One ignores at one's peril the admirable battery of current bibliographies produced by the All-Union Book Chamber in Moscow, and the perspicacious will welcome the second edition of the late Yu. I. Masanov's guide to them, prepared by I. B. Gracheva and V. N. Frantskevich: Государственная библиография СССР: справочник, М, Книга, 112 pp. The booklet covers the publications of the 17 Republican knizhnye palaty as well as the All-Union one in Moscow.

The jubilee of 1917 has stimulated many Soviet organizations into taking a peep over their shoulders, and scholars at Moscow University celebrated the occasion with Советское литературоведение за пятьдесят лет: сборник. Под ред. В. И. Кулешова. МГУ, 556 pp. Among the nine essays in the сборник are an important general sketch by G. N. Pospelov and an interesting survey of Soviet work on the history of Russian romanticism by A. N. Sokolov.

The Russian penchant for literary series is of long standing and has by now much to its credit. In 1965 Библиотека поэта found its bibliographers (YWML, xxvii, 622), and now D. V. Oznobishin has recorded even more thoroughly the past and present (and forecast the future) of another noble band of brother-vols: Литературные памятники: итоги и перспективы серии. М, 'Наука', 128 pp. The 115 vols published since 1948 are listed (with references to reviews) and details are given of about the same number of vols in preparation. The latter include, for example, not only works by Kurbsky, Sil'vestr
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Medvedev, M. M. Shcherbatov, B. P. Botkin, A. A. Fet, and Alexander Benois, but also others by Malory, Rabelais, Gongora, Boswell, Emily Dickinson, and Proust. Editors and translators are all in the top class (they plainly need to be since they will be tackling, e.g. Donne’s poems and Burton’s Anatomy of Melancholy), and all deserve congratulations and thanks for a подвиг which Gorky’s ghost must surely be welcoming as a more than worthy successor to his Всемирная литература.

The Great Encyclopaedia Handicap was finally won during the year (not, alas, in a photo-finish) by the Театральная энциклопедия with a fourth vol. (Табакова-Яшугин, 1136 cols) and a supplementary and index vol. (296 cols). Articles on bibliography (30 cols) and театральное and the very practical classified index are notable features of the latter. The horse from the other stable, the Краткая литературная энциклопедия produced a fourth vol. (Лакшин-Мураново, 1024 cols) but is still three vols short of the winning-post.

Among bibls of work produced outside the USSR, H. Pohrt’s ‘Bibl. slawistischer Publikationen aus der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 1963–1964’, ZSl, xii, 57–95, supplements his basic bibl (YWML, xxv, 538). A 1966 supp. to M. Seydoux’s bibl. of French dissertations on Russian subjects (YWML, xxvii, 623) has appeared in CMRS, viii, 496–8; so too has the writer’s ‘Theses in Slavonic Studies accepted for higher degrees by British Universities, 1907–1966’, OSP, xiii, 133–60. This means that the output of English- and French-language dissertations in the Russian field is now covered both retrospectively and currently. Other countries might do worse than do likewise.

The bibl. of translations from Russian has received a massive reinforcement in the shape of R. C. and L. G. Lewanski and M. Deriugin, The Literatures of the World in English Translation, ii: The Slavic Literatures, N.Y., N.Y. Public Library and Fred Ungar Pub. Co., 630 pp. Details of English translations of works by Russian writers published separately, in anthologies, or in periodicals occupy over one third of the vol. Data in the first two categories are effectively complete, but the record of translations published in periodicals is by no means exhaustive. The work is none the less a vital reference tool and increases once again the debt which scholars already owe to the Library