

a greater or lesser degree, emphasize that the basic and ultimate purposes of literature are extra-aesthetic. The boldest statements to this effect are by Grigoriev and Soloviev respectively: "But for me an artistic work is a revelation of the great secrets of the soul and of life, the sole decider of social and ethical questions" (p. 108); "Artists and poets must again become priests and prophets, . . . not only will the religious idea possess them, but they will possess it and consciously govern its earthly incarnations" (p. 171). The importance attributed to art, by conservatives and radicals alike, reflects the absence of democratic political life in nineteenth-century Russia. Then, as now, literature and its study served both as a compensation for such absence and as an alternative vehicle for the propagation of ideologies.

The translators are to be commended for producing generally readable and what appear to be accurate versions. The texts are annotated, and a helpful index is included.

ARTHUR LEVIN
University of Calgary

APOLLON GRIGOR'EV: SOCHINENIIA. Vol. 1: KRITIKA. Edited, with an introductory essay and notes, by *V. S. Krupitsch*. Villanova: Villanova University Press, 1970. xxxvi, 415 pp.

This edition of some of Apollon Grigoriev's more important articles and reviews is a most meritorious undertaking, especially since Professor Krupitsch has taken care not to include in his collection any of the material printed in the Gosizdat edition of 1967. His selection is a representative one, and perfectly adequate for the purpose of acquainting a student of Russian literature with Grigoriev's thought. It will no doubt appear on many reading lists from now on.

Professor Krupitsch has provided his selection with ample and useful explanatory notes, which are, however, marred by some minor inaccuracies and misprints. His introductory essay shows his deep interest and justified admiration for Grigoriev—an important, immensely likable, and long-neglected figure. Understandably, Professor Krupitsch is overly enthusiastic on occasion. Thus when pointing out, quite correctly, that Grigoriev had considerable influence on Dostoevsky, he goes on to say: "It is now known that Grigor'ev's philosophical thought was profounder and more original than Dostoevsky's, and that the latter's fame was earned partly by his expression of the former's thought" (p. xxxiii). Since Professor Krupitsch does not prove this thesis, or quote his authority for it, it leaves the reader merely wondering. Unfortunately Professor Krupitsch has chosen to write his introduction in English, and his editors have done an unbelievably careless job of proofreading. As a result, the whole text makes for rather painful reading.

VICTOR TERRAS
Brown University

THE SUBCONSCIOUS IN GOGOL' AND DOSTOEVSKIJ, AND ITS ANTECEDENTS. By *Leonard J. Kent*. Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 75. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1969. 172 pp. 30 Dutch guilders.

It is now becoming almost as fashionable and interesting for American critics to seek an understanding of literature outside the literary text itself as it was mandatory

and productive for a previous generation of scholars to dig out “intrinsic” literary riches. We may soon be reading more psychological studies of Russian authors by American Slavists, and some may even have the excellence of Richard Gregg’s study of Tiutchev, combining textual and psychological analysis.

Leonard Kent’s book is divided into three parts: one giving an exposition of the subconscious in folklore and literature since the dawn of time, one dealing with Gogol, and a third—the longest—discussing Dostoevsky. The first section shows a great deal of background reading, too much of it put into the foreground. Kent steers a too careful course between the Scylla of delving exhaustively into certain literary treatments of the subconscious to determine their influence on Gogol and Dostoevsky (he calls this “to squeeze and dismember possible source material”) and the Charybdis of naming the high points of the appearance of the subconscious in all of Western literature (“how few works are devoid of dreams!”). Although he seems well qualified to do more of the former, especially as concerns the German romantics, he does too much of the latter.

In the actual discussion of Gogol and Dostoevsky, Kent shows a similar lack of discrimination in limiting and defining his topic. Most of the book consists of a catalogue of the dreams in the works of the two authors, although Dostoevsky’s use of doubles and epileptic fits is also included as part of the subconscious. But other studies, if not mere common sense, should have made it clear that these are not the only or even the chief expressions of the irrational in their works. Even within these limits there are gaps. For instance, we are told what Raskolnikov’s dreams mean to him but little of how they function in the novel, and the same is true for nearly all of the works treated; Alyosha’s dream is not even mentioned in the discussion of *The Brothers Karamazov*. The book does contain some things of interest. Although certain key works are barely mentioned, the best parts of the book explore minor works such as Gogol’s early stories and Dostoevsky’s *Netochka Nezvanova*. Kent also raises the interesting possibility that Prince Myshkin subconsciously uses his epileptic fits to remove himself from intolerable situations.

Indeed, one wishes that Kent had been less timid in using psychological insights. The collective or mythic unconscious is invoked whenever the Golden Age dreams are discussed, but usually a sort of halfway Freudianism prevails. Dreams are “born of guilt,” but sex and family relations are hardly ever connected to this guilt. Thus Kent mentions Gogol’s “allegiance to a chivalric code he could not let die,” but does not speculate on the possibility of chivalry as a refuge for sexual guilt. The riches that language might reveal are untouched. An investigation of possible differences between the language of subconscious moments and that of “reality” in each author might have provided a clue to larger differences in their works.

Kent worked exclusively from uncorrected English translations, yet he mentions several works in Russian in his bibliography (none are used in footnotes). He obtained biographical material from Lavrin and Simmons rather than from Veresaev or from the more complete editions of the letters. Ermakov’s psychological study of Gogol is not included, although the formalist ones by Eikhenbaum and Vinogradov are. Even in his non-Russian sources, Kent omits mentioning the excellent psychological insights of W. D. Snodgrass on Raskolnikov’s mare-beating dream and of René Girard on *The Eternal Husband*. This book can in no way be recommended as a model for future research.

BARBARA HELDT MONTER
Evanston, Illinois