

Martynov's poems that recommend themselves about as little in one language as in the other, but the better part of it consists of a lengthy analysis of Tvardovsky's anti-Stalinist poem "Za dal'iu—dal'." It is characteristic of Etkind that what he has to say about the original itself is as good as anything written about Tvardovsky's work, and would fully justify the article even if it did not also include the acute analysis of Wiens's translation—to which, incidentally, rather less space is devoted. As a field, translation theory too often attracts writers who if they were not writing about translation would not be writing about poetry at all. But Etkind consistently begins his work with a lucid exposition of what is there to be translated in the first place—of what V. V. Ivanov has happily called the "poetic model."

This excellent collection would be worth ten times its price if it contained only pages 341–63: letters written in 1942 by and to Boris Pasternak concerning his translations of Shakespeare. No, they are priceless. Here in little is the struggle of the translator who is also an original genius to defend his work against the forces of genteel and academic "correctness." Pasternak voices the rage of the artist whose work has been vetted by the certified expert—in this case the Russian authority on Shakespeare, M. M. Morozov. These hitherto unpublished letters make fascinating and often poignant reading.

CLARENCE BROWN  
*Princeton University*

RUSSIAN LITERATURE TRIQUARTERLY. Edited by *Carl R. Proffer* and *Ellendea Proffer*. Number 1 (Fall 1971). Ann Arbor: Ardis Publishers, 1971. 455 pp.

This fresh new journal is to be welcomed into the Slavic field, for its very first issue shows that it will fill some dire needs. It provides an opportunity for Slavists to show Americans that there is more to Russian literature than the great Tolstoevsky. It offers stimulating, fine work in translation and criticism, and is open to contributions from the new and the young as well as from the established. Best of all, its editors seem determined to exhaust one of the very best sources for a journal of translation and criticism: the top drawers of those literary Slavists who have until now been laboring in silence and with care for the work itself, without hope of publication.

*RLT* is a *tolsty* *zhurnal*—something new for Americans but well known to Slavists. Like the Russian "fat journals" it is divided into departments: "Translations," "Criticism," "Texts and Documents," "Moot Points," "Humor," "Reviews," "Bibliography," and "Queries." Each issue will focus on a theme: the première issue is devoted to Acmeism. Themes for subsequent issues include the 1920s, Romanticism and Nabokov, Symbolism, the theater, and contemporary Russian literature. This format provides stability, but at the same time does not prevent an issue from "falling apart" the way a good fat journal should. The first issue, for example, contains materials not only on Acmeism, but on Dostoevsky, Solzhenitsyn, Tolstoy, Brodsky, Akhmadulina, and others. Which is to say, with the editors, "The contents reflect the tastes of the editors, the needs of English-speaking readers, *and chance*" (emphasis is mine). The result is a variegated and fascinating literary journal.

Perhaps a few random comments can serve as a brief review. The translations of poetry range from fair to excellent in quality, and from "literalist" to "dynamic" in method. I did not think anyone in this country except Clarence Brown had the

erudition to attempt Mandelstam (he contributes here three translations in collaboration with the poet W. S. Merwin), but Alexander Kovitz's translations of "O, I See You Clear" and "We Shall Gather Again in Petersburg" are a pleasant surprise. Kovitz is a rarity: an American poet who knows Russian. Brodsky, whose poetry is also perilous for the translator, has been well treated by Carl R. Proffer and George L. Kline (who have their subject's admiration) and Jamie Fuller (who has mine). I think Fuller has done the impossible: she has conveyed the Brodsky tone (ennui, irony, and that insight into what Novella Matveeva calls the "soul of things") and the intricacies of Brodsky's metaphysics, and she has done so with fidelity to the rhythms, rhymes, and phonics of the original. Her translations of Akhmatova and Gumilev are also good poetry. If it is true, as the late Ivan Kashkin said, that a translator must be his subject's most knowledgeable scholar and critic, then Proffer and Christine Rydel have met this definition. Proffer's essay "A Stop in the Madhouse" is an excellent analysis of Brodsky's *Gorbunov and Gorchakov*, and it is paired with his translation of this, the most difficult of Brodsky's long poems. Rydel's essay "The Metapoetical World of Bella Akhmadulina" is a sensitive study of this fine poet, and it goes with her very feminine translation of Akhmadulina's ultrafeminine "Fairytale About the Rain." Both essays, particularly their notes, tell us much that we need to know about these Russian poets, and both are fine criticism.

Criticism ranges in this issue from "scholarly" (appeal to a specialized audience) to "literary" (appeal to a little magazine audience). Of the items under "Acmeism" I especially like Denis Mickiewicz's "Apollo and Modernist Poetics," and I should stress the importance of Boris Bukhshtab's essay (ca. 1929), "The Poetry of Mandelstam," published here for the first time. Under "Style," Nathan Rosen's "Style and Structure in *The Brothers Karamazov*" and Elliott Mossman's "Pasternak's Prose Style" are good. Richard Luplow's "Narrative Style and Structure in *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*" proves that it is possible to discuss Solzhenitsyn intelligently without tedious treatises on politics. In the "Moot Points" department Priscilla Meyer takes the writers of such treatises to task in an essay titled "Hoist by the Socialist-Realist Petard: American Interpretations of Soviet Literature." Her statement is long overdue. The bibliographies of Akhmatova, Gumilev, Akhmadulina, and Brodsky make this issue a valuable reference work. And finally, the illustrations—rare photographs—make for a handsome journal.

In an introductory "Notice" the editors state: "We see the journal as a 'post-horse of enlightenment.' Whether it will be a thoroughbred or a nag remains to be seen." In my opinion, *RLT* is what Pushkin would call a *kon' retivyi*.

LAUREN G. LEIGHTON  
Northern Illinois University

RUSSIAN DERIVATIONAL DICTIONARY. By Dean S. Worth, Andrew S. Kozak, and Donald B. Johnson. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1970. xxiv, 747 pp. \$22.95.

In the introduction to this work, the senior editor, Dean S. Worth, states that the *Russian Derivational Dictionary* does not present a description of Russian derivational morphology, but rather offers "materials" for its study. Worth and his col-