

but the ways in which they do answer do not come from the questions. All the contributors to the volume (being intelligent people) in some way agree with this notion. Wolfgang Iser, in what he calls a phenomenological approach, examines interaction between text and reader, the building up of a "gestalt" of the text (p. 134), so that the text unfolds as a living event. On the one hand, we readers agree with that, although, on the other, we applaud Alastair Fowler's survey of the rise and decline of various, specific forms and Henryk Markiewicz's astute limning of the limits of literature, even though it comes to a sort of negative definition: "Verbal works are today considered part of literature when the represented world is fictional . . . , when, in relation to the requirements of ordinary linguistic communication, a 'superimposed ordering' is observed, and finally in virtue of figurativeness" (p. 197).

In the very next essay, Svetlana and Paul Alpers pry into differences between literary criticism and art criticism, come to emphasize the difference between verbal and pictorial images, yet finally urge that all critics "take on the role of either artist or perceiver and treat them as aspects of the same phenomenon, as the human dimensions implicit in a text or painting" (p. 219). Hans Robert Jauss, D. W. Robertson, Jr., Barbara Hernstein Smith, Francis R. Hart, George Garrett—what they say also requires and repays reading.

F. D. REEVE

*Higganum, Connecticut*

DOSTOEVSKIJ AND SCHILLER. By *Alexandra H. Lyngstad*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 303. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1975. 126 pp. 36 Dglds.

The author attempts two complementary tasks: "to trace the nature and extent of Dostoevskij's literary debt to Schiller" and to present "the climax of this relationship as it manifests itself in Schiller's impact on *The Brothers Karamazov*." The first two chapters present material on Dostoevsky's lifelong interest in Schiller, his complex reevaluations of his youthful enthusiasm, and echoes of "Schillerian" themes in his earlier fiction. The third chapter, devoted to Schillerian themes and motifs found in *The Brothers Karamazov*, is largely an elaboration of Čiževsky's seminal essay—so far as *Die Räuber*, theodicy, patricide, and the "higher man" are concerned—and offers several corrections and additions, as well as interesting new developments of the "Hymn and its Permutations." The final and most rewarding chapter deals with the three brothers and (Schilleresque) related motifs, seen now as operational in the context of the novel, rather than as restatements of abstract notions.

The author is conscious of critical pitfalls in influence studies, but succumbs to them nevertheless. There are two generic drawbacks of such studies: first, a failure not so much to define "debt" or "influence" adequately, but to limit, in some reasonable way, the possible ramifications of this concept so that the subject is not exaggerated and distorted. Thus, far too much is referred to the ostensible prototype. Second, there is the failure to gauge adequately the significance of the metamorphoses which the original work undergoes. Much "influence" is necessarily speculative because we not only do not know exactly what Dostoevsky read in several instances, but we also do not know *how* he read it, that is, what affected him, how it affected him, and what his reflections may have been. The notions that

“frequent association of Schiller’s name with situations and figures exhibiting moral ambiguity is by itself presumptive evidence that Schiller contributed to this cardinal Dostoevskian concept” (p. 30), that similarities could hardly be “pure chance” (p. 31), that Dostoevsky’s psychology “may have” received a stimulus from Schiller (p. 32), that there is a pervasive “negative influence [!]” (p. 27) and even, once, an “unconscious” influence, all leads the author to vague associations and speculations she had condemned earlier, and to an acceptance of a Hoffmann parallel that is totally invalid (pp. 76–77).

There are aesthetic, moral, and philosophical themes that derive from Schiller and remain vital in Dostoevsky’s work. There are, however, others that Dostoevsky rejected, and the designation “Schiller” itself becomes a shorthand term for a kind of misty dreamer Dostoevsky came to abhor. Its presence is no longer specifically connected with the poet, as in *The Eternal Husband* where it does not signal the presence of a Schillerian concept, or, if it does, one that has been so transformed that it can only be considered Dostoevskian. Nor can it logically be maintained and demonstrated that the theme of *Notes from Underground* is “anti-Schillerian,” that *Brüderschaft*-murder in *The Idiot* is of Schillerian provenance, that Ippolit’s “Explanation” is a gloss on freedom and necessity in Schiller, and that Kirillov’s view is an extension thereof with the addition of “eternal harmony.” The author might have spent less effort in Procrustean efforts on Dostoevsky’s early and middle work, since she states that after the earliest works it was no longer Schiller’s Weltanschauung that appealed to Dostoevsky.

The monograph constantly and unnecessarily tries to balance critical opinions of unequal weight and merit—Čiževsky’s and Kurt Wais’s views with those of Meier-Graefe, Carr, and others—and the critical apparatus seems inadequate and, at times, arbitrary, citing articles by Malia and Guardini but not their books, omitting Hans Harder’s *Schiller in Russland* (1969), and adducing ancient and outmoded works in English and German, particularly on Schiller. There is some material in Dostoevsky’s *Notebooks* that is not utilized at all. Nevertheless, the book contains suggestive material and its very exaggeration illuminates an important facet of Dostoevsky’s fiction.

RALPH E. MATLAW  
University of Chicago

THE CLEMENT VISION: POETIC REALISM IN TURGENEV AND JAMES. By Dale E. Peterson. National University Publications, Literary Criticism Series. Port Washington, N.Y. and London: Kennikat Press, 1975. x, 157 pp. \$9.95.

There are not many instances in which the confrontation of two writers belonging to different literatures is worth a book length study. But there are so many ties between Turgenev and James that a major monograph such as Peterson’s is well worth a scholar’s while. The book contains interesting observations on both writers, coordinated by an effort to demonstrate not only instances of direct influence, but also various kinds of convergence and affinity. Connections of the first type, though always debatable, are the most interesting. For example, one can certainly agree that “in the America of Howells and James . . . the name of Ivan Turgenev figured prominently in excited accounts of recent innovations in the craft of fiction” (p. 71), but one wonders if “it can safely be assumed that the young James derived the idea of incorporating a reliable observer within the action from Turgenev’s