

“frequent association of Schiller’s name with situations and figures exhibiting moral ambiguity is by itself presumptive evidence that Schiller contributed to this cardinal Dostoevskian concept” (p. 30), that similarities could hardly be “pure chance” (p. 31), that Dostoevsky’s psychology “may have” received a stimulus from Schiller (p. 32), that there is a pervasive “negative influence [!]” (p. 27) and even, once, an “unconscious” influence, all leads the author to vague associations and speculations she had condemned earlier, and to an acceptance of a Hoffmann parallel that is totally invalid (pp. 76–77).

There are aesthetic, moral, and philosophical themes that derive from Schiller and remain vital in Dostoevsky’s work. There are, however, others that Dostoevsky rejected, and the designation “Schiller” itself becomes a shorthand term for a kind of misty dreamer Dostoevsky came to abhor. Its presence is no longer specifically connected with the poet, as in *The Eternal Husband* where it does not signal the presence of a Schillerian concept, or, if it does, one that has been so transformed that it can only be considered Dostoevskian. Nor can it logically be maintained and demonstrated that the theme of *Notes from Underground* is “anti-Schillerian,” that *Brüderschaft*-murder in *The Idiot* is of Schillerian provenance, that Ippolit’s “Explanation” is a gloss on freedom and necessity in Schiller, and that Kirillov’s view is an extension thereof with the addition of “eternal harmony.” The author might have spent less effort in Procrustean efforts on Dostoevsky’s early and middle work, since she states that after the earliest works it was no longer Schiller’s *Weltanschauung* that appealed to Dostoevsky.

The monograph constantly and unnecessarily tries to balance critical opinions of unequal weight and merit—Čiževsky’s and Kurt Wais’s views with those of Meier-Graefe, Carr, and others—and the critical apparatus seems inadequate and, at times, arbitrary, citing articles by Malia and Guardini but not their books, omitting Hans Harder’s *Schiller in Russland* (1969), and adducing ancient and outmoded works in English and German, particularly on Schiller. There is some material in Dostoevsky’s *Notebooks* that is not utilized at all. Nevertheless, the book contains suggestive material and its very exaggeration illuminates an important facet of Dostoevsky’s fiction.

RALPH E. MATLAW
University of Chicago

THE CLEMENT VISION: POETIC REALISM IN TURGENEV AND JAMES. By Dale E. Peterson. National University Publications, Literary Criticism Series. Port Washington, N.Y. and London: Kennikat Press, 1975. x, 157 pp. \$9.95.

There are not many instances in which the confrontation of two writers belonging to different literatures is worth a book length study. But there are so many ties between Turgenev and James that a major monograph such as Peterson’s is well worth a scholar’s while. The book contains interesting observations on both writers, coordinated by an effort to demonstrate not only instances of direct influence, but also various kinds of convergence and affinity. Connections of the first type, though always debatable, are the most interesting. For example, one can certainly agree that “in the America of Howells and James . . . the name of Ivan Turgenev figured prominently in excited accounts of recent innovations in the craft of fiction” (p. 71), but one wonders if “it can safely be assumed that the young James derived the idea of incorporating a reliable observer within the action from Turgenev’s

precedent with Lezhnirov in *Rudin*" (p. 92). Peterson's own caution that "the aesthetic accolades showered on Turgenev as the supreme mentor of the dramatic novel served mainly to mask an extensive borrowing of French narrative strategies" (p. 21) is well taken. Peterson's detailed confrontation of "Asia" with "Daisy Miller" (pp. 64–68) is characteristic of his efforts to show direct influence: it gives a convincing demonstration of the "reformation" of a Turgenevian theme by James, yet manages to do so without touching upon the symbolic national significance of either story, or upon their greatness, for that matter.

The convergences between Turgenev and James are obvious, well known, and have probably been overworked by critics, including Professor Peterson himself. Thus, the notion that the creative personality of both writers was formed by the fact that they were "provincials" and that this "posed a problem which would clearly require some meddling with the size and structure of what passed for 'the novel' in Europe" (p. 72) would seem exaggerated and, perhaps, misleading. In theory and in practice, American and Russian literature of the mid-nineteenth century were as innovative and sophisticated as any Western literature in the period, a fact which is amply proven by Peterson's own treatment of the art as well as of the aesthetic theory of Turgenev and James.

Peterson's observations concerning Turgenev and James as practitioners of the dramatic novel might have been more technical. In particular, one would be interested in the connection between the "novellalike" character of Turgenev's and James's novels (p. 82) and their dramatic structure. In effect, Peterson ignores Apollon Grigoriev's suggestion that a Turgenevian novel is like a large and masterfully conceived canvas, with some parts left bare and others tentatively sketched, and only some key junctures complete. Would this description apply to James, as well?

Peterson's conception of the "clement vision" of Turgenev-Jamesian "poetic realism" (p. 122) is surely well taken. There is indeed a "deep affinity" of vision between Volodia as seen by Turgenev in "First Love" and James's "What Maisie Knew" (p. 123). Perhaps it is even more important to realize that the "epiphany" of which Peterson speaks (p. 124) is in both instances a negative one: it is wistfully hinted at, not joyously produced. All in all, Peterson's study is well informed, competent, and intelligent, one with whose theses one can generally agree. If it does not make for very satisfying reading, it is because of its subject matter, not its execution.

VICTOR TERRAS
Brown University

TWENTIETH-CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERARY CRITICISM. Edited by
Victor Erlich. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975. x, 317 pp.
\$15.00.

The essays in this collection have been chosen to represent either different approaches to literature (Symbolism, Formalism, Marxism) or historical periods and situations (the "thaw," the emigration). Further restrictions have been imposed because several suitable essays have been preempted for other forthcoming anthologies, and because of the need "to restrict the scope of the volume to major figures, in order to render it accessible to the non-specialist." The translations have been done with varying degrees of success—the prose naturally faring better than the poetry—but here and there the reader with a knowledge of Russian will detect inaccuracies.