

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*

TURGENEVS “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

the cycle story—by such writers as Lermontov, Dal, Kukolnik, Bulgarin, Panaev, Nekrasov, and Grigorovich, and by discussing related criticism of the sketch, Peters proves that this genre served a transitional function in Russian literature: it bridged the period between the historical novel and the period of realism that followed. The second part of the book is a detailed discussion of Turgenev's *Zapiski okhotnika*, with emphasis on his *staraia* and *novaiia manera* of writing. The author makes a comparative analysis of earlier and later stories in the cycle in terms of character portrayals, nature descriptions, certain stylistic and linguistic peculiarities, and the role of the narrator. In so doing, he shows Turgenev's gradual departure from the sketch tradition and evolution toward a more artistic style of narrative, which finds full realization only in his later novels.

With this study, Peters demonstrates that the achievements of the realistic period of Russian literature, with its giant representatives, were a slow, painstaking process of correction and broadening of the poetics of the Natural School as well as of borrowing from foreign sources. Along with the informative, excellent bibliography, this study provides an invaluable basis for further research on the development and origin of the great works of Russian narrative fiction.

VICKIE BABENKO

*The College of William and Mary*

LETTERS OF ANTON CHEKHOV. Selected and edited by *Avrahm Yarmolinsky*. New York: Viking Press, 1973. xxi, 490 pp. \$12.50.

LETTERS OF ANTON CHEKHOV. Selected and edited by *Simon Karlinsky*. Translated from the Russian by *Michael Henry Heim* in collaboration with *Simon Karlinsky*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973. xiv, 494 pp. \$17.50.

And suddenly, simultaneously, there were these two bulky, big books with identical titles, both containing a large selection of Chekhov's letters. The coincidence is not so surprising: similar editions have appeared recently in several European countries. Chekhov's letters have now become an indispensable companion to his works—shedding light on these works, the personality of their author, and the times he lived in, and at the same time providing delightful reading.

No reviewer can resist the temptation to compare the two volumes. Yarmolinsky's and Karlinsky's selections (abbreviated Yar and Kar) are of equal size, although Kar is in smaller print, so it actually contains more (note the price difference of 40 percent!). One is surprised to find that Yar comprises 413 letters, Kar only 185. The reason is that Kar used only complete letters whereas Yar abbreviated many. Kar has incomparably more comments, since many more unknown and unimportant persons and situations had to be explained that Yar simply left out. A letter is not, or is usually not, a literary text; therefore, excisions in a publication of someone's correspondence are mostly considered permissible. Yar, following the method of most letter compilers, omitted less-interesting passages; this way he presents a higher concentration of worthwhile material (the omissions are indicated by asterisks; incidentally, in a letter on page 403 a few sentences are left out without asterisks). He has a ten-page-long, matter-of-fact introduction, short explanatory notes, and a name and subject index. Along with his own translations, there are 115 letters translated by Bernard G. Guerny and 32 by Lynn Solotaroff.