interconnection of both Pushkin and Chekhov in texts which are created as public works of art and thereby speak to a universal humanity.

The third essay is an engaging, detailed reading of some of Pushkin's most popular lyrics, including "Yo glubine sibirskikh rud," and "Ja pomnju chudnoe mgnoven'e." He provides the reader with a detailed Formalist-inspired analysis of each of the works, placing them against the backdrop of his Decembrist sympathies. For a Western scholar, the analyses provide interesting biographical fodder based squarely on the literary texts.

It is interesting that, though Markovich claims the relevance of universal meanings and plots, he is dismissive of the large part of Russian critical work which seeks to establish writers such as Lermontov as part of the Russian pantheon of great writers and activists. His nuance is well taken, however, for the claims of universal value in the earlier essays are buttressed by Freudian and Jungian psychology in the final two essays of the collection. This is not an attempt to continue the polemic of Lermontov's political leanings (and hence his "value" to society), but rather the ability of the writer to engage in an ironic self-construction, impossible to achieve except in the process of artistic creation itself. (Markovich begins by basing his argument on the circularity of both Lermontov's A Hero of our Time and Pasternak's Doctor Zhivago.) This ironic self-construction is a type of poetic realism, a philosophy that Markovich calls "subjective biographical realism," using terminology Pasternak himself used with respect to Lermontov. Ultimately, then, the possibilities of universal value lie at the heart of poetics, even while discussing prose (something Markovich demonstrates when examining the short stories of Chekhov as well as Pushkin, for example).

Markovich's collection of essays will appeal to any readers interested in the complex matrix that is the legacy of the Golden Age from the 1800s to the current century. He weaves connections between the private and the public, the intimate and the universal, which inform all facets of his arguments. It is an added treat that the reader also sees the same development in Markovich's own thought, and it is a pleasure to contemplate the horizons that await Russian literary criticism in the coming years.

Luc Beaudoin

University of Denver


We face an interesting critical issue in considering the possible presence of the Gothic in Russian literature. On the one hand, the term can refer specifically to a tradition in English literature, and especially to a current in prose beginning in 1765 with Horace Walpole's The Castle of Otranto and extending into the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the term is often used more generally: the Gothic implies mysterious and possibly supernatural doings, brooding protagonists or perhaps naive protagonists who stumble into brooding antagonists and their mysterious doings, and shadowy castles (always castles). And, of course, we have an atmosphere of the macabre and the emergence of repressed, often sexual, desires. Russian literature has no
lack of mysterious plots and brooding, no lack of the macabre and repressed desires, and no lack of the fantastic (however one defines the term), but does it have the Gothic?

In twelve essays and an introduction by the editor, Neil Cornwell, *The Gothic-Fantastic in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature* is presented as a symposium examining various aspects of this central question. Chronologically, the collection begins with Karamzin's *The Island of Bornholm* and ends with Chekhov's "The Black Monk." These essays are predicated on three touchstones, all with obvious relevance to the presence of the Gothic in Russian literature: Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto*, which is often used as a benchmark by which to identify and measure the presence of the Gothic; Tzvetan Todorov's *The Fantastic*; and V. E. Vatsuro's existing scholarship on the Gothic in Russia. At least one of these three authors is mentioned in almost every essay in this collection, and some essays incorporate all three. This compilation never intends to be a comprehensive survey of the history of the Gothic in Russia, and only Cornwell's introduction and Richard Peace's "From Pantheon to Pandemonium" are broad in scope. The other essays examine one particular issue related to the Gothic, and most confine themselves to identifying a specific work as Gothic or providing an exegesis of Gothic elements in a work. A few essays address topical questions such as gender and/or sexuality, and a few address comparative questions.

The merits of the essays vary. Anyone interested in the subject matter of any given essay will find something interesting here, but a number of the essays will not appeal to the non-specialist. Nonetheless, a number of the essays are most compelling and intriguing, and I will single out a few that I feel deserve particular praise. Cornwell's introduction is quite interesting in its contemplation of the Gothic in Russia, particularly in his treatment of the intersection of the Gothic as a foreign influence with specifically Russian phenomena such as *dvоemirie* and Russian demonism in literature. Peace constructs a most intriguing model for examining gods and demons, and his arguments on inversions of these two populations are quite engaging. I found myself quite taken with Alessandra Tosi's literary archeology, as it were, as she makes an argument that a now-forgotten novel by Gnedich deserves acknowledgment as an early example of a Russian Gothic novel. We never learn if Gnedich wrote a good Gothic novel, but Tosi's work as a literary historian is certainly commendable. Finally, Leon Burnett's discussion of fantasias in Dostoevskii and Turgenev, especially his reading of Turgenev's "Faust," is fascinating and a pleasure to read. It suffers a bit from being disjointed as it winds its way from translation issues in Dostoevsky to the Northwest Passage, but the treatment of "Faust" is one of those special moments that compels one to read or re-read the work immediately after reading the critical analysis.

Specialists in Karamzin, Gogol', Odoevskii, Gan, Dostoevskii, Turgenev, or Chekhov may take issue with particular points or arguments, but this review is not the place for speaking to specific infelicities of argumentation. Two more general comments about recurrent problems, however, should be noted. First, a few essays seem to force-fit a given work into the category of the Gothic, and one gets the sense that an author attempts at times to make a good essay suitable for publication in this volume by extending valid arguments into tenuous ground by applying the standards of Gothic literature. Sometimes there just is no castle – the fundamental chronotope of