

the myth of the "bezumnyi Edgar" (Alexander Blok, 1912) was disseminated in Russia, and she also sets herself the problem of the earlier discussed influence on individual Russian writers (Dostoevsky, Turgenev, Fedor Sologub, Valerii Briusov, Leonid Andreev, Alexander Grin) of Poe's work.

The author sees the specific character of the internal literary contacts with Poe in Russia (as elsewhere) in the fusion of Poe with the effects of Baudelaire and the gradual penetration of Poe's work by symbolist literary theory translated from French (see chap. 6, "The Poet's Poet"). Concrete influences are shown convincingly and in detail in the work of Dostoevsky, on which also an additional "confluence" (p. 98) extending to decadence and symbolism can be demonstrated. The longest and most productive chapter ("The Imp of the Perverse") is devoted to discussion of the symbolist prose of the turn of the century (including the work of Andreev). It is to be regretted that little-known titles of works by Russian authors (Sologub, Andreev, Grin) are cited not in Russian but only in English translation.

The internal conditions, and the basis for the influence of Poe and the response to him, in the Russia of the period are explored with great care throughout the book. The final chapter ("Poe as a Classic"), dealing with the years after 1912, sets forth a rather motley selection of events and leaves one rather wishing for an examination of individual aspects of Futurism (Velimir Khlebnikov's war poetry) and also early Soviet literature.

In the terminology of the newer comparative literary studies—for example, Dionýz Đurišin—one must distinguish between genetic relations, both "external" and "internal," and "typological" relations (analogies) in regard to Poe's reception in Russia. This distinction is consciously made and in many cases clarified in this book.

As evidence for the response through external contacts the author provides a thorough bibliographical apparatus, which includes not only translations of Poe into Russian but also critical discussions of Poe between 1852 and 1970 (ninety-one entries).

JOHANNES HOLTHUSEN  
*University of Munich*

CHERNOVIKI PUSHKINA: STAT'I 1930–1970 GG. By *S. Bondi*. Moscow: "Prosveshchenie," 1971. 232 pp. 77 kopeks.

One of the most appealing of recent developments in Soviet book publishing is the appearance of collections of studies, written over a lifetime, by great scholars who have died or reached the age of retirement fairly recently. Such collections by outstanding Pushkinists include those of Tsiavlovsky, Tomashevsky, Tynianov, A. P. Alekseev, and now Bondi. In the last half-century there have been many outstanding Soviet Pushkin scholars and many outstanding contributions to Pushkin scholarship. Perhaps the greatest contribution has been the textual edition of Pushkin's *Works*, published in 1937–49, with a supplementary volume in 1959, by the Academy of Sciences. No field of Soviet literary study has been more complex and more fruitful than that of textology—the development and application of techniques for producing definitive, reliable texts of literary works. Various pre-revolutionary editors had attempted solutions related to publishing Pushkin's rough drafts, but only with the publication of Bondi's *Novye stranitsy Pushkina* (1931)

was a dependable solution presented—one that has made it possible to replace unintelligible “diplomatic transcriptions” by readings of many, many of the rough drafts and even intermediate versions of poems which were later completed.

The first eight articles of the first part of this book present applications of Bondi’s method, resulting in new or improved texts of particular works. The last article of this section is an “accounting” (*otchet*) of the editorial work on the fourth volume of the textual edition of Pushkin; it can serve as a good introduction to proper use of the edition. The second section of the book presents two complex textological cases, one of a reconstructed hypothetical much-longer draft of the poem “Gorish’ li ty . . .,” and the other of the so-called “Imaginary Conversation with Alexander I,” of which editors had presented contradictory versions: Bondi shows the absolute necessity of using his system of reading and understanding the “layers” of a rough draft, following the train of thought of the author in composing them. The third part, “On the Reading of Pushkin’s Manuscripts,” presents in detail (pp. 143–90) the specific techniques Bondi developed, which are based first on determining whether a given manuscript is a rough draft or a fair copy, and then on studying the rough draft as indicating the *process* of creation of the work (including false starts and revisions of all varieties). The fair copy itself is seen as being produced “mechanically” from the rough draft. Detailed advice is given on the application of the technique, together with examples of its successful application to Pushkin’s works.

The first three parts of the book reprint articles that were published earlier (most in the 1930s, but one in 1952); the final part, the appendix, includes three articles written in the last decade or so and published for the first time here. They include examples of how successive scholars have worked toward the solution of the problems of a final version of a poem, with each making a substantial contribution. They also show how knowledge of Pushkin’s eccentricities of handwriting and peculiar employment of conventional marks for his own use, as well as knowledge of his style, themes, and poetics, can be used in arriving at the final, satisfactory solution of textological problems presented by a rough draft. Anyone who would write on Pushkin—or anybody else—should be aware of the problem of the degree of reliance that can be placed on the text used. For any scholar who would write on Pushkin, this book is indispensable.

J. THOMAS SHAW  
*University of Wisconsin*

TURGENEV’S “ZAPISKI OCHOTNIKA” INNERHALB DER OČERK-TRADITION DER 40-ER JAHRE: ZUR ENTWICKLUNG DES REALISTISCHEN ERZÄHLENS IN RUSSLAND. By *Jochen-Ulrich Peters*. Berlin and Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1972. viii, 141 pp. DM 46, paper.

This is the first serious attempt to throw some light on a *smutnoe vremia* (obscure period) of Russian letters—the style and poetics of the Natural School. Unfortunately this area, which is the real cradle of many outstanding Russian writers, such as Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, has been neglected by Western scholars for too long. Peters’s book, a published Ph.D. thesis, is divided into two parts. The first deals with the genealogy of the Russian sketch (*ocherk*) and the poetics of the Natural School. By analyzing different kinds of sketches—“physiological” (describing a person or milieu), ethnographic, and descriptive sketches, essays, and