In an introductory essay with the mysterious title "Orthodoxico Cleving," Barnet surveys the relations between Germans and Russians over the past three hundred years. A combination of the Oxford English Dictionary reveals "orthodoxico" to be a nonce-English term denoting "deserving at right angles to each other." The metaphorical implications of this expression remain somewhat nebulous. Presumably, it refers to Barabatko's observation of the Germans, in the process of carving a cultural space for themselves in the Russian Empire, "became Russified almost to the exact degree to which that influence proceeded" (7). The resulting "fusion" of the two nationalities led to a release of cultural energy. If we take literally the nuclear metaphor implied in this image, we might note that the "cold fusion" studied in the title of the book is something that physicists have thus far been unable to achieve. Barabatko underlines the extent to which the German-Russian cultural exchange has been one-way street. He perhaps overstates the case, however, when he claims that, unlike for Russian immigrants in Berlin in the 1920s, "hardly anything significant can be adduced in the reverse direction." (7) One could mention, for example, Kusminsky's seminal activities in Munich and at the Bahnhof, or the impact of Russian literature on Thomas Mann and other twentieth-century German novelists.

The cultural interaction between Russia and Germany is such a vast field, and touches on so many different spheres, that it provides an almost unlimited supply of possible topics. With the exception of William Craft Brumfield's interesting assessment of the role of German architecture in Russia, the present collection focuses exclusively on literature and philosophy. Even within this limited sphere, approaches abound. We find traditional studies of reception and influence, such as the impact of Ch. F. Gellert on the literary writings of Catherine II. Great (Annetta Engel-Braunschmidt), of Friedrich von Schiller's poetry on Derzhavin (Anna Lise Creutz), or of T. A. Hoffmann on Gogol (Priscilla Meyer). Chesney Ransome applies her talent for ferreting out subtleties to investigate Goethean elements in Nekotv's, while Katrin R geom-Romaine detects allusions to Heine in the poetry of Pasternak. It turns out, interestingly enough, that Pasternak refers not to Heine's German original, but to nineteenth-century Russian translations. Otherwise, the topic of translation receives scant attention in this volume, despite the fact that the book is dedicated to the memory of the Rikls translator, Konstantin Bogutsky. Barabatko provides a laudatio to Bogutsky in his introduction, but unfortunately refrains from giving any examples of his translations.

Another approach followed by several contributors consists in drawing parallels between Russian and German writers who, though probably ignorant of each other, still exhibit similar concerns. Maria Kanzinskaya compares Vatshsagen von Ewer's and Dostoevsky's approaches to Pashkin, Michael Bernard-Donals links Bakhita with Walter Benjamin, and Leona Toker finds a common concern with the "Discourse of Lest" in Kafka and Shklovsky. Given the crucial role of German philosophy in Russian intellectual history, it is not surprising that this aspect receives prominent coverage, from the role of Kantian ethics in the "Lecture on the Grand Inquisition" (Alexander von Schefhberg) to Kauf's reception in the Russian Religious Renaissance (Steven Crawford). Nietzsche's is the object of two contributions. Bertrix Glauert Rosenfeld searches Nietzschean elements in the theory and practice of Socialism; one wonders, however, whether the idea of the "beneficial lie" and of art in the service of the state ideology is not more acutely foreshadowed in Plato's Republic than in Nietzsche's writings. John Butt Foster, Jr., raises the interesting issue of Nietzsche's "transvaluation," which he compares to Nekotv's multinational identity.

In a larger sense, both "Russians" and "Germans" are of course constructed entities. This insight leads to the issue of national perception, addressed by several contributors. Roger F. Cook examines Heine's changing opinions of the Russian Empire, while Alexander Dolin studies the image of Berlin in the writings of Russian émigré authors. The "Russe Berlin" of the 1920s presents the curious case of a Russian-German non-encounter. As Dolin shows, the Russian writers living in Berlin had no appreciation for the sternest modern
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The third part of Tikhonov's book presents the most important writers to which Lukács and Bakhtin have applied their literary theories. Not surprisingly, Dostoevsky has top priority. Both thinkers were fascinated by Dostoevsky's accurate rendering of psychic processes, yet they interpreted this literary characteristic in very different ways. Lukács's views on Dostoevsky changed considerably over time: in the early Theory of the Novel, originally conceived as an introduction to a Dostoevsky monograph, he praises Dostoevsky for overcoming the aristocratic novel and introducing a new epic (176). Later, in a two articles from 1922, Lukács reveals Dostoevsky's psychology in his own sociopolitical pretensions, as Dostoevsky's 'is now hailed as the first and greatest poet of the modern capitalist metropolis.' Finally, in 1931, Lukács adopts the official view of Dostoevsky as prophet of petit bourgeois salon revolution (185). Bakhtin's views on Dostoevsky also reflect a certain, though not so dramatic development. Bakhtin carefully compares the two versions of Bakhtin's Dostoevsky book, from 1929 and 1963. Bakhtin eventually suppressed the sociological line of reasoning and stressed Dostoevsky's dependence on metamorphic processes. Dostoevsky's role as innovator is famously undermined in the 1963 book: dialogic imagination is no longer credited to Dostoevsky as an original writer, but appears as a necessary consequence of the stylistic implications of carnivalesque genres (210).

Another major writer who caught Lukács's and Bakhtin's attention is Goethe. Each planned to write a monograph on the German poet, but in both cases the materials were lost during the war. Lukács and Bakhtin depart from the same point, Goethe's "soulful" in the Lukácsian sense. Whereas Lukács considers Goethe as the historically determined expression of a cultural-political consciousness, Bakhtin interprets Goethe's immanent poetry in terms of the idyllic chronotope.

Finally, Tikhonov proposes a very thought-provoking reading of Bakhtin's Rabelais book as a "grand footnote" to Lukács's interpretation of Hegel's Phenomenology. Tikhonov demonstrates that it is quite possible to interpret the Bakhtinian concepts of "body" and "laughter" as essentialized forms of the Hegelian Spirit (271).

Tikhonov shows Bakhtin in a very new light, not as the lonely genius who created his theoretical concepts in the intellectual desert of a provincial Soviet Pedestrian. Bakhtin operated very precisely to the philosophical stratum which reached Russia—althogether astonishingly so to modernists with Marxist distortions—from Germany. The only negative point of Tikhonov's thorough study is in Hegelian title, which seems unjustly chosen. On the one hand, Tikhonov uses "theory" and "slavery" as interpretative figures for the relation between "subject" and "object," "author" and "hero" and the like. On the other hand, the study presents Lukács in a manner which he is challenged by Bakhtin. Both aspects may be to some degree true, but the readers are too blunt to describe a problem as delicate as the connection between life and art in a philosophical reception. This lapse can be no mean hide the fact that Tikhonov's accurate study is one of the most important publications in the "Bakhtinology" of recent years.