

a greater or lesser degree, emphasize that the basic and ultimate purposes of literature are extra-aesthetic. The boldest statements to this effect are by Grigoriev and Soloviev respectively: "But for me an artistic work is a revelation of the great secrets of the soul and of life, the sole decider of social and ethical questions" (p. 108); "Artists and poets must again become priests and prophets, . . . not only will the religious idea possess them, but they will possess it and consciously govern its earthly incarnations" (p. 171). The importance attributed to art, by conservatives and radicals alike, reflects the absence of democratic political life in nineteenth-century Russia. Then, as now, literature and its study served both as a compensation for such absence and as an alternative vehicle for the propagation of ideologies.

The translators are to be commended for producing generally readable and what appear to be accurate versions. The texts are annotated, and a helpful index is included.

ARTHUR LEVIN
University of Calgary

APOLLON GRIGOR'EV: SOCHINENIJA. Vol. 1: KRITIKA. Edited, with an introductory essay and notes, by *V. S. Krupitsch*. Villanova: Villanova University Press, 1970. xxxvi, 415 pp.

This edition of some of Apollon Grigoriev's more important articles and reviews is a most meritorious undertaking, especially since Professor Krupitsch has taken care not to include in his collection any of the material printed in the Gosizdat edition of 1967. His selection is a representative one, and perfectly adequate for the purpose of acquainting a student of Russian literature with Grigoriev's thought. It will no doubt appear on many reading lists from now on.

Professor Krupitsch has provided his selection with ample and useful explanatory notes, which are, however, marred by some minor inaccuracies and misprints. His introductory essay shows his deep interest and justified admiration for Grigoriev—an important, immensely likable, and long-neglected figure. Understandably, Professor Krupitsch is overly enthusiastic on occasion. Thus when pointing out, quite correctly, that Grigoriev had considerable influence on Dostoevsky, he goes on to say: "It is now known that Grigor'ev's philosophical thought was profounder and more original than Dostoevsky's, and that the latter's fame was earned partly by his expression of the former's thought" (p. xxxiii). Since Professor Krupitsch does not prove this thesis, or quote his authority for it, it leaves the reader merely wondering. Unfortunately Professor Krupitsch has chosen to write his introduction in English, and his editors have done an unbelievably careless job of proofreading. As a result, the whole text makes for rather painful reading.

VICTOR TERRAS
Brown University

THE SUBCONSCIOUS IN GOGOL' AND DOSTOEVSKIJ, AND ITS ANTECEDENTS. By *Leonard J. Kent*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 75. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969. 172 pp. 30 Dutch guilders.

It is now becoming almost as fashionable and interesting for American critics to seek an understanding of literature outside the literary text itself as it was mandatory