

unfortunately, characteristic of the entire book. Place names, names of persons, and titles of journalistic organs that served as sources are mostly omitted, presumably to avoid the necessity of closer identification. A few such data are relegated to notes, of which there are 42 in all, as opposed to the 251 much more precise notes of the Hungarian original. Lack of documentation and of data reduces the book to the level of popularization. And the treatment of various subject matters qua subject matters rather than mere events within the biographical context is too summary even for popularization. To assign a mere dozen pages to the discussion of the scholarly work of one of the greatest ethnomusicologists of the century seems less than adequate even for such a purpose. If the book still has some value, that is because its protagonist, a truly great man, had the uncommon quality that even his most casual journalistic utterances (quoted copiously throughout the volume) are impressively clear, concise, and far-reaching in their implications.

IVAN F. WALDBAUER  
Brown University

DOSTOEVSKIJ ON REALISM. By *Sven Linnér*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Stockholm Slavic Studies, 1. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1967. 211 pp. Kr. 30.

This book on Dostoevsky, the first of the Stockholm Slavic Studies series, is an attempt to investigate what Dostoevsky's views on "realism" actually were. To solve this problem, Professor Linnér examines very carefully and conscientiously all of Dostoevsky's nonfictional writings (journalism, letters, and notebooks) from the time of his emergence from his Siberian *katonga* (1854) to his death in 1881. Dostoevsky's novels are excluded from consideration of this question on methodological grounds. Writers who interpret Dostoevsky's opinions in the light of his novels, Linnér argues, assume that "the kind of special realism which is found in his novels" (p. 7) is also what he meant when he wrote *about* realism. Linnér thinks that this approach is not satisfactory and results in doing little more than using "his critical views to confirm our way of reading his novels" (p. 8). One might reply that it is perfectly possible to use a writer's novels to define and particularize the significance of general critical terms—whose usage, as we know, is rarely exact or unambiguous. The world of a great writer, after all, is usually of one piece, and it seems odd to refuse to turn to his novels for help in clarifying his criticism.

The dangers and misunderstandings to which this procedure gives rise are well illustrated in Linnér's comments on Dostoevsky's famous introductory footnote to *Notes from the Underground*. Here, it will be recalled, Dostoevsky says that "such persons as the writer of these notes not only may, but positively must, exist in our society, when we consider the circumstances under which our society was formed" (p. 40). Since Dostoevsky speaks of the underground man as being a product of his society, Linnér hastens to the conclusion that "Dostoevskij's view of man may not only be called realistic; we have reason to go a step further and call it naturalistic, quite regardless of the fact that the author himself loathed the term" (p. 40).

This is what occurs when one focuses on words, and neglects the vital artistic and historical contexts in which they appear. The underground man, as an ideological parody, is a far different "product" of society than a character of Zola's; and to speak of him as "naturalistic" in any sense is simply grotesque. He is conceived precisely to embody the struggle against that moral determinism on which the theory of naturalism is based; and some reflection on the artwork here would

have saved Linnér from this egregious error. Happily, this example is the most extreme in the book, which for the most part is very sensible and level-headed; but it reveals the inescapable limitations of Linnér's point of view.

What Linnér's examination shows has long been well known, though it has not before been documented so carefully and so clearly. Dostoevsky's ideas on art were influenced by Belinsky's advocacy of "realism" in the 1840s, and his articles in *Vremia* in the 1860s largely stress representative accuracy and "truth" as artistic standards. At the same time, his polemic with Dobroliubov in 1861, and some remarks in his letters, also bring him close to "a romantic and idealistic position." This contradiction between realism and idealism runs through all of Dostoevsky's thinking about art, and Linnér follows the course of his oscillations from one point of view to the other throughout the rest of his career. His famous claim to a "fantastic realism" is an effort to reconcile these two divergent strands of his aesthetics.

Linnér's study stresses what may be called the "empiricism" of Dostoevsky's idealism, his conviction that his "fantasy" was a genuine part of human life and not the access to some supersensible realm. This line of argument appears aimed at the very influential interpretation of Dostoevsky offered by Viacheslav Ivanov in his *Freedom and the Tragic Life*, which maintained that Dostoevsky's art implied "a vision of some higher order." No warrant for such a claim can be found in Dostoevsky's criticism; and Linnér suggests it would be equally difficult to support it from the novels. This last point may be questioned, particularly as regards *The Idiot*; but Linnér is certainly right in insisting that for Dostoevsky "the idea and the ideal . . . were thoroughly embedded in the concreteness of things and the process of social change" (p. 118).

So far as this emphasis is directed against Ivanov's theosophical readings, it represents a healthy reaction. Linnér goes too far in the other direction, however, when he assimilates Ivanov to Professor Robert Jackson's contention (in his *Dostoevsky's Quest for Form*) that for Dostoevsky "in its deeper action artistic cognition approaches religious revelation." Some such claim is implied in German Idealist aesthetics, whose major tenets Dostoevsky accepted all his life; and since art for an Idealist like Hegel was "the sensuous appearance of the idea," the specificity of the absolute as art (and not as religion or philosophy) required its total immersion and involvement with the real. This is one reason why it was so easy for the equally Hegelian Belinsky to turn to "realism" in the mid-1840s.

Once again, Linnér's determination to treat Dostoevsky's utterances independently of any context—whether of his novels, or of an exploration of historical influences—leads him astray and reduces the value of his study. But, if read along with Jackson's much wider-ranging investigation, the book contributes to providing the best and most reliable analysis of Dostoevsky's aesthetic views existing in any language.

JOSEPH FRANK  
Princeton University

THE NOTEBOOKS FOR "A RAW YOUTH." By *Fyodor Dostoevsky*. Edited and with an introduction by *Edward Wasiolek*. Translated by *Victor Terras*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1969. 570 pp. \$15.00.

Ironically, Dostoevsky's creative process in writing *A Raw Youth*, his commonly acknowledged failure, is documented more fully than it is for any of his great successes. For *Crime and Punishment* there are only a few, rather late notes, and