

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

for *The Idiot* only the earliest notes survive. Though more complete, the notebooks for *The Possessed* are still far from the final text, and for *The Brothers Karamazov* only notes apparently prepared just before dictating remain. But the notebooks for the little-known, mediocre *Raw Youth* have been preserved almost in their entirety, from the earliest sketches to the final notations made after the novel had begun to appear. Moreover, while access to the Russian editions of the other notebooks is limited, those for *A Raw Youth* are readily available in volume 77 of *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* (1965). And in this publication A. S. Dolinin's job of editing is so vastly superior to the editing of his predecessors as to suggest a need for new editions of the earlier notebooks on similar chronological principles. To see a translation of Dolinin's magnificent, though esoteric, accomplishment published for Dostoevsky's English-speaking readers makes this irony of fate seem somewhat perverse.

This translation has all the earmarks of a bibliographic white elephant. Edward Wasiolek and Victor Terras have expended much effort on the project, and yet one wonders to whose profit. Slavists will have little cause to consult the translation; it appears neither intended for nor suited to their needs. The scholarly apparatus of the Russian edition contains almost all that is in Wasiolek's commentaries and annotations that would interest the specialist. (Wasiolek's topic index is a useful addition, however.) Terras's translation bears checking against the original, although it does read well—too well in fact. Dostoevsky's rough notes are often smoothed over and filled out: nouns become verbs; past tenses become present; fragments become sentences; occasionally words are deleted (e.g., the young man N is "looking for *a man and* sympathy," p. 102); more often words are added (e.g., Dostoevsky's "Especially invent these scenes of the youth's clashes with the princess" becomes "Invent some special details for these scenes in which the Youth clashes with the Princess," p. 275). The editing of the translation is inconsistent. Words crossed out by Dostoevsky are usually indicated, but not always. On occasion they are simply included, with nonsensical results (e.g., p. 26); more often they are excluded (e.g., pp. 26, 29, 102, 103). Quotation marks are liberally added; so is capitalization; and conventional English punctuation is supplied even where Dostoevsky abandons Russian conventions.

Wasiolek follows Dolinin's edition only "in all substantial respects" instead of completely, in all respects. It is questionable whether this serves the scholarly interest of those who cannot work with the original Russian. Little of the history of the text and nothing of Dolinin's methods are given. Although the translation does reproduce Dostoevsky's ideas faithfully, the style and details are often not his and invite misleading interpretations.

This edition would seem of greatest profit to the general admirer of Dostoevsky—the reader with no specialized demands. The translator and editor have done much to make the text as readable and enjoyable as possible. The introduction is an informative discussion of the notebooks' content and significance; each section begins with a short survey and commentary on its most important aspects. The explanatory notes clarify specific historical references and unusual translations. Perhaps there are a few nonspecialists who have seen beyond the artistic shortcomings of *A Raw Youth* and have found the novel valuable for an understanding of Dostoevsky himself. These readers will find the notebooks better reading than the novel. But for such a small and select audience a five-hundred-page translation seems an unjustifiable luxury.

ROBERT T. WHITTAKER, JR.  
Stanford University