

once uttered is a lie," appears as "Pronounced thought is a lie," which is neither English nor Tiutchev. Nor are most of the other poems.

There are peculiar renderings, such as "In the gloom-filled depths of the dark" for *v sumrake glubokom* (p. 27), and outright mistakes: the lyre in "Problek" mourns "across the skies" rather than "for the heavens" (p. 27); "I lay deaf to this chaos" rather than "Deafened by . . .," and "both capriciously inwardly played" (!) for "played (toyed) with me" (in "Son na more").

The footnoting depends heavily on Soviet texts, but is sometimes wrong, sometimes unnecessary ("The addressee of this poem is unknown"), sometimes misleading in indicating liberties taken in the text and specific meanings rendered differently—misleading because it implies that the text elsewhere is correct. There is a line in "Napoleon's Tomb" translated with no reference to the original, footnoted "This line could also read . . ." and then the correct translation. But there is no ambiguity in Tiutchev's text at all.

The clumsy versions debase Tiutchev's art and perform him a disservice.

RALPH E. MATLAW  
*University of Chicago*

TURGENEV-ROMANIST. By *A. Batiuto*. Leningrad: "Nauka," 1972. 389 pp. 1.49 rubles.

Potentially this volume would be a welcome addition to Turgenev scholarship and could serve as an introduction to Turgenev's work for the uninformed reader. Unfortunately the book does not fulfill those expectations. This is the more regrettable because Batiuto already has established himself as a specialist in Turgenev studies through some stimulating articles on sparsely illuminated aspects of Turgenev's fiction. The specialist will accept the present monograph as a collection of uneven articles on various topics and, since it is published under the "responsible editorship" of G. A. Bialy, will be prepared to find a renewed defense of Turgenev's "enrichment of the realistic literary tradition begun by Pushkin, Lermontov, and Gogol" (p. 3) and a staunch reaffirmation of Turgenev as the "champion of realistic aesthetics in literature" (pp. 36, 166, 227).

The first article sets the tone appropriately. In it Batiuto does justice to its title, "The Sociopolitical Contents of Turgenev's Novels," by repeating the hackneyed assertions of established Soviet critics and by referring again and again to the authority of radical nineteenth-century critics and to Lenin's sacred pronouncements. When at the end of this disappointing introduction Batiuto discloses his intention to examine diverse components of Turgenev's "synthetic art," including philosophical and aesthetic problems, one is tempted to assume that this first article serves as a shield behind which the author will turn to more interesting aspects of Turgenev's work.

But the following chapter, in which Batiuto concentrates on the philosophical and aesthetic connection of Turgenev's major novels with the "mysterious tales," is also not satisfactory. The author reiterates much that is known from his earlier articles and from essays by prominent Turgenev scholars. In his overbearing insistence on Turgenev's "materialistic world view" (pp. 44, 70, 81, 107, 131), Batiuto overlooks the part of Schiller, Schelling, and the German Romanticists generally in Turgenev's intellectual growth; he also minimizes Schopenhauer's role in order to give priority to the influence of classical thinkers of Greco-Roman

antiquity, and to Voltaire and Feuerbach. He succeeds in drawing interesting parallels with the adduced thinkers, which is not surprising since most of them shared a similar world view and intellectual disposition.

The remaining articles under such familiar headings as "Turgenev and George Sand," "Turgenev and Goncharov," and so forth, provide the uninitiated reader with a mass of information, until now dispersed in various books and articles, but here reinterpreted from a Soviet scholar's point of view. Unfortunately, that reinterpretation decreases the potential benefit of the subject matter. Generally, the author seems to be working in a vacuum, unaware of any scholarly work on Turgenev that appeared in the West after Melchior de Vogüé! His annotations refer solely to nineteenth and twentieth-century Russian scholars, and among them Batiuto's selection is geared to the requirements set by authorities. These limitations and the lack of a bibliography lend the volume a pedestrian quality. At best, it is a book by a pre-eminently Soviet scholar for pre-eminently Soviet readers.

MARINA LEDKOVSKY  
Barnard College

TWENTIETH CENTURY INTERPRETATIONS OF *CRIME AND PUNISHMENT*: A COLLECTION OF CRITICAL ESSAYS. Edited by Robert Louis Jackson. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974. v, 122 pp. \$5.95, cloth. \$1.45, paper.

BALZAC AND DOSTOEVSKY. By Leonid Grossman. Translated by Lena Karpov. Ann Arbor: Ardis Publishers (2901 Heatherway), 1973. 98 pp. \$6.95, cloth. \$2.95, paper.

PROBLEMS OF DOSTOEVSKY'S POETICS. By Mikhail Bakhtin. Translated by R. W. Rotsel. Ann Arbor: Ardis Publishers, 1973. vii, 249 pp. \$8.95, cloth. \$3.95, paper.

*Twentieth Century Interpretations of "Crime and Punishment"* numbers a bare hundred pages of text, a quantity that is insufficient to give the reader any sense of the diversity and richness of twentieth-century criticism on *Crime and Punishment*. The fourteen selections are almost all fragments, some of them as little as two or three pages in length. Most of the selections also are by foreigners, even though some of our best work on *Crime and Punishment* has been done by Americans. Snodgrass's magnificent essay on the novel is not included, and there is nothing of Reeve, Steiner, or Fanger. But we do have Chirikov on the capitalist ethos in *Crime and Punishment*; three pages of Konrad Onasch on "The Death of Marmeladov," in which he offers such gems as, "Life and death are closely intertwined"; and neither Kozhinov nor the editor seem to be aware that the legal and religious ambiguities of the word "crime" had already been analyzed some ten years before—by an American critic. Fortunately something by Joseph Frank is included, and his essay along with the essays by Jackson and Holquist are probably the best in the volume; they are also the only ones that are not excerpts. Even the heavyweights of twentieth-century Russian criticism are not here: no Grossman, Bakhtin, or Shklovsky, among others. There is at least some unconscious bias against structural and formal studies and in favor of ideological and meta-physical ones. Finally, the bibliography is a single page.