

writers in exile since 1917; thus, Setchkarev's statement that the best of Ivan Bunin's work "was written in emigration" (p. 169) is not pursued. Vladimir Nabokov is mentioned only as a critic of Pushkin and Gogol, and not as a creative artist himself. It is as if the work done by Gleb Struve, Simon Karlinsky, and others simply did not exist.

A certain British provincialism is sometimes discernible in the references given. With a single exception, one would never know from Auty's list of references on the Russian language that anything had ever been published in the United States. But these minor objections should not obscure the fact that this book is well worth keeping at hand for ready reference, along with Mirsky, Harkins, and a very few others. A great amount of information has been crammed into very little space. Whatever the authors' faults, they write clearly, which cannot be said about all scholars.

EDGAR H. LEHRMAN

Washington University, St. Louis

STRUCTURALISM AND SEMIOTICS. By *Terence Hawkes*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977. 192 pp. \$10.00, cloth. \$3.95, paper.

This compact volume is a welcome addition to the recent surge of books on its subject, and it has the advantage of brevity and directness of definition. In fact, the author performs a kind of "structuralist" operation on all the "structuralisms" in his effort to identify the essential features they all have in common. Following Piaget, he finds that structuralism embodies (1) the idea of wholeness, (2) the idea of transformation, and (3) the idea of self-regulation; and he agrees with other writers on the subject (Scholes, Culler) in locating the "ground base" of literary structuralism in the work of Ferdinand de Saussure and structural linguistics. The author's treatment of Saussure's system, and of the use Lévi-Strauss made of the linguistic model in his own study of myth, possesses a fundamental lucidity rare in the discussion of these matters.

The pages on Russian formalism rely heavily on Victor Erlich and on translations of the formalists by Lemon and Reis, but they do provide fundamental information, and the author suitably emphasizes the importance of Russian formalism for Western structuralism. Unfortunately, the contribution of the Soviet structuralists is not dealt with at all. Ann Shukman's book, *Literature and Semiotics: A Study of the Writings of Yu. M. Lotman* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Pub. Co., 1977), which was not available to Mr. Hawkes, together with new translations of Soviet structuralist essays too numerous to mention, now makes it possible to write with some authority on that subject even if one knows no Russian.

A concise statement of Roman Jakobson's position concerning the six constitutive factors of every speech event and his famous "projection principle" as the constitutive device of poetic art is followed by illuminating discussions of A. J. Greimas, Tzvetan Todorov, and Roland Barthes, especially their contributions to the study of prose narrative. The order in which the three are treated gives the unfortunate impression (certainly not intended by the author) that Barthes somehow "takes up" the "seminal ideas" of Todorov. Mr. Hawkes offers a brief exposition of those ideas, but the genre of his study—a concise introduction to the subject—leaves him little scope for criticism of any of the ideas he describes.

Mr. Hawkes's most original contribution is his treatment of structuralism (the "newest" new criticism) in its relationship to both traditional criticism, with its search for a firm ground extraneous to the literary work, and American new criticism, which treats the literary work as autonomous unto itself. Structuralism, as he points out, finds that "there exists . . . no 'objective' text, and no preordained content stored within

it." All "reading" involves a complex interaction between text and reader, in which the text is a functioning item in a cultural whole and the reader's judgments are, in fact, conditioned by "complex political and economic ideology."

The volume provides an excellent critical bibliography, which includes a section on relevant journals, and culminates in a very helpful reading guide to the student seeking a basic introduction to structuralism.

EDWARD J. BROWN
Stanford University

HAMLET AND DON QUIXOTE: TURGENEV'S AMBIVALENT VISION.

By *Eva Kagan-Kans*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 288. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1975. iv, 161 pp. Paper.

All is not what it seems in this book, despite the title, which leads one to expect an analysis of Turgenev's use of oppositions. Kagan-Kans's thesis is that "one essential feature of Turgenev's work has been overlooked. He is a philosophical writer, and it is necessary to read him in this way to understand his art" (p. 7). Unfortunately, she never explains what reading Turgenev "in this way" means.

Although Kagan-Kans characterizes Turgenev's attitudes toward German Romantic philosophers such as Schelling and Schopenhauer, many of these passages are general enough to sound like old lecture notes, and some of them contain internal contradictions. The penultimate paragraph in the book, for example, begins: "We could point out some affinities between Turgenev and the existentialists," and ends: "Thus, it is impossible to fit Turgenev's belief in the value of faith or love into an existentialist framework of *engagement*" (p. 142). Nor, I believe, does Turgenev have any significant affinities with logical positivism; but why is it necessary to say so?

Actually, Kagan-Kans has very little to say about Turgenev and philosophy; moreover, she does not even *propose* to relate his work to social history. She takes no interest at all in the structure of individual works, and very little interest in symbolism. What, then, is left?

A good deal, as a matter of fact; and this book is an excellent, innovative (though difficult to use) synchronic study of some major themes and patterns of characterization in Turgenev. Using her exhaustive knowledge of Turgenev's *oeuvre*, Kagan-Kans makes some very astute remarks about its overall structure, and sets up some convincing character typologies. She is generally good on women in Turgenev, with occasional lapses into strident dogmatism, such as her statement that "there is only one action in Turgenev's novels and stories: predatory love and passionate virgins in contrast to the man who is unable to live up to their demands" (p. 51). Her last two chapters—"Fate and Fantasy" and "Dream and Reality"—strike me as especially successful, although in writing the latter chapter, Kagan-Kans could have profited from Marina Ledkovsky's book on Turgenev's later works, *From Romanticism to Symbolism*.

If one disregards the author's stated thesis, Kagan-Kans's *Hamlet and Don Quixote* offers a great many stimulating analyses and conclusions, which will surely prove helpful to other scholars, some of whom might even want to relate Turgenev to philosophy.

JAMES M. CURTIS
University of Missouri, Columbia