

and philosophical ideas; his influence on world literature; the realism, the dramatic qualities of his work; the novels as tragedies; the novels as comedies—all these aspects, and many more, have already been well covered”). In the second sentence he defines his own intention, which is “not to do what has already been done, but rather to look closely at the texts of the major novels and see how each functions as a work of art.” To this intention he is faithful in the series of double chapters on the four great novels which follows an introductory tracing of Dostoevsky’s career through *Notes from Underground*—though, given the vagueness of the intention, infidelity would be a difficult thing. What he offers, in fact, is detailed, eclectic discussions, which begin with a few lines of biographical background and center on structure, motif, symbol, idea, and sometimes political and cultural background. These discussions reflect careful reading of the novels; they contain intelligent observations and at least one particularly interesting discovery, concerning the extent to which the lore of dissident religious sects is made to play a prominent (if often covert) role in all the large novels.

These discussions are not, however, based on any clear methodology. They do not seek with any consistency to incorporate or build on the best Russian and Western work; indeed, they give few signs that the author is acquainted with it. There is no bibliography, and references to other critics are sparse and perfunctory. One searches in vain for any mention of Bakhtin or Bem or Chirkov; of Wasiolek’s book, or Jackson’s, or Belknap’s; or of the important articles which Joseph Frank has been publishing over the last decade. As a result, Peace’s conclusions (and many of his generalizations), lacking qualification as they do, seem disappointingly elementary, and often show as well a tendency to beg critical questions through the use of impressionistic terminology: “A constant thread running through Dostoyevsky’s major writing is that of polemics with the nihilists” (p. 299). “The theme of beauty is an important one for Dostoyevsky” (p. 302). “The other great motive force in Dostoyevsky’s work is his gift for drama. This is so strong that under his pen even ideas can take on a dramatic intensity” (p. 310). “The behaviour of Dostoyevsky’s characters is, on many occasions, extreme and irrational, but, with few exceptions, his figures are fully-rounded and convincing” (p. 307).

In one sense, these quotations—typical as they are—may give an unfair impression of the work as a whole, for the journey on which Peace conducts us is more interesting than arrival at the destination. His chapters could make a respectable set of lectures; their rationale as a book is more obscure.

DONALD FANGER  
Harvard University

THE NOTEBOOKS FOR *THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV*. By Fyodor Dostoevsky. Edited and translated by Edward Wasiolek. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1971. 279 pp. \$9.50.

With the publication of this last volume, the working notebooks for all of Dostoevsky’s major novels are now available in English. Unfortunately the most detailed notebooks that have survived are those for Dostoevsky’s weakest novel (*A Raw Youth*). For *The Brothers Karamazov* we have only a fragmentary account of the last stage of his work—which makes this the least interesting of the notebooks.

Wasiolek's commentary is, as usual, intelligent and informed, though his remarks are understandably brief.

The most striking item is the mass of documentation on court procedure (much of it never used) that Dostoevsky gathered as background material for Mitya's trial. For Dostoevsky's illuminating comments on the novel we have to turn elsewhere—to his letters or to the scattered entries in his pocket notebook (reproduced in *Biografija, pis'ma i zametki iz zapisnoi knizhki*, 1883). Those entries could easily have been included in the book under review.

The translation is generally reliable, although awkward in spots. There is, regrettably, much evidence of haste. A spot check shows that one or two lines of text are missing on pages 195, 201, 221, 224, 252, 264, and seven lines on page 233. Too often the space that should separate unrelated entries is missing, which confuses the reader. Printer's errors occur—for example, "Teach me to love" becomes "Teach me to live," a somewhat different plea. The symbols devised by Dostoevsky to orient himself in these entries—circles, triangles, crosses—are completely dropped by the editor without any explanation. Nor is it clear why Smerdiakov's frequent use of the deferential "sir" (*sudar'*) to Ivan is dropped, which changes the tone of the interviews. But these are minor objections in a job generally well done.

Wasiolek's ambitious venture of translating all the notebooks came to a close just when the USSR announced plans to publish Dostoevsky's complete works in thirty volumes. For this new edition the texts will be freshly examined. Since Wasiolek was able to take advantage only of the recently published notebooks for *A Raw Youth*, all of his other translations—based on old sources—may well prove to be defective. Furthermore, unpublished manuscripts from the notebooks for the novels have just become available in *Neizdannyi Dostoevskii (Literaturnoe nasledstvo, vol. 83, 726 pp.)*. I would urge Wasiolek to produce a supplemental volume containing material from *Neizdannyi Dostoevskii*. He should also include a comparison of any important changes between the Russian texts he has used up to now and the fresh readings in the thirty-volume edition. Producing such a volume is made easier because a complete translation of *Neizdannyi Dostoevskii*, edited by Carl Proffer, is scheduled for publication in September by Ardis Publishers.

NATHAN ROSEN  
*University of Rochester*

GOGOL' UND DOSTOJEVSKIJ IN IHREM KÜNSTLERISCHEN VERHÄLTNIS: VERSUCH EINER ZUSAMMENFASSENDEN DARSTELLUNG. By *Dietrich Gerhardt*. Forum Slavicum, vol. 28. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970 [1941]. 186 pp. DM 28, paper.

In selecting for the title of his book an inversion of the abbreviated title of Iurii Tynianov's famous article of 1921, Mr. Gerhardt, a Slavist no more than twenty-eight years old at the time (1941), must have been well aware of the difficult challenge of being considered alongside such a noted Formalist critic. In the body of his work, far from avoiding reference to his predecessor, he wages a courageous if misdirected battle against Tynianov's central exposition of the relationship between Gogol's *Perepiska s družiami* and Dostoevsky's *Selo Stepanchikovo i ego obiteli*.

As Gerhardt confesses in his introduction, he does not wish to restrict himself to either a solely synchronic (textual analysis and evaluation) or diachronic