

The close observer of contemporary Greek politics might deride Braddock's use of the mythological phoenix in the title. The legendary bird behind a soldier with bayonet became the official symbol of the recent regime in Greece, thus reducing the phoenix to a hollow cliché.

S. VICTOR PAPACOSMA  
Kent State University

AZ ANTINÓMIÁK KÖLTŐJE: DOSZTOJEVSZKIJ ÉS AZ INDIVIDUUM  
VÁLSÁGA. By *Ferenc Fehér*. Budapest: Magvető, 1972. 490 pp. 29 Ft.

Rather than writing a traditional monograph, the author sets out to identify the essence of Dostoevsky's philosophy and ethics and offers an explanation for the world-wide response to Dostoevsky's art and ideas. Focusing on the "crisis of the individual," clearly felt by the time of Dostoevsky's appearance, the author follows the historical process through which the "antinomies of the bourgeois society" developed. In agreement with his teacher, Lukács, Fehér states that the socioeconomic structure of the bourgeois society inevitably leads to a subject-object split, and the conflict between voluntarism and fatalism creates, also in the mind of the individual, a dual image of the world. This antinomy necessarily constitutes the *condition humaine* of society and consequently brings about a devaluation of values, replacing them either with the mere *desire* to reach them or by *convention* as a substitute for ethics. Rejecting the "interest theories" and "love ethics" alike, Fehér suggests that no philosopher can avoid the recognition of these antinomies, and that neither the state of "chained freedom" (Kierkegaard) nor the thought of a synthesis based on a new community (Nietzsche) can resolve the conflicts until *all* antinomies are *totally* resolved and material relations become human ones.

Having familiarized his reader with the philosophical background of his thesis, Fehér shows how these antinomies constitute the essence of Dostoevsky's art. Illustrating how the antinomic ideas and heroes collide in Dostoevsky's novels, he proves that this hopeless battle also releases forces of a centripetal nature which indiscriminately pull together the oppressor and the oppressed. The author establishes a *basic model* of the Dostoevskian novel and points out that the heroes move in a "soul sphere" (Lukács) separating them from the material world. Their only aim is to achieve self-realization, and none of them is an *active* person in the traditional sense. Thus the backdrop is also of secondary importance: it is an *artificial medium* in which the conflicts occur. The powers of real life appear as abstract forces, while money through which personal relations are expressed, instead of being the ultimate abstraction, becomes the sole concrete form of human relations. The only ones who can step out of this magic circle (and even then only to a limited extent) are those who have severed their ties with the material world.

Pointing out that Dostoevsky concentrated precisely on those antinomies with which the thinkers of the nineteenth century battled, Fehér discusses his philosophical and aesthetic principles (directly stated or as expressed in his works) and compares and contrasts them with the views of Kant, Hegel, Schiller, Kierkegaard, and others. In the chapter "The Revolution as Demon or as Love in Action" the author analyzes Dostoevsky's approach to social change. Here the opinions of Lunacharsky, Gide, Uspensky, Wellek, Steiner, and others are taken into consid-

eration. Fehér emphasizes that for Dostoevsky, also, revolution was an "answer to an alienated life," and it remained "love in action" in the author's world view, reaching its most realistic depiction in Dostoevsky's most "obscurantist" period. "Love in action" focuses on the figure of Christ and on the recognition of the impossibility of following him. According to Fehér, Dostoevsky's religious atheists express the antinomy of the bourgeois society in which the atheist and the religious fanatic are but two colliding extremes of the same instability and insecurity.

Based on Lukács's *Théorie des Romans*, a chapter—in itself a fine essay—is devoted to an analysis of the function of the novel in expressing a dynamically changing system of values. Fehér points out that Dostoevsky's "polyphonic novels," which represent the heroes as aspects of consciousness in relation to each other, re-create the illusion of totality in which the idea replaces nature and time and becomes the substance of the depicted world. Fehér finds the novelty of Dostoevsky's art primarily in this and in the way he allows polarized ideas to develop equally and to carry the same weight. Since his aim is to examine his heroes in the moment of crisis, Dostoevsky's concept of time has no need for the *durée réelle*—thus making him a major poet of the antinomies as well as of a new time concept. Fehér arrives at the following conclusion: The unresolvable tension between freedom and necessity, a hope for deliverance and the impossibility of achieving it—yet a dim promise pointing to the future—keep Dostoevsky's heroes in a permanent state of mobility. And that, in turn, makes Dostoevsky the foremost literary representative of the "crisis of the individual."

This review offers just a skeleton abstract and a very limited selection of ideas found in this exciting and well-written book, which contains a great number of new thoughts and evaluations, some of them modestly buried in a clause, others only vaguely alluded to. No review of this size could possibly do justice to the immense amount of work that has gone into this volume, which certainly deserves to be made available to the Western reading public in a good English translation.

MARIANNA D. BIRNBAUM  
*University of California, Los Angeles*

ISSLEDOVANIIA PO POETIKE I STILISTIKE. Edited by V. V. Vinogradov, V. G. Bazanov, and G. M. Fridlender. Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut russkoi literatury (Pushkinskii Dom). Leningrad: "Nauka," 1972. 277 pp. 1.43-rubles.

This collection of nine articles displays a great diversity of approaches, and it represents poetics only in the broadest sense. Three articles reflect the revived Soviet interest in Dostoevsky, two are devoted to textual criticism, and three concern poetry. G. M. Fridlender's "official" introduction is without originality.

V. I. Eremina deals with repetition in folk songs. Her effort to explain repetition through the melody ignores pervasive repetition in all forms of folklore, with or without musical accompaniment. G. B. Ponomareva discusses Dostoevsky's "Zhitie velikogo greshnika" and considers that Dostoevsky's usage of elements from saints' lives influenced his later novels. She does not define a saint's life, nor does she note the differences between it and Dostoevsky's works. V. A. Tunimanov analyzes in detail the chronicler's role in *The Devils*, showing his various functions and his relationship to each character. Essentially Tunimanov is treating viewpoint, something which has attracted little attention among Soviet critics. V. E. Vetlovskaiia discusses rhetorical devices in *The Brothers Karamazov* and indicates how