

seau, Chateaubriand, and Sarrazin (1775–1852), an almost forgotten author. One of these stories, “Tri poiasa,” achieved fame as an original work by Zhukovsky. Mrs. Eichstädt, however, proves it to be an adaptation of Sarrazin’s “Les trois ceintures,” with Russian names and details substituted for Sarrazin’s oriental setting.

The second essay deals with Zhukovsky’s stay in Derpt (1815–17), where he became friends with the German poet and composer August Heinrich von Weyrauch (1788–1865). The melody of Weyrauch’s songbooks, *Fünf Sammlungen deutscher Lieder* (edited 1820–27), inspired Zhukovsky to translate poems by Goethe, Schiller, Jacobi, Arndt, and Weyrauch.

The final study analyzes the translation of the German romantic La Motte-Fouqué’s *Undine*, a prose piece which Zhukovsky transformed into “fairy-tale hexameter.” The author demonstrates that the Russian poet is more or less faithful to the original text, but that even in his most faithful moments he pays tribute to sentimentalism.

It is extremely instructive to read Mrs. Eichstädt’s comparative analysis of translations from the different literary-historical layers of the same period. Her method ought to be applied more extensively in the future to aid in the identification of literary styles. In this suggestive book the reader will regret only the absence of an index and a more complete bibliography.

WALTER SCHAMSCHULA
University of California, Berkeley

THE YOUNG DOSTOEVSKY (1846–1849): A CRITICAL STUDY. By *Victor Terras*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 69. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969. 326 pp. 52 Dutch guilders.

Because there was no book on Dostoevsky’s early work, and because much of the criticism on this topic is available only in Russian, this book fills a serious gap. Professor Terras’s erudition makes his work extremely valuable to students of Dostoevsky.

The material, however, is organized into eight chapters whose overlapping categories result in incessant cross-referencing and repetition. Sometimes the continuation in a later chapter of a discussion cut short earlier seems to refute the initial statement, yet no connection is made. In chapter 2, “Experiments in Human Existence,” Terras establishes at length the symbolic importance of Devushkin’s shoes to conclude that he is “no better than Bašmačkin even when it comes to measuring the true value of a pair of shoes” (p. 62). No connection is made between the shoe motif and Dostoevsky’s psychology of poverty, which is later discussed separately (pp. 141–42). Furthermore, Dostoevsky’s polemic with Gogol, crucial regarding this point, is here ignored.

The book is weakest in psychological interpretation. For example, the analysis of *Mr. Prokharchin* is incomplete. Terras feels that the censor’s cuts obscure the comparison of Prokharchin and Napoleon (p. 26), although he proposes that Prokharchin may want money for the power it brings. Later, however, Terras sees Prokharchin’s hoarding as motivated by fear, and therefore misses the relevance of Prokharchin’s dream (p. 186): in seeking to become a Napoleon by acquiring money, Prokharchin, like Raskolnikov, commits the crime of cutting himself off from his fellow men. His dream, then, enumerates instances of his refusal to share the com-

mon burden of human suffering. But Terras, having described the dream in detail, concludes: "It is difficult to decide whether Proxarčín's dream is supposed to indicate that he has a guilty conscience, or simply emphasize his fear of people and of life in general" (p. 186).

There is much description, but insufficient analysis of the final scene of *Mr. Prokharchin*. Terras says that the dead body "becomes curiously alive" (p. 134), but he does not explain the ironic intent: Prokharchin, treated as an inanimate object when he was alive, is granted awed attention only after he has in fact become a mere thing.

Chapter 4 contains an interesting discussion of the manifestation of psychology in style, and chapter 5 includes a fine treatment of the levels of Devushkin's speech (similar to Vinogradov's in *Iazyk i stil' khudozhestvennoi literatury*, which should have been cited in the bibliography).

Chapter 6, "Structure and Texture," makes many interesting observations, relying heavily on Bakhtin's discussion of polyphony. Otherwise, few references are made to the canonical criticism on early Dostoevsky. Tseitlin's "O bednom chinovnike" is cited (in the text but not in the bibliography), but Vinogradov's more relevant analysis of *Poor Folk's* relationship to the literature of the forties is not mentioned. The concluding chapter summarizes material which Mochulsky treats in greater detail, and does not use relevant material from Komarovich's "Iunost' Dostoevskogo," which is also missing from the bibliography. Other omissions include Fanger's *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism* and related material on Gogol (Tschizewskij's "O 'Shinele' Gogolia," Eikhenbaum's "Kak sdelena 'Shinel' Gogolia," and so forth). Terras deliberately avoids the problem of Gogol and Dostoevsky, which seems unwise. In this connection it would have been helpful to distinguish between Dostoevsky's earliest works (*Poor Folk*) and the later ones (*The Landlady*).

The book nonetheless provides insight into Dostoevsky's concept of style and is an important addition to the field.

PRISCILLA MEYER
Wesleyan University

DOSTOEVSKY, TOLSTOY AND NIETZSCHE. By *Lev Shestov*. Translated by *Bernard Martin* and *Spencer Roberts*. Introduction by *Bernard Martin*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1970. xxx, 322 pp. \$10.00.

A SHESTOV ANTHOLOGY. By *Lev Shestov*. Edited, with an introduction, by *Bernard Martin*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1970. xvii, 328 pp. \$10.00.

There are now five volumes of the works of Lev Shestov (1866–1938) in print in English under the editorship of Bernard Martin and published by Ohio University Press. One more, a reprint entitled *Chekhov and Other Essays*, is available in a cheap edition (Ann Arbor Paperbacks). Not since the palmy days of Merezhkovsky and Berdiaev has a Russian religious philosopher been made so readily available to the American public. Since I have the highest esteem for Shestov as a writer, I am both impressed and grateful. Bernard Martin, the scholar largely responsible for this renaissance, is to be congratulated not only for his good judgment and sober scholarship but for his perseverance and persuasiveness as well.

The first volume consists of two essays by Shestov—one on Tolstoy and