

second volume along the same lines to cover subsequent work. In light of the need for careful and methodical treatment of Rumanian social history, this unpretentious book provides both necessary groundwork and a welcome impetus to further investigations. There is also a useful bibliography.

PAUL E. MICHELSON
Huntington College

THE DACIAN STONES SPEAK. By *Paul MacKendrick*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975. xxii, 248 pp. Illus. \$12.95.

MacKendrick has now written six books surveying parts of the Roman Empire in which he sketches the archaeological evidence bearing on cultural development. The present work covers most of Rumania (for example, ancient lower Moesia and Dacia) from the Neolithic era to the Slavic conquest of Histria in the seventh century after Christ. Initially his treatment is chronological, but in the Roman era chapters are topographical or topical (as on religion and the arts).

The author writes in a lively, personal style which sometimes produces exaggerated appreciations; where evidence is abundant, as in the Roman period, his account becomes almost a list of sites and emperors. He has traveled recently in Rumania, where he had good guides, and is at home in the literature cited in the bibliography; technical terms are duly explained. The lay reader will not be led seriously astray, but a serious student should not expect to gain any deep insight into the many ancient peculiarities of a land which still today differs markedly from its neighbors. Almost half the pages are given over to illustrations and plans, not all of them as sharply reproduced as might be wished; but, as a whole, the work is a pleasant perambulation over ground not often trodden by classical scholars.

CHESTER G. STARR
University of Michigan

N. M. KARAMZIN'S PROSE: THE TELLER IN THE TALE. By *Roger B. Anderson*. Houston: Cordovan Press, 1974. 238 pp. \$8.95.

Mr. Anderson's is the third English-language doctoral dissertation on Karamzin to be published over the past decade. The other two are by Henry M. Nebel, Jr., *N. M. Karamzin: A Russian Sentimentalist* (1967) and by A. G. Cross, *N. M. Karamzin: A Study of His Literary Career (1783-1803)*, which appeared in 1971. In addition, Hans Rothe published a major study in 1968, *N. M. Karamzins europäische Reise: Der Beginn des russischen Romans*, and, following the pioneering work of Iurii Lotman, a host of articles on Karamzin's prose tales have appeared in Soviet journals and *sborniki*, as well as F. Z. Kanunova's monograph, *Iz istorii russkoi povesti (Istoriko-literaturnoe znachenie povestei N. M. Karamzina)*, published in 1967.

Mr. Anderson adds nothing to this considerable body of recent scholarship. His book manages to be both derivative and inadequately researched; it is also poorly organized and written in a bizarre, jargon-ridden style. His argument, that Karamzin's tales can be broken into three separate groups according to Karamzin's psychological mood at the time of composition and the point of view from which they are narrated, is contradicted by the facts he himself adduces. His criteria,

what he calls "ideational emphases" and "narrative schemes," are muddled and inconsistent.

Anderson declines to discuss all Karamzin's stories, his only explanation being that those ignored "lie outside the scope of this study" (p. 19). At the same time, he devotes several pages to the *Pis'ma russkogo puteshestvennika*. A good deal of this material is taken without acknowledgment from an article Anderson published in 1969. He makes no reference to the article in footnotes and the book contains no bibliography. During his discussion of the *Pis'ma*, Anderson argues that there is a shift from the first person singular to the first person plural and that it indicates Karamzin was "eliminating the narrator's personality" (p. 39). In fact, Karamzin was using "we" to refer to himself and a nameless Russian *tovarishch* who accompanied him on a tour of Potsdam.

The most depressing aspect of this book is not the clumsy style or its numerous errors, but Anderson's lack of critical perception. One must conclude, sadly, that Anderson is himself an unreliable narrator.

The best short introduction to Karamzin remains G. A. Gukovskii's article in the fifth volume of the Academy *Istoriia russkoi literatury* (1941). The best studies of Karamzin's fiction are the relevant articles by Lotman and the excellent book by Peter Brang, *Studien zu Theorie und Praxis der russischen Erzählung 1770–1811* (1960).

J. G. GARRARD
University of Virginia

DIE FRANZÖSISCHE GOGOLREZEPTION. By *Helmut Stolze*. Slavistische Forschungen, vol. 16. Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1974. vi, 201 pp. DM 52.

Although it seems to be fashionable, nowadays, to look more closely at critical opinions about writers than at the writers' works themselves, one may certainly question the usefulness of this approach. Too often, tendentiousness carries the critic of critics to absurd extremes. Sometimes, however, a discussion of the reception of the work of an outstanding writer from one country by critics of another country can be worthwhile. Such is the case of the book presently under review. In this volume, Stolze gives us some information about literary connections between sometimes very heterogeneous parties and, alas, about the instability of literary judgments as such.

It is really quite interesting to read how Gogol was understood—or rather misunderstood—in French criticism. Of course, this criticism does not contain any new information whatsoever about Gogol. Exceptions are such excellent monographs as Boris de Schloezer's *Gogol* and a few others, but they were written by critics of Russian extraction and can hardly be considered to belong under the heading: Reception of Gogol by the French. This survey is a kind of erudite catalog of misjudgments about the great Russian writer, which can mostly be ascribed to the ignorance and lack of information on the part of his largely journalistic critics. The French critics were obviously unable to see that Gogol's work reaches far beyond national boundaries.

The first part of the book is a historical survey with special attention given to such figures as Sainte-Beuve and Merimée; the second part deals with twentieth-century criticism, focusing on the question of "the truth of the reality" in Gogol's