

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 Furthermore, unpublished manuscripts from the notebooks for the novels have just become available in *Neizdannyi Dostoevskii (Literaturnoe nasledstvo, vol. 83, 726 pp.)*.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

(biography and literary history) approach, and makes a fairly good case for the limitations of rigid adherence to one methodology in studying literature. Unfortunately in his own study Gerhardt fails to distinguish between the diverse nature and objectives of such approaches. As a result, biographical and historical citations from the authors' letters and critical remarks concerning certain texts are juxtaposed in such a way that it occasionally becomes difficult to see exactly what the writer is trying to establish. At times it would seem that Gerhardt tries misguidedly to employ biographical material to prove a point about his interpretation of a text, yet at other times he attempts to use citations from the two authors' works apparently to enlarge their spiritual biographies.

In the postscript to the 1941 edition of his book Gerhardt emphasizes that the focus of his work is on Gogol rather than Dostoevsky, and would seem to identify himself as a student of Gogol in a world of Dostoevsky scholars. If this is the case, it may in part explain why the author takes such an aggressive stand toward Tynianov's claim that Dostoevsky parodied Gogol (in particular his *Perepiska*) in the work *Selo Stepanchikovo*. His effusive efforts to refute Tynianov's arguments are marred, I think, by a fundamental misunderstanding of Tynianov's definition of parody. Although Tynianov emphasized in his article that parody in no way implies the presence of hostile polemics (satire?), Gerhardt consistently sees the two concepts as inseparable. He attempts therefore to establish on the basis of biographical and textual material that Dostoevsky did not harbor or express any disrespectful thoughts or feelings toward Gogol, and that after his return from exile he was neither in a position nor of a mind to launch such a "personal" attack. Gerhardt is so strongly moved by what he believes is Tynianov's implication of the political and personal vilification of Gogol through parody that he feels called upon to justify *Perepiska* even though the feverish political debates of the Belinsky era are long past.

What this would seem to show is that Gerhardt misunderstands Tynianov's view of the literary nature of parody. By wrongly classifying Tynianov's opinions with those of Belinsky and other radical critics of the nineteenth century, Gerhardt demonstrates his own inability to think in terms that are not polemical. He thereby fails to consider the complicated problems raised by Tynianov's definition of parody as the creative (nonpolemical) reworking of prior material into a literary work.

Despite the presumptuousness of the book's broad title, Gerhardt's work does provide some useful and basic biographical and textual information concerning the literary activity of the two authors.

DAVID BORKER  
Yale University

NIKOLAI STRAKHOV. By *Linda Gerstein*. Russian Research Center Studies, 65. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971. xi, 233 pp. \$8.50.

Dostoevsky once described Nikolai Strakhov (1828–96) as "the only real critic of our times." Moreover, it is as a critic, book reviewer, and correspondent with Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and others that Strakhov is best known to students of Russian literature. But Professor Gerstein takes a broader approach here, leaning more toward Tolstoy's opinion that Strakhov was destined for "pure philosophical activity." Actually, his intellectual range was so wide that the Russian term *myslitel'* might well be used. To describe his ideological bent Mrs. Gerstein uses the word