

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 NEZVANOV. 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

twentieth century conventions. *Netochka Nezvanova* is best presented, we believe, with a memory to [*sic*] its original, serial appearance in 1849—as an intensely dramatic story whose insights and rich texture were not intended to be savored at a single sitting.”

To these remarks, both lame and audacious, we can only reply: If Dostoevsky had wished to indicate “passage of time” with space breaks, he would have done so; had he preferred shorter paragraphs to longer ones he would have made them shorter; the master translators of the twentieth century strive to respect—not violate—the style of writers. The contemporary reader has a strong constitution: he likes his Dostoevsky straight.

The reader would have been better served if the editor had been less studious of Dostoevsky’s style and more attentive to his own.

ROBERT LOUIS JACKSON
Yale University

GROWN-UP NARRATOR AND CHILDLIKE HERO: AN ANALYSIS OF THE LITERARY DEVICES EMPLOYED IN TOLSTOY’S TRILOGY *CHILDHOOD, BOYHOOD, AND YOUTH*. By *Alexander F. Zweers*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1971. 165 pp. 32 Dglds.

The attempt to reconstruct and relate the elusive experience of childhood has long engaged Russian writers. For more than a century, in works ranging from the purely autobiographical to those of an exclusively fictional nature, they have dealt with the relation between external reality and the developing consciousness of the child. In their efforts to capture something of the quality of the child’s experience, they have been brought to a reconsideration of the conventions of narrative structure and the assumptions concerning character perception. Critical examination of the genre thus offers an interesting opportunity for expanding our total understanding of “point of view” as a functional element of prose.

Alexander Zweers’s study of the Tolstoy trilogy merits attention as one of the first to deal with Russian works of this sort. Within the confines of this rather slim volume, he attempts to define the salient features of *Childhood*, *Boyhood*, and *Youth*, and to relate Tolstoy’s achievement to the genre as a whole. Regrettably, the study suffers from its erratic focus and the author’s adamant rejection of all psychological considerations. Moreover, by disregarding several outstanding works by other authors, including Turgenev’s *First Love* and Andrei Bely’s *Kotik Letaeu*, he deprives the reader of the proper perspective for making a comparative judgment of Tolstoy’s success with the genre.

After an extremely sketchy introductory characterization of various kinds of books about children, Zweers devotes a lengthy first chapter to a survey of the critical literature on the trilogy. It is a rather inauspicious beginning, for much that has been written has little relevance to Zweers’s own analysis, yet he repeatedly becomes entangled in the details of other critics’ commentaries. The space might have been better used for a more thorough investigation of the trilogy itself. As it is, only the second chapter deals directly with the work, and there Zweers itemizes the various ways in which the narrator mediates the impressions of childhood.

Zweers establishes nine different categories, some of them overlapping, which reveal the adult narrator as a passive transmitter, evaluator, commentator, or