

ence between Old Russian plot narrative and contemporary Russian prose (a topic for a new book?), thereby raising more questions than he answers. He judiciously concludes the book, however, simply by saying that the study of Old Russian "belles-lettres" provides the key to many important problems in the study of imaginative prose in general.

The book suffers a little from overly detailed retelling of narratives and, apart from Lurie's introduction, shows a remarkable neglect of non-Russian studies of the material in question. On the positive side, it has few misprints and factual errors, has decent indexes, and has been extremely well edited by Lurie, no mean feat for a book of this size and collective nature.

In a way the book is a milestone in the study of Old Russian literature and a testimony to D. S. Likhachev's teachings and aims. Without the many critical editions of various works that have come out of the Pushkinskii Dom, such a book could not have been written. Although not everything in this book will be new to students of these critical editions, much *is* new. Besides, it is good to see everything brought together and drawn on to illustrate a new general goal. The book is a must for all students of Old Russian literature.

RICHARD W. F. POPE
Indiana University

THE DEMETRIUS LEGEND AND ITS LITERARY TREATMENT IN THE AGE OF THE BAROQUE. By *Ervin C. Brody*. Rutherford, Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1972. 323 pp. \$15.00.

This is a careful study of the treatment of the Demetrius theme by European dramatists from Lope de Vega to several minor German playwrights of the early twentieth century. Following a satisfactory chapter on the historiography of the Demetrius legend, Professor Brody presents detailed studies of Lope's *Gran Duque de Moscovia y emperador perseguido* (ca. 1613) and John Fletcher's *Loyal Subject* (1618). He then analyzes works by German and Russian playwrights, concentrating on Schiller, Hebbel, Pushkin, Khomiakov, Ostrovsky, A. Tolstoy, and A. Suvorin.

Brody goes far toward establishing the sources of and influences on the various plays he has studied. He identifies the historical original of many characters and perceptively illustrates how some of his authors (especially Lope and Fletcher) were influenced by their *Zeitgeist* in organization of plot and depiction of character. Lope's drama, for instance, is permeated with typically Spanish concepts of honor, Catholicism, and monarchy. If Lope's sources were Jesuits, Fletcher's included his uncle Giles (*Of the Russe Commonwealth*), Jerome Horsey, Thomas Heywood, and Lope's *Gran Duque*. Fletcher was inhibited by political conditions under James I, and could not develop the Demetrius theme as he may have wished to do. Yet, as Brody demonstrates in a tour de force of literary-historical detection, the Demetrius theme is present in *The Loyal Subject* in the person of the younger son of Archas (the loyal subject), who appears at the court of the duke disguised as a maiden. Brody shows that Schiller, Hebbel, and Pushkin surmounted the limitations of earlier writers and, in depicting the events of the Time of Troubles, created universal types and posed eternal questions. Brody's generally positive assessment of the works of Khomiakov, Ostrovsky, and A. Tolstoy are also of interest.

There are some minor annoying errors in the book. The names of Duma

Secretary Vyluzgin and Metropolitan Gelasii (Gelasij) are misspelled (p. 27). Dmitrii could not have become tsar in 1065 (p. 37). English travelers discovered Russia in the second half of the sixteenth (not seventeenth) century (p. 158).

Professor Brody has used a large number of sources well. His command of languages is remarkable. His textual criticism is careful and perceptive. His imagination—so necessary to a study of this nature—is fertile. In his concluding chapter (perhaps the best part of the book) he summarizes the themes, motifs, techniques, religious and political biases, historical accuracy, and other aspects of the writers he has studied. Inherent throughout his work is the question: Who more nearly achieves the re-creation of an uncertain and contradictory historical situation, the historian or the poet? Brody's answer is clear: "The historian is one instrument. The poet is a whole orchestra" (p. 297). This book is a valuable contribution to our understanding of the Demetrius problem and its artistic interpretation by some of the best minds of the past.

ROBERT C. HOWES
Oakland University

NETOCHKA NEZVANOVA. By *Fyodor Dostoyevsky*. Translated by *Ann Dunnigan*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970. vi, 201 pp. \$6.95, cloth. \$2.45, paper.

Netochka Nezvanova, published in 1849 with the subtitle "The Story of a Woman," is one of Dostoevsky's first attempts at a novel. The work, however, remained unfinished. The second installment of *Netochka Nezvanova* appeared in *Otechestvennye zapiski* in May 1849. A few weeks earlier Dostoevsky had been arrested by the secret police for participation in the Petrashevsky Circle. Ten years later (1860), after prison and exile, Dostoevsky returned to the work, but only to edit the original text: among other things to remove those elements that were relevant to the once-planned continuation of the novel (he dropped the subtitle as well as the titles of the first three sections, "Childhood," "A New Life," "A Mystery"). Yet even in its unfinished state *Netochka Nezvanova* represents an exploratory step for Dostoevsky, an extraordinarily interesting experiment with the form of the *Bildungsroman*, an attempt at presenting a character in development. The work is a crystal in which may be viewed in shifting focus the elements of his art in the first period of his work and many of the elements of his later postexile period. This reviewer finds *Netochka Nezvanova* a particularly engaging work. The romantic and sentimental-philanthropic elements yield, finally, to a powerful social and psychological realism. The problem content of the work (including some of the aspects of Dostoevsky's moral and aesthetic outlook) deserves careful study.

The appearance, therefore, of a new translation of *Netochka Nezvanova* is a welcome event. Ann Dunnigan's translation is faithful to the ethos of the work; it is accurate, lucid, and readable. The original design of *Netochka Nezvanova*, however, has been marred by a number of "stylistic" changes—the work of an editor, it would appear, and not the translator. Thus a curious "note from the publisher" states: "In this new translation, a few minor stylistic changes have been effected to make Dostoyevsky's narrative more accessible to the modern reader. Space breaks [about twenty—R.L.J.] have been introduced to reinforce the passage of time, for example; and Dostoyevsky's paragraphs—often extremely long in the original Russian text—have been broken down into smaller units, in confirmation [*sic*] with