Boris Pasternaks Lehrjahre: Neopublikovannye filosofskie konspekty i zametki Borisa Pasternaka. By Lazar Fleishman, Hans-Bernd Harder, and Sergei Dorzweiler. Stanford Slavic Studies, vol. 11:1. Oakland, Calif.: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 1996. 799 pp in 2 vols. Notes. Index. Plates. Paper.

An epigraph quotes Hermann Cohen quoting Friedrich von Schelling saying philosophy is born of poetry and will flow back into it; these two volumes give invaluable insight into a poet's sojourn in philosophy before his move on, or back, into a life of poetry.

Little detailed information has been available on the four years Boris Pasternak spent studying philosophy at Moscow University (1909–1913), with the summer semester of 1912 spent at the University of Marburg in Germany. Now we have 630 pages of his lecture notes, synopses of books he read, drafts of seminar presentations (his erasures interestingly preserved), and reflections on seminars conducted by some of the best philosophers of the age. Thus, for example, from Moscow there is an obedient summary of a textbook by his teacher G. I. Chelpanov, contrasting with livelier notes from courses by Gustav Shpet; notes on Heinrich Rickert, Edmund Husserl, Schelling, Plato; on Immanuel Kant and on Cohen—the doyen of Marburg neo-Kantianism—on Kant; aesthetics, psychology. And from Marburg: notes and thoughts from seminars led by Nikolai Hartmann, Paul Natorp, and Cohen himself. The materials are drawn from the Pasternak family archive in Moscow; they have been thoroughly and discreetly edited, with full bibliographical data added to each text; many dates have been established by the retrieval of library book applications; and there is a most useful 130-page introduction.

Pasternak moved easily between Russian and German, apparently hardly noticing the transition, so that for the reader who knows both languages there are macaronic delights such as: "To obst<oiatel'stvo>, chto sredi razno<obraziia> perezhiv<aemogo> soderzhaniia my *mnim* einen und denselben Gegenstand zu erfassen—opiat'-taki otnositsia zum Erlebnisbereich" (1:293). French and Latin are used too, as well as a certain amount of Greek and English; one receives the impression of a borderless European culture accessible to the educated contemporary mind.

A range of questions is prompted about how these student notes relate to the poet's subsequent work. The editors offer some suggestions, but this is not the task they have taken on; there is a whole new book to be written here. It might start with the way Pasternak's central idea that "art is interested in life at the moment when the ray of power is passing through it" seems to echo a particular undergraduate note on Husserl, or with how we now see at firsthand that the poet's fascination with "impersonal subjectivity" (1:68) is related to his fascination with Cohen. Cohen's philosophy is helpfully expounded in the introduction, which makes clear that his removing Kant's "Ding an sich" (demonstrating that there are no givens but that we construct the world) depended on the mathematical notion of the infinitesimally small; *this* allowed for absolute continuity and absence of stasis—concepts vital to Pasternak's poetic vision.

The introduction provides an illuminating and indispensable account of current debate in the two centers: Moscow, at a time of unusual philosophical flowering—with quotations from the memoirs of Andrei Belyi (another poet delving into philosophy)—and Marburg, at its neo-Kantian peak—with vivid sketches of influential personalities, both German and Russian, taken from memoirs that put Pasternak's own "Okhrannaia gramota" account into interesting perspective.

Pasternak's position emerges clearly. He had chosen philosophy largely from a desire for self-discipline; to curb his romanticism. Within philosophy, accordingly, he preferred criticism to metaphysics, the Germanic "scrutiny of the cognitive process" (1:28) to any traditional, and probably neo-Slavophile, scrutiny of the cosmos. (Pasternak's alienation from everything Slavic is a point made strongly.) No matter that the very ardor with which he studied philosophy suggested the romantic: he *could* have become a professional philosopher. One realizes with a certain shock that he was in fact exceptionally good at it; the notes are "first-class," the contrast with Andrei Belyi shows up his seriousness, and Cohen's encouragement to him to stay on in Marburg is all the weightier amidst this mass of new evidence. It is very moving to follow the process of his deciding not to do so. Early doubts—seen in letters and in the self-projective prose fragment on Heinrich von Kleist (1911), quoted and analyzed in the introduction—come to a head in events of that summer in Germany and in his eventual disillusion with Cohen. All is carefully documented; there is discussion, too, of his quite different relation to Jewishness from Cohen's.

Among the several recent publications relevant to a study of the sources of Pasternak's inspiration (Karen Evans-Romaine's *Boris Pasternak and the Tradition of German Romanticism* [1997]; E. B. and E. V. Pasternak's editions of his letters and of biographical materials), *Pasternaks Lehrjahre* occupies a notable place, greatly increasing as it does both our knowledge of the poet's formation and our capacity to appreciate his poetic oeuvre.

ANGELA LIVINGSTONE
University of Essex