

turalist but a phenomenologist. This was Roman Ingarden. The Russian Formalists have failed to be systematically cognizant of this line.

As to the second objection, Professor Matejka's view that there is a direct link between the impact of the Kazan school and the early adherents of the formal method can hardly be contested. Yet such a view is too narrow. As I stated earlier, the Formalists were far from alone in their search for an objective justification of literary scholarship. They were a part, albeit an important one, of a larger movement which swept European and American criticism in the twenties and thirties. They were acutely aware of this movement and both profited from it and contributed to it. At one time T. S. Eliot observed, "Each generation brings to the contemplation of art its own categories of appreciation, makes its own demands upon art, and has its own uses for art." In Russian Formalism we witness, perhaps for the first time in the history of Russian criticism, a highly sophisticated concern with aesthetic phenomena of a supranational character. Through this, Russian critics joined the common European generation of literary scholars. It seems to me that it is from this standpoint that Russian formalism deserves to be retrospected.

My critical observations are not meant to diminish the significance of this anthology. Beyond any doubt it is a valuable addition to the growing literature on Russian Formalism and a fine didactic tool for those whose language skills do not extend to Russian and Czech.

JOHN FIZER
Rutgers University

MASTERSTVO PEREVODA: SBORNIK SHESTOI, 1969. Edited by K. Chukovsky. Moscow: "Sovetskii pisatel'," 1970. 591 pp. 1.54 rubles.

This sixth issue of a distinguished series (published irregularly since 1955) like the others is devoted entirely to literary translation. The recent demise of *Delos*, along with our National Translation Center, leaves *Masterstvo perevoda* without any serious competitor in the field.

Anything edited by the late Kornei Chukovsky is bound to contain a leaven of the merely *dulce* to relieve the *utile*, so the material under review ranges from rather temporary, if diverting, journalism to archival publications and original theoretical work of a very high order. No one interested in translation can afford to ignore the 130-page bibliography, which covers not only the USSR but also, more sketchily, the rest of the world for the years 1965–66.

The best articles are those that survey the fate of individual writers or works in foreign versions. I. Kuzminskaja reports on the Russian translations of Nicolás Guillén, the Cuban poet; B. Ilek and G. Vanečkova on those of Vítězslav Nezval; and the late A. Finkel on those of a poem by Byron ("My Soul Is Dark," from the *Hebrew Melodies*), especially the translation by Lermontov. L. Frizman examines Baratynsky's translation into French prose of some twenty of his own poems, and thereby sheds valuable light on the little-studied area of "autotranslation," which has lately acquired a certain immediacy owing to the practice of such writers as Samuel Beckett, Vladimir Nabokov, and J. L. Borges. Efim Etkind—whose many contributions, beginning with *Poeziia i perevod* (1963), surely qualify him as the leading student of translation in the USSR, if not in the world—contributes a study of Paul Wiens, the German poet and translator of Soviet poetry.

Etkind's article begins rather unpromisingly with a study of several of L.

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