among senior Soviet scholars did promote El'chaninov's *Nakazannaiavertoprashka*.

Russian Drama is of great value not just to those who wish to grapple with the problem of how Russia so rapidly assimilated the West's major dramatic forms but is a very readable introduction to Russian literature before Pushkin generally. Karlinsky is quick to draw attention to interesting biographical facts, especially the personal jealousies of supposedly secure leading playwrights: Krylov is shown to have carried out a vicious vendetta against Kniazhnin, Shakhovskoi to have smeared Ozerov mercilessly, and Gribedov to have feuded with Mikhail Zagoskin for many years. He also has a keen awareness of the hypocritical disjunction between the social ills of the day and the reality that is depicted in these plays. Accordingly, he can write: "Fonvizin may have condemned the abuse and mistreatment of serfs in his comedy, but there is no indication anywhere in the play or in his other writings that he perceived the injustice of the institution of serfdom as such" (p. 167). In raising such issues, Karlinsky is not seeking to be sensational; instead they form part of the pattern of curious paradoxes that can be detected in his material. Thus it is that the enormously popular *Nedorosl'* is one of the few comedies of its day not set in verse, that Ozerov's best two tragedies have non-Russian subjects, and that Gribedov, although writing in the 1820s, is more classical than his predecessors.

Certain reviewers of the hard cover edition expressed dismay that some areas of Russian drama are slighted and that the chapters on Gribedov and Pushkin, the most thoroughly researched of these playwrights, are not very original. On the contrary, in the light of Karlinsky's aims (see pp. xviii-xxi) and his very broad perspective, it was enough to provide a general discussion of Gribedov's stylistically difficult comedy and to outline both these authors' indebtedness to Shakhovskoi and Khmel'nitskii, who, after all, are the two figures whose role he seeks to impress on the minds of his mainly nonspecialist audience. All in all, Russian Drama succeeds in popularizing a topic in pre-Pushkinian literature that is eminently suited to this format. Because of its strong stands on a variety of plays, it will not satisfy all who have done research in this area, but it will undoubtedly inspire many readers to go to or go back to these works and realize that the major nineteenth-century dramatists were no pioneers but simply achieved what many earlier figures did not quite manage themselves.

Ian K. Lilly  
*University of Auckland*


Since the time of Belinskii, Dostoevskii's fictional output has been fair game for thinkers of virtually every persuasion. In recent years Dostoevskii criticism has flexed its muscles in new directions; thus we have had psychoanalytic, anthropological, sociological, and phenomenological readings of various texts by Dostoevskii. Some of these works have been fruitfully provocative, others nearly offensive in their blindness to the nuances of text and an unrelenting commitment to the march of ideology at all costs.
Roger Anderson, in Dostoevsky: Myths of Duality has written a book which conscientiously balances an attention to the codifying demands of rigorous theory and a sensitivity to the real, living presence of the text. Although Anderson seems, at times, to remain distant from the messy details any text by Dostoevskii can engender—to its realia—the cumulative effect of reading his well-argued book proves otherwise.

Anderson starts by drawing on the work of Walls, Frye, Levi-Strauss, and Lotman to develop a working definition of myth, for, it is Anderson's contention—and he has convinced this reader—that there exist powerful "structural similarities between the kind of problem solving evident in [Dostoevskii's] art and certain traditional mythologisms" (p. 162). Anderson offers readings of The Double, Notes from Underground, Crime and Punishment, The Idiot, The Devils, and The Brothers Karamazov. By the end of the first chapter, "A Context for the Mythological," it is clear that Anderson has investigated carefully the various concepts of myth, although his understanding of duality emerges only later, during his analysis of specific works.

Anderson's readings of Crime and Punishment and The Brothers Karamazov are particularly rich. He links Raskol'nikov to the myth of the hero and his standard rites of passage. Drawing from the work of Campbell and Propp, Anderson identifies five primary stages of the hero's development and proceeds to show how Raskol'nikov's experience duplicates these categories. Along the way, Anderson makes other observations of considerable interest: for example, he identifies the pawnbroker as a kind of mother figure; he defines Raskol'nikov's "chief task" as a need "to overcome the paradox" that Sonia and Svidrigailov, taken together, represent (p. 60). He provides a fascinating explanation for the aptness of Raskol'nikov's image of his developing idea as being like a chick pecking its way out of a "resisting shell" (p. 53). Anderson argues that by the end of Crime and Punishment, after Raskol'nikov's "epiphany by the Siberian River," "the inner split in Raskol'nikov, openly expressed in his name, has been closed; the paradox governing his journey has been resolved." The issue of where Raskol'nikov really is in his spiritual development at the end of the novel has been a topic of endless debate among Dostoevskii's readers, and Anderson takes a strong, well-reasoned stand on this matter.

In his chapter on The Brothers Karamazov, Anderson focuses primarily on Zosima and the unique blending within him of Christian belief and elements of Russian folklore, particularly the emphasis on rod, Mother Earth, sobornost', and the cycles of life and death. Anderson argues that in death, Zosima's body "re-creates precisely what nature does each autumn (the time of year of the elder's death)." He "fertilizes the lives of those who follow him" (p. 87). It is surprising that Anderson does not make any reference to the seminal work of Belknap or Terras on the implications of Zosima's death for the novel. Anderson does, however, go beyond the customary linking of Fedor and Zosima as the two father figures of the novel to suggest interesting parallels between them: each is, in his own way, pantheistic; each reverses basic social codes. "As literary refractions of the ancient carnival, they both accommodate the mixture and inversion of very different levels of life" (p. 143). Moreover, those readers of The Brothers Karamazov who have found Aleshia's "moment of doubt" programmatic or unconvincing could do worse than to turn to Anderson's book to be persuaded of the profundity and authenticity of Aleshia's spiritual crisis.