

Another questionable point is Mr. Katz's view of parody. Can one really consider "Svetlana" to be "Bürger's 'Lenore' and Zhukovsky's 'Lyudmila' turned upside down, mocked, or parodied" (p. 59)? It would appear that the unexpected twist at the end of the story reminded Mr. Katz of similar parodic twists in Pushkin's *Tales of Belkin*, and led him to conclude that this too was a parody. The fact is that there are no parodic elements, either in style or in intent, discernible in Zhukovskii's tale; the "happy ending" was an afterthought (the original draft had a tragic denouement). On the other hand, elsewhere in his book, Mr. Katz fails to recognize parody in Pushkin's "Chernaia shal'" (p. 142), although its tone and vocabulary are so unlike Pushkin that it prompted a parody by A. K. Tolstoi.

My final critical remark concerns the idea of Zhukovskii's originality. It seems to me that one is playing with the semantics of the word "original" when one ascribes it to translations. Zhukovskii's ballads are talented and imaginative reworkings and adaptations but certainly not completely original pieces, as Mr. Katz indirectly admits when he states that "Svetlana" is one of the poet's "most original works" (p. 59).

Among some minor points, I find it amusing to see Leon Trotsky's name listed alongside "other critics," such as Pushkin and Belinskii (p. 74), but perhaps it was Mr. Katz's intention to amuse us. Misprints are amazingly few as are misspellings ("xozajka" instead of *xozajka* occurs twice, the Ukrainian title of the song on p. 141 is misspelled, and the title of Shakhovskoi's comedy "Urok koketkam" is consistently given as "Urok koketam").

I have been deliberately exhaustive in my "negative" criticism in order to illustrate how relatively few faults I could find with this fine and well-written book. It was a pleasure to read it, and I can only recommend it to students of Russian poetry.

ASSYA HUMESKY
University of Michigan

DOSTOEVSKY: THE LITERARY ARTIST. By *Erik Krag*. Translated from the Norwegian by *Sven Larr*. Oslo and Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Universitetsforlaget and Humanities Press, 1976 [1962]. 317 pp. \$20.00, paper.

FROM GOGOL TO DOSTOEVSKY: JAKOV BUTKOV, A RELUCTANT NATURALIST IN THE 1840'S. By *Peter Hodgson*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1976. x, 190 pp. DM 28, paper.

The appearance of the Academy edition of Dostoevsky's works has created a watershed in Dostoevsky scholarship. Recent books which have not had the benefit of the information contained in the introductory articles and commentaries of the Academy edition will show some gaps of which readers will be acutely aware. Krag's excellent work is in this category. Even more unfortunate, his work has not been updated to include recent Western scholarship: the names of Dominique Arban, Maximilian Braun, Joseph Frank, Robert L. Jackson, Ralph E. Matlaw, and Edward Wasiolek, to name but a few, are missing from his index of authors. Save for this deficiency, Krag's *Dostoevsky* would be well suited as a manual for the professor who teaches Dostoevsky but is not himself a Dostoevsky scholar: it contains a well-selected body of information on the biographical, historical, ideological, and literary background of Dostoevsky's works; it reconstructs the genesis of each major work carefully, using all available sources; it summarizes existing interpretations objectively and concisely; and it presents many of the problems connected with the philosophical and aesthetic content of each work clearly and judiciously. Krag's mastery of his material is evident at all times. On the other hand, Krag's book is not remarkable for depth of empathy,

originality of judgment, or aesthetic flair. In fact, some of Krag's opinions have, I think, been refuted years ago. Not many scholars, at least in the West, would still say that Belinskii's critique of *Poor Folk* was "subtle and penetrating" (p. 21), although few will deny that it had great merit. Many will disagree with Krag's assertion that *Notes from the Underground*, "a sort of amphibious production, . . . is quite impossible as a work of art" (p. 97). Recent scholarship has produced a better understanding of symbolic patterns in the structure and texture of Dostoevsky's novels than Krag's presentation suggests. Recent works by Cox, Gibson, Sandoz, Vetlovskaiia, and others have opened up broad vistas of religious meaning in Dostoevsky's work, an area only sketchily developed by Krag. Still, Krag's book is a solid achievement and scholar and student alike would be well advised to consult it.

Western Slavists now find themselves in the position which their confreres in the Western literatures have been in for a long time: the "major" authors have been overworked, and a scholar who wants to produce something new will have to tackle "minor" authors, usually hoping to discover some link or relevance to one or more "major" authors. Hodgson's very worthy study, *From Gogol to Dostoevsky: Iakov Butkov, A Reluctant Naturalist in the 1840's*, is a case in point. It is not that Iakov Butkov is not worth a monograph. Rather, the total amount of his work and what we know about him are hardly enough for one. Hence much of Hodgson's book deals with matters which could be—and have been—dealt with in connection with other authors of the 1840s and 1850s, Gogol and Dostoevsky in particular. Hodgson covers much the same ground as Fanger did in *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism* (1965), but Hodgson puts greater emphasis on the Russian scene. He adduces many additional facts, along with developing some conceptions of his own. The focal notion is "reluctant naturalism," seen as "the middle ground between the frivolous subculture and the stylization practiced by Gogol and Dostoevsky" (p. 60). I believe that "reluctant naturalism" is an infelicitous term; it suggests nothing of the fact that "naturalism" here is not "mimesis" but "lowering of genre," and also "reluctant" hardly points in the direction of the active stylistic ingredients (burlesque, irony, hyperbole, light banter) of Butkov's prose.

In his efforts to explain the nature and origin of the light banter, grotesquerie, and condescending irony at the expense of the underdog, all found in the concept of "reluctant naturalism," Hodgson's emphasis is on what he terms "the native subculture" (p. 37). By "native subculture" he means vaudeville, pulp literature (*lubok*), feuilleton, adventure stories, and other forms of popular entertainment. This means, then, that direct Western influences (Hoffmann, Dickens) are underplayed. Similar ideas were voiced by V. F. Pereverzev in the 1920s and early 1930s, in connection with A. F. Weltmann's prose (a connection to which Hodgson should have paid more attention). Hodgson's ideas are plausible per se, but one wishes he would have given some specific textual examples to illustrate these connections, specifically as regards vaudeville and *lubok*. Is the connection really as close, say, as that between some of Gogol's early stories and his father's dialect comedies? I believe that Hodgson's thesis, that Iakov Butkov was "the most typical representative of a counter-current of reluctant naturalism" (p. 181) during the early development of Russian realism, is correct, but that it is not particularly well formulated or demonstrated. Nevertheless, this is a solid piece of scholarship.

VICTOR TERRAS
Brown University