

Richard Fortune is responsible for *Hamlet* and *Semira* and, for some reason which escapes me, has contributed act 4 to his brother's *Dimitrii*.

No rationale for the choice of plays is provided, so we must assume that the translators accepted the reasoning of the editors of the "Bol'shaia seriia" Sumarokov, in which three of the tragedies (*Hamlet* is the exception) appeared: *Khorev* (1747) was Sumarokov's first tragedy, *Semira* (1751) had the greatest appeal for his contemporaries, and *Dimitrii* (1771) was his most important "political" play. It should, incidentally, have been pointed out that the translation of *Khorev* was made from the second, revised edition of 1768, a date which marks the beginning of Sumarokov's second "tragic" period. The inclusion of *Hamlet* (1748) is nicely provocative. For lovers of Shakespeare who are interested in the fortunes of his plays abroad but are deprived of a knowledge of the more "esoteric" languages in which they appeared, Sumarokov's *Hamlet*, which was based on an acquaintance with the original through the emasculated French "translation" by La Place, is an amusing curiosity, but it may also and indeed should be seen as a fully representative early Sumarokovian tragedy. *Khorev*, *Hamlet*, and *Semira* appear in English dress for the first time; the Fortunes' *Dimitrii* originally appeared in Professor Harold Segel's *Literature of Eighteenth-Century Russia* (1967) (although there are a few minor changes), but it is nowhere pointed out that in 1806 the talented A. G. Evstafiev, a member of the Russian Embassy in London, published a prose version of the tragedy which was well received by the English press. In general the Fortunes are to be congratulated on their attempt "to capture the spirit of the originals and to re-create something of their aesthetic impact in English." Lack of space allows comment neither on their occasional lapses and excessively free reading nor on their many successes.

Professor Fizer's introduction provides a fitting complement to the translations. If some of his generalizations on the Russian literary scene are more striking than just, his analysis of Sumarokov's poetics far surpasses anything hitherto available in English. He does not undertake to comment in detail on any of the selected tragedies, but ranges widely but profoundly over aspects of Sumarokov's aesthetic theory. It is writing of this caliber which contributes to the much-needed wider understanding and appreciation of the achievements of eighteenth-century Russian literature.

ANTHONY CROSS
University of East Anglia

ŽUKOVSKIJ ALS ÜBERSETZER: DREI STUDIEN ZU ÜBERSETZUNGEN V. A. ŽUKOVSKIJS AUS DEM DEUTSCHEN UND FRANZÖSISCHEN. By *Hildegard Eichstädt*. Forum Slavicum, 29. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970. 199 pp. DM 38, paper.

Any discussion of Zhukovsky as a translator should be based on two premises: Russia's most prominent translator ought to be re-examined in the light of recent advances in the theory of translation, and intensified study of the many unsolved questions in Zhukovsky's life and work should be the first step in this project. Mrs. Eichstädt's dissertation is of great value in that it provides a new scholarly approach to Zhukovsky's work.

The first of her three studies investigates Zhukovsky's prose translations between 1807 and 1811 for *Vestnik Evropy* of works by Kotzebue, Wieland, Rous-

seau, Chateaubriand, and Sarrazin (1775–1852), an almost forgotten author. One of these stories, “Tri poiasa,” achieved fame as an original work by Zhukovsky. Mrs. Eichstädt, however, proves it to be an adaptation of Sarrazin’s “Les trois ceintures,” with Russian names and details substituted for Sarrazin’s oriental setting.

The second essay deals with Zhukovsky’s stay in Derpt (1815–17), where he became friends with the German poet and composer August Heinrich von Weyrauch (1788–1865). The melody of Weyrauch’s songbooks, *Fünf Sammlungen deutscher Lieder* (edited 1820–27), inspired Zhukovsky to translate poems by Goethe, Schiller, Jacobi, Arndt, and Weyrauch.

The final study analyzes the translation of the German romantic La Motte-Fouqué’s *Undine*, a prose piece which Zhukovsky transformed into “fairy-tale hexameter.” The author demonstrates that the Russian poet is more or less faithful to the original text, but that even in his most faithful moments he pays tribute to sentimentalism.

It is extremely instructive to read Mrs. Eichstädt’s comparative analysis of translations from the different literary-historical layers of the same period. Her method ought to be applied more extensively in the future to aid in the identification of literary styles. In this suggestive book the reader will regret only the absence of an index and a more complete bibliography.

WALTER SCHAMSCHULA
University of California, Berkeley

THE YOUNG DOSTOEVSKY (1846–1849): A CRITICAL STUDY. By *Victor Terras*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 69. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969. 326 pp. 52 Dutch guilders.

Because there was no book on Dostoevsky’s early work, and because much of the criticism on this topic is available only in Russian, this book fills a serious gap. Professor Terras’s erudition makes his work extremely valuable to students of Dostoevsky.

The material, however, is organized into eight chapters whose overlapping categories result in incessant cross-referencing and repetition. Sometimes the continuation in a later chapter of a discussion cut short earlier seems to refute the initial statement, yet no connection is made. In chapter 2, “Experiments in Human Existence,” Terras establishes at length the symbolic importance of Devushkin’s shoes to conclude that he is “no better than Bašmačkin even when it comes to measuring the true value of a pair of shoes” (p. 62). No connection is made between the shoe motif and Dostoevsky’s psychology of poverty, which is later discussed separately (pp. 141–42). Furthermore, Dostoevsky’s polemic with Gogol, crucial regarding this point, is here ignored.

The book is weakest in psychological interpretation. For example, the analysis of *Mr. Prokharchin* is incomplete. Terras feels that the censor’s cuts obscure the comparison of Prokharchin and Napoleon (p. 26), although he proposes that Prokharchin may want money for the power it brings. Later, however, Terras sees Prokharchin’s hoarding as motivated by fear, and therefore misses the relevance of Prokharchin’s dream (p. 186): in seeking to become a Napoleon by acquiring money, Prokharchin, like Raskolnikov, commits the crime of cutting himself off from his fellow men. His dream, then, enumerates instances of his refusal to share the com-