America. In her last chapter she leaps into the twentieth century with a suggestion that Levin's indifference to the fate of the Serbs (Slavic bothers) finds a response in Virginia Woolf's denial of feeling for the Armenians.

These are specific examples, but most of the book is more generalized, considering correspondences in broader terms of morality (Who is my brother?), love, vengeance, conscience, religious exploration (plenty of dispiriting Pascalian philosophy), and, returning to formal properties, the question of indeterminacy. This can be seen as a fault (not linking things that should be connected) or a particularly Russian virtue (reflecting the open-endedness of experience).

This study confirms my opinion of the two great novels. *War and Peace* is a sunny experience born in the only period of the author's life when he was, briefly, a happy man. *Anna Karenina* is a vindictive work created after the disastrous summer of 1869, when the author, misguided by Afanasii Fet, soaked himself in Schopenhauer. No one can do that and ever smile again; you can easily distinguish between a person who has been reading Schopenhauer and a sunbeam. For the rest of his life Tolstoi would require us to suffer for his sins.

I have been puzzled by the arbitrariness with which Liza Knapp's texts and subjects were chosen and accorded, or not accorded, detailed treatment. Why *these* writers in particular? Why not Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Samuel Richardson, William Faulkner, Theodor Fontane (think of all the potential in *Effi Briest*), or a dozen others? This magpie visitation, incorporating material from four centuries, different forms of writing, different themes for discussion, minutely formalist and broadly hermeneutic examination, is itself an exemplar of open-ended indeterminacy. It is not clear whether this is good or bad, deliberate or incidental, but I have certainly taken pleasure in reading it all.

Within these pages Liza Knapp has confirmed some truths of intertextuality—no book is an island, no story unique, no scrutiny unrewarded, no issue exhausted. Above all, she reasserts the joy of reading, comparing impressions, thinking and building attitudes and arguments on an expanding awareness of the world through what has been written about it.

Anthony Briggs
University of Birmingham

Border Crossing: Russian Literature into Film. Ed. Alexander Burry and Frederick H. White. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016. xi, 298 pp. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Photographs. £75.00/$120.00, hardbound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.215

When filmmakers choose to "adapt" (for lack of a better word) a work of literature for the screen, they cross a border not unlike the work of composers or sculptors who create a ballet or sculpture based on literary texts. The filmmakers face many challenges, including some that arise from economic and cultural constraints that may drive artistic decisions: expectations of the production and distribution companies determine budgets that have an impact on every subsequent decision, including time for production and length of the final film. Within these parameters, filmmakers choose which of the literary fabula events, characters, motifs, and so forth they can and cannot include. They must also choose how to convey information encoded in the literary text in the narrator's discourse and the internal monologues of characters, all of which in turn may have aesthetic features such as sound play, imagery, symbolism, metaphor, and so forth. Filmmakers must contend also with that which authors

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2017.215 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have not specified, or *unbestimmtheiten*; for example, the narrator of a literary text focuses his/her attention on the fact that Ostap Bender enters an office with swagger, not what clothing he is wearing. As we read, we imagine that Ostap is neither naked, nor wearing a tutu; either of those two alternative options (naked or wearing a tutu) would in the cultural context have to be the focus of the scene, but since they are not, we assume Ostap to be clothed. The filmmaker adapting *The 12 Chairs* for the screen must make a decision about costuming for this and every character in every scene, often without guidance from the literary author, just as s/he must do with every set. Filmmakers adapting works of literature for the screen must also make decisions about uniquely cinematographic devices, such as the question as to whether to use a deep or shallow focus in any scene, whether to use a long shot or short shots with rapid transitions, how to use light and color, how to use diegetic and non-diegetic sound, and many more.

Filmmakers adapting literary works created in one culture for a film to be screened primarily in another, such as Vladimir Popkov's adaptation of Jack London's *Hearts of Three* or Mel Brook's adaption of Il′ia Il′f and Evgenii Petrov's *The 12 Chairs* have additional borders to cross: what cultural references and cues will resonate in the hearts and minds of the viewers; in what ways will the literary text resonate as universal for the viewers; and in what ways will it present the culture of the text's origin as interesting, either option sufficient to bring audiences to the film. And lastly, what will be the reactions of audiences in the culture of origin, should the film be played there, as was the case, for example, of Joe Wright's 2012 film, *Anna Karenina*: some Russian critics judged the film "not Russian enough." Lastly, some filmmakers cross a border in time, adapting a work written in one historical period, such as *Anna Karenina*, for viewers who live in a vastly different historical period. In the Russian context, even a decade or two of difference between literary and filmic texts can make a big difference in interpretation in the context of the changing nature of political control in the USSR and post-Soviet space.

Border Crossing: Russian Literature into Film is a volume edited by Alexander Burry and Frederick H. White, with an introduction by Burry and a concluding essay by White. The book consists of eleven essays by individual authors, mostly on a single work of film, with some comparing multiple works of film based on a single literary text. The vast majority of essays focus almost exclusively on fabula components and character discourse, comparing the literary source text (the hypotext) and the filmic destination text (the hypertext), showing how these elements combine in different ways to create similar or different meanings for readers and audiences. Some of these essays fail to take up more than ever so briefly the uniquely filmic artistic decisions of the filmmakers, dwelling instead exclusively on the narrative connections between the hypo- and hypertexts (fabula and dialogue). Any such analysis is, in my view, incomplete. The essays that are most compelling in this volume are those by Olga Peters Hasty, on Bresson's *Pickpocket* (adapted from *Crime and Punishment*) and by Yuri Leving, on the suicide scene in several different fim versions of *Anna Karenina*. Each of the essays in the volume would be useful to an expert seeking more information about a particular work, and here I would especially commend Ronald Meyer's analysis of *White Nights*, Alexander Burry's essay on *Ward No. 6*, Frederick White's chapter on *He Who Gets Slapped*, and Robert Mulcahy's essay on Mel Brooks's *The Twelve Chairs*. Dennis Ioffe's and Otto Boele's essays take up the challenge of temporal crossings with regard to Nabokov's *Despair* (Ioffe), recast in the context of Nazism that Nabokov wouldn't have known when he wrote the novel, and with regard to Aksenov's *Starry Ticket* (Boele) turned into *My Younger Brother* with substantial political intervention by Soviet cultural authorities. The introductory and concluding essays are useful contributions to the field, and together with the bibliography and

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2017.215 Published online by Cambridge University Press

filmography constitute a comprehensive reference to important works. The essays by Olga Peters Hasty and Yuri Leving in this volume stand out as significant contributions to a framework of how to analyze other pairs of texts precisely because the essays take up not only the narrative components of hypo- and hypertext, which by their very nature privilege the hypotext, but also the filmic devices of the hypertext, creating far more compelling arguments. As such, these essays are important not merely in connection with the texts they analyze, but constitute a contribution to the method for analyzing such border crossings more generally.

Benjamin Rifkin
Ithaca College

***Russkii paranoidal′nyi roman: Fedor Sologub, Andrei Belyi, Vladimir Nabokov*.** By Olga Skonechnaia. Moscow: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2015. 256 pp. Appendix. Notes. RUB 260, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.216

Golden Ages are generally a retrospective phenomenon. The Golden Age of science fiction, for example, is usually located in the 1930s or 1940s, although Peter Graham identified it simply as "12." But the Golden Age of paranoia is something else entirely: it is almost always now. Certainly that was the case during the Cold War, and again in the 1990s, with the X-Files/Dan Brown Axis of Intrigue dominating the global entertainment industry. Our current age of "fake news," allegations of Russian hacking, and science denial renders these previous decades quaint.

In her thorough and intelligent book *Russkii paranoidal′nyi roman* (*The Russian Paranoid Novel*), Irina Skonechnaia wisely sets aside all purported golden ages in favor of Russia's Silver Age (1880s–1920), which in her hands proves to be Russia's true golden age of paranoia. The Silver Age coincides with the rise of psychoanalytic thought (and therefore Freud's 1911 study of his favorite paranoid not-quite-patient, Judge Daniel Schreiber), a fact that Skonechnaia exploits admirably in her discussion "Psycho-Analytic Notes on an Autobiographical Account of a Case of Paranoia (Dementia Paranoides)." Here, as throughout the book, Skonechnaia strikes a delicate balance between the historical (that is, how paranoia was being constructed at the time) and the theoretical (while Freud may have had the first word on paranoia, he definitely did not have the last).

Skonechnaia's choice of the Silver Age (rounded out by a Nabokovian coda) is not merely a matter of historical coincidence. By focusing on the works of Fedor Sologub and Andrei Belyi, Skonechnaia shows that the metaphysics of the Symbolist-dominated Silver Age, with its focus on correspondences between the high and the low as well as its emphasis on the hidden or deferred, provides a comfortable home not just for the *unheimlich*, but for a full-blown paranoid worldview. Describing Symbolism as a "return to the mystical against the backdrop of the reigning rationalism and positivism," Skonechnaia argues that the persecution complex found so often in her chosen texts is "persecution by vanished forms of cognition that are trying to form the extrasensory (*сверхчувественное*) . . . and connect it to the everyday."

Reinterpreting Symbolism as paranoid allows the author to revisit the movement's genealogy. Vladimir Solov′ev's influence has long been a given, but Skonechnaia points out that the philosopher's eschatology, in addition to its obvious manifestations in the verse of Aleksandr Blok and Belyi, "develops into the conspiratorial plots of [Symbolist] paranoid novels." From there, her focus on the "decadence" of the early Sologub allows her to identify "suspicion" as the "first stage of Decadent cognition."

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2017.215 Published online by Cambridge University Press