

the United States over the Cyprus issue, Turkey has rethought her position on her relations with NATO; she has drawn away from the American line on the Arab-Israeli question and closer to the position of her Muslim neighbors, although her relations with Israel are still cordial. Turkey has also found it necessary to open a window to the Soviet Union.

Just how all this was accomplished is recorded in this work, which tries to break the traditional mold of foreign policy studies. Váli does attempt to relate foreign policy to internal developments, but those are so complicated that the task cannot be managed within the scope of this one volume. That task would have been facilitated by a more thorough familiarity with the legacy of traditional society in the political sphere and a deeper understanding of Turkish urban upper-class life. The interconnecting web of personal relations still determines a good deal of what goes on in the political realm, and cannot be divorced from the field of foreign policy. For example, accounts relating to the treatment of Adnan Menderes and his supporters are still not paid in full, and that continues to play an important role in the political life of Turkey.

Cyprus is the key to understanding Turkish foreign policy. Váli does not shy away from dealing with the Turkish feeling that pro-Greek, pro-Christian elements in the State Department tipped the balance in favor of Greece. It will be some time before historians can examine the record on that score, but until then it is hard to fault the Turks on this one. It is unfair to ask that Váli tell us in this book why it was that America fouled the cosiest nest it had in the post-World War II era. I am sure he would agree that the makers of American foreign policy have never really understood or even tried to understand Turkey. Too many of the ambassadors have been old Arab hands who were assigned to Ankara as a place for their R and R. A lot of people were asleep at the switch in 1964. One hopes that Váli will turn his talents to that question soon, and tell us who they were and why it happened.

NORMAN ITZKOWITZ
Princeton University

THE ADOLESCENT. By *Fyodor Dostoevsky*. Translated, with an introduction, by *Andrew R. MacAndrew*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971. xxxiii, 585 pp. \$10.00.

In the opening paragraph of the fictional memoirs which constitute the novel *Podrostok*, Arkadii Dolgoruky declares that he has decided to record "slovo v slovo" all that has happened to him during the past year. Arkadii's inappropriate use of this conventional phrase is ironically symptomatic of the naïveté that underlies his autobiographical enterprise, in which he repeatedly disavows all artfulness and literary sophistication in the interest of sheer, raw honesty and fidelity to fact. Subtly the phrase emphasizes the distance that separates narrator from author in this novel. Dostoevsky is very much aware, as Arkadii is not, that reality is not constituted of words that present themselves to be accurately transcribed by the scrupulous chronicler. At this point, however, as throughout his translation, MacAndrew comes to Arkadii's assistance where Dostoevsky leaves him to founder within the confines of his own sensibility. Instead of choosing the exact English equivalent, "word for word," the translator mutes the sense of Arkadii's epistemo-

logical innocence by rendering "slovo v slovo" with the single adverb "faithfully" (p. 3). Unfortunately this minor example is indicative of the rather loose sense of fidelity to the original which characterizes MacAndrew's translation.

Throughout this Englishing of *Podrostok*, MacAndrew performs for Arkadii and other speakers in the novel the service which a conscientious instructor might perform for the author of a freshman composition. He deletes repetitious phrases; he amends faulty paragraphing; he breaks up and reworks awkwardly long sentences; he corrects occasional illogicality; and he finds alternatives for ineptly chosen or repeated words. Such an approach to translation would, at best, be justified only if one were to accept the discredited notion that Dostoevsky was careless of style. The frequent inelegancies of Arkadii's style, however, are themselves evidence of Dostoevsky's conscious art. Arkadii's style often reflects his emotional turmoil and intellectual confusion. Like the style of others in the novel, moreover, his style is especially important in view of the novel's central concern with moral and aesthetic form and formlessness.

In *Podrostok*, as in other works by Dostoevsky, theme is reflected in certain verbal motifs which recur throughout the book. The novel, for example, is concerned with the chaos that results when its characters make or attempt to make moral judgments and choices in the absence of any unified moral vision. Among the repeated words that reflect the obsessive but shakily grounded moral preoccupations of Arkadii and others are *podlyi*, *podlets*, and *podlost'*. The significant verbal repetitions of the original are virtually lost as MacAndrew—to cite several examples—translates these words variously as (*podlyi*) "despicable" (p. 62); (*podlets*) "villain" (p. 58), "pig" (p. 62), "cowardly swine" (p. 97), "despicable princeling" (p. 172), "thieves" (p. 316), "crooked" (p. 418), "as stupid as his big toe" (p. 469); (*podlost'*) "villainous" (p. 69), "despicable thoughts" (p. 306), "dirty trick" (p. 314). Other important words in the original which suffer a similar fate in the translation include *blagorodnyi*, *blagorodstvo*; *nichtozhnyi*, *nichtozhestvo*; *bezobraznyi*, *bezobrazie*; *mechtat'*, *mechta*; *podvig*. Although it may be difficult in translation to preserve a single root throughout various parts of speech, and although different contexts may occasionally demand different translations of the same word, such circumstances do not adequately justify the careless disregard for significantly repeated words and roots which this translation reveals. Too frequently, moreover, the translator renders isolated words and phrases with a similar disregard for the significance of the original. For example, the symbolic weight of Arkadii's declaration to Katerina Nikolaevna concerning her smile, "eto moi rai," vanishes in the translation, "that's a joy to me!" (p. 259).

MacAndrew's *Adolescent* may be stylistically superior to Garnett's *Raw Youth*. Occasionally it is more accurate. But much more frequently MacAndrew unhappily sacrifices accuracy to verbal facility. One need not naïvely believe that a translation should, or could, correspond word for word to the original to contend that a good translation must show considerably more respect for the words of the original than this translation evinces.

GORDON LIVERMORE
Dartmouth College