightenment. Disillusionment is an attitude not available to a Neoclassicist; this reader, at least, fails to find in Baratynsky's early period the "appeal to reason" that Dees uses as chapter title for it. And one wishes that he had devoted far more space for explication, demonstration, and documentation of the relation of Schelling to the later lyrics.

Dees's book merits careful attention in detail, whether or not one accepts his premises; the same cannot be said of G. R. V. Barratt's *Kozlov*. Everything about Barratt's book shows hastiness—hasty and superficial views and evaluations, hasty and erratic scholarship and even translations. A book on Kozlov in English would be as surprising today as one might be in Russian on, say, Leigh Hunt, Thomas Campbell, Thomas Hood, or Walter Savage Landor—except for the fact that Kozlov was known to his generation as translator of English works, particularly of Byron (considered by Kozlov and his time as the essence of Romanticism), and as author of poems on Byron. Hence the specific comments here will largely concern Kozlov's Byron.

As has been shown in detail by Antonia Glasse (*Slavic and East European*

*Journal*, 17 [Fall 1973]: 332–33), no statement of purported fact in Barratt's book is to be accepted without supporting evidence from elsewhere. The interpretation of Kozlov as representing Preromanticism, and at the same time as the translator who brought the "true Byron" into Russian, is a central unresolved (and unrecognized) conceptual contradiction in the book. We are never given a clear idea of what Barratt thinks—or what Barratt thinks Kozlov thought—the "true Byron" to be like. Kozlov was indeed known mainly for his translations and imitations of Byron, but the only long poem of his he translated was a Romantic verse tale, *The Bride of Abydos*. The rest of the translations from Byron are of short lyrics or short passages, few of which adequately represented much of what—then or now—would be considered the "true Byron" that a "systematic" translator of his works would have given; that would require substantially all of *Childe Harold*, plus *Manfred*, *Cain*, *Beppo*, and *Don Juan*. Of the some twenty-six hundred lines Kozlov translated from Byron, seventeen hundred were in his translation of *The Bride of Abydos*, but only thirty (to translate sixteen lines) were from *Don Juan*, and they are not of a nature to reveal the quality of the work. The "true Byron" of Kozlov's translations did not include the earth-storming or the heaven-storming, or the humorous or satiric (the Byron that today remains most alive and fresh). Barratt asserts, in contradistinction to the usual scholarly opinion and without presenting convincing evidence, that Kozlov exemplified a degree of literalness and fidelity in translation uncommon in Russia at the time (in contrast to Zhukovsky). Barratt sniffs at the level of knowledge of English possessed by Russian poets of the time other than Kozlov—especially Pushkin and Lermontov—without considering the evidence or scholarship on the subject. And then he commits three howlers in his own translation of Kozlov's Russian on the first page I checked (p. 98): *na persiakh belosnezhnykh* "on her snow-white fingers" (breasts); *v gondole odinokoi* "alone in a gondola" (in a lonely gondola); *polnochnnyi, veshchii boi* "prophetic, midnight buoy" (striking of a clock). These expressions are from Kozlov's perhaps most popular original poem—and one about Byron—"Venetian Night: A Fantasy"; Barratt's discussion of the poem is condescending and at the same time shows total failure to understand it. Barratt's publications up to now have been mainly biographical; what is new about his *Kozlov* is the publication of a number of letters (mainly to Kozlov) and some documents, including a prose poem in French, which may have been by Kozlov (pp. 115–16). The level of Barratt's criticism may be seen in his thumbnail critique of Lermontov's *Hero of Our Time*: "It is an obvious patchwork, the earliest chapters having been composed the last, and various influences are discernible." However inadequate this judgment of Lermontov's novel may be, its term "obvious patchwork" all too accurately characterizes Barratt's *Kozlov*.

J. THOMAS SHAW

*University of Wisconsin, Madison*

POEMS AND POLITICAL LETTERS OF F. I. TYUTCHEV. Translated with introduction and notes by *Jesse Zeldin*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1973. xi, 236 pp. \$8.95.

It is symptomatic of this book that its title is misleading. Any reader, but especially a reader of Tyutchev, would expect it to contain excerpts from Tyutchev's