

following a disastrous fire in the village. The author was one of Tolstoy's pupils at the Iasnaia Poliana school in the early 1860s; the memoir is from much later, of course.

Most interesting to me, though, was the memoir of S. N. Everling, a university student preparing for the professoriate under the tutelage of Tolstoy's acquaintance N. Ia. Grot. Here is a wonderful picture of Tolstoy at home with guests (in the Moscow house) and an abundance of sharp comment by him on Solov'ev, Fedorov, Strakhov, and others. This is the longest selection in the anthology, 163-180. A note tells us that the material was first published in English in a magazine (evidently called *The Nineteenth Century and After*) in 1923. In 1976 a Russian journal, *Literaturnaia Rossiia*, published a Russian translation of this English material. Thus, the claim that all of the materials in this collection were previously unpublished may not be true in the strictest sense, but the obscurity and inadequacy of the previous publications leaves the substance of the claim unimpugned.

Besides the letters and reminiscences themselves, the volume is richly supplied with admirable scholarly apparatus. This includes introductory pieces by both Donskov and Ivanova (both of them given in both English and Russian) and English summaries of the contents of each of the letters and all of the reminiscences. There are also numerous illustrations and photographs (many of them new to this reviewer), a handy table describing the nature and extent of Tolstoy's connection with the various memoirists, and indices of personal names and the titles of works by Tolstoy which are mentioned anywhere in the book. Once again we must thank Professors Donskov, Gromova, and Ivanova for an excellent further contribution to our store of documents pertaining to Tolstoy.

GARY JAHN  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

*\*Editor's Note:* Excerpts from this volume are published, translated into English, in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal*.

## Tolstoy and the Legend: Questions about Answers

**Anna Glebovna Grodetskaia.** *Otvety predaniia: zhitiiia sviatykh v dukhovnom poiske L'va Tolstogo.* St.-Petersburg: Nauka, 2000. 264 pp. Cloth, 1000 copies in print.

Tolstoy's "complex attitude to the ideology of the genre, to the world outlook of a vita—is an issue that has been barely touched"—this is how the author concludes an introductory chapter of her book (22). With her immensely learned and scrupulously written account of Tolstoy's "complex attitude" to hagiography, Anna Glebovna Grodetskaia fills many a lacuna in our knowledge of Tolstoy and traditional forms of religious art. Bypassed by modern readers of Tolstoy to whom they remain largely unknown, gingerly avoided by Tolstoy scholars to whom they appear unpromising as a topic, Tolstoy's hagiographic projects can indeed be considered a patch of *terra incognita* on the map of his life.

By titling her book *otvety predaniia* [answers supplied by legends] Grodetskaia takes on herself the impossibly difficult task of clarifying the murky aspects of Tolstoy's "complex attitudes." She makes no ambitious promises but sifts through every single hagiographic source or motif of relevance to Tolstoy and follows its refraction in his art and thought. Overall she succeeds admirably. The "answers" that Grodetskaia offers are not final ones; carefully extrapolated from Tolstoy's collections of popular legends, or from his own rewriting of these legends, the book's conclusions demonstrate how subtle Tolstoy's dealings with absolute rhetoric were.

It will be helpful to define the meaning of the Russian word "predanie" explicitly for the Anglo-American reader. In Grodetskaia's book no such definition is attempted, but not because the Russian audience did not need one. On the contrary, for the country that as a nation was introduced so late to its own past and then had to accommodate this knowledge to the ever-changing political realities,

the divisions between hagiography, tales from the historic past and legends are hopelessly blurred. (The various Formalist and structuralist taxonomies which have been suggested do not really fill the bill.)

For Pushkin, who in this sense was arch-romantic, *predaniia* as vestiges of domestic antiquity bear absolute, self-sufficient authority, measuring us against themselves and not vice versa. “Prelest” [charm] is a word that Tolstoy—like Pushkin— would associate with *predanie*, but as will become clear in the course of our discussion, he would constantly put up guard against the legendary charms lest he be ensnared by their many seductions. If anything, Tolstoy did not take *predanie* for a delightful game, he took it seriously. In Tolstoy’s time the absolute authority of legends was somewhat diluted by an unspoken agreement about their separateness from life, irrelevance to reality. They were fables that had to be studied by specially commissioned scholars. Amateurish bibliophiles, lovers of archaic trophies with patriotic flair, the romantic balladeers of the *alte Tracht* of the Pushkin period would give way, from the 1850s on, to professionals who dedicated their entire careers to assembling, cataloguing, studying, and publishing the documents of Russia’s past. Tolstoy was closely acquainted with most of this learned cohort (Afanas’ev, Tikhonravov, Buslaev) and on good working terms with them: he approached them for advice, he entered into disputes with them; most importantly, he used their publications as background sources for his own hagiographic projects. How does this connect with Tolstoy’s instruction to Strakhov, commissioned to work with the “experts” while compiling stories for Tolstoy’s *Azbuka*: “The main thing is, do not trust the experts for advice, for they will delude” [*glavnoe ne sovetuites’ s znatokami. Oni budut putat’*] (PSS 61: 297; Grodetskaia 47).

*Predanie* is a peculiar thing, a conflicted thing and as such, it responds well to Tolstoy’s own conflicted nature. On the one hand, it makes a claim on active, harshly selective memory, which establishes living connecting links of wisdom [*stseplenie mudrosti*], so dear to Tolstoy. (Tolstoy’s favourite point against collections and reconstructions of the

past, by the way, was that in popular culture out of past products of human activity there remains only what is truly eternal, what needs no collecting.) On the other hand, *predanie* in popular culture borders on superstition, and in literary pastiches it becomes one of the most artificial, ornate, forced, facetious genres, not especially what Tolstoy would respect or endorse. In short, a *predanie* is a legend that despite its decided artificiality and fairy-tale-like frivolity can connect us to an unbreakable chain of historical memory. Even the contrasting semantic connotations hidden within the word *predanie* point to its highly contradictory nature. In addition to signifying “a tale from the past, transferred from generation to generation” as a noun, the word’s derivatives from the verb base *predat’* [entrust, commit, betray]: *predannyi* [loyal, committed], and *predatels’kii* [treacherous] make it a two-faced Janus. It is here that we witness a paradox, maybe even a contradiction in terms which illustrate Tolstoy’s vacillations between the roles in the world as its resident or its stranger, fundamentally explained by Richard Gustafson.

Grodetskaia’s first chapter (“Zhitiinye pamiatniki v izdaniiax Tolstogo. Logika otbora siuzhetov,” 23-97) offers a tour into the nature of these more general attractions and repulsions. As becomes clear from the chapter’s title, Tolstoy’s efforts of “selective preservation” will be at odds with the very nature of hagiography, which is perceived as something uncontested, absolute, monumental. Tolstoy strives for highly independent selective memory [*pamiat’*] and this policy will run against the canon of enclosed, finished memory of *predanie* as a national literary monument [*pamiatnik*]. It also becomes clear that Grodetskaia limits her understanding of *predanie* to the *vita*, a saint’s life [*zhitie*], a genre on which she will concentrate throughout the book. The battle for a genre of memory becomes a struggle against sanctified sainthood, an anarchic project that we would expect from Tolstoy. But Tolstoy, in fact, approached *vitae* without a deliberate intention of deconstructing them, or of ruining their integrity. As Grodetskaia notes in the “Introduction,” he was driven to them by the prospect of finding a miracle, a miracle of the congruence [*chudo sovpadeniia*

13] of his own searches with those recorded in national spiritual chronicles. Spurred by this initial enthusiasm, by a possibility of learning “from the people,” Tolstoy starts his selection crusade. This is of course a self-serving selection, we should have no doubt about it, a selection in search of a self-satisfying miracle. The resulting idiosyncracies of Tolstoy’s choices should neither offend nor surprise us, implies Grodetskaia, and this is not a trifling comment considering that the scholar is working on a topic where vulnerabilities of national identity are at stake. Last but not least, we should acknowledge that she also works against decades of Soviet-sponsored myths extolling Tolstoy’s *epic-size narodnost*’ and she is not deterred by the prospect of reinterpreting the whole legacy of “Tolstoy and the traditions of Old Russian Literature.”

Of the editorial projects conducted by Tolstoy in the 1870s, Grodetskaia studies the logic of Tolstoy’s marginalia [*logika otcherkivaniia*] in “vita monuments” [*zhitiinye pamiatniki*] as reflected in Tolstoy’s choices of stories and rewriting of them in his *Primers* [*Azbuki* 1871-2, 1874-5], *Slavic Books* [*Slavianskie knigi*] and four Russian *Readers* [*Russkie knigi dlia chteniia* 1875, 1885]. *Posrednik* and *Tsvetnik*, Tolstoy’s popular publications of the 1880s, are mentioned only fleetingly and episodically, while Tolstoy’s later-life calendars of wisdom—“Na kazhdyi den’,” “Krug chteniia,” “Put’ zhizni”—are not discussed at all. The “monuments” that Grodetskaia has in mind are monthly readings from *Synaxary* [*Prolog*], *Menology* [*Chet’i Minei*], and *Paterikon* [*Paterik*] that were preserved in Tolstoy’s library and that she studied painstakingly, page by page, to gain access into the logic of his selections. Tolstoy’s major sources were the editions of *Chet’i Minei* published by the Archeological Commission (based on the Dmitri Rostovskii version), *Saints Vitae* of the Russian Church in 12 vols. edited by A. N. Muraviev, and Archimandrite Makary’s sourcebook, *History of the Russian Church*. In addition, Grodetskaia examines recorded non-canonic versions of these same legends to which Tolstoy himself referred. (Here his sources were V. P. Shchegolenok and A. N. Afanasiev.)

Grodetskaia’s conclusions about the criteria by

which Tolstoy seemed to have been guided in his selections are remarkable in their subtlety, integrity, and avoidance of easy solutions. We shall enumerate them as if they appeared itemized by the author:

1) Tolstoy’s indifference to patriotic lore, to national sainthood (28-30);

2) Tolstoy’s indifference to the popularity of certain legends (30-31);

3) Tolstoy’s heightened and consistent interest in martyrologues and crisis narratives, especially those of temptations and loss of old beliefs in search for new faith (e.g., Peter the Publican, Filaret the Charitable, Arseny the Great, Justin the Philosopher, *Of Wrath and Its Plight* [*Slovo o gneve*]) which are not very numerous and not very popular within the Russian hagiographic tradition (31-34);

4) among the martyrologues those chosen by Tolstoy have no miracles except folkloric ones, and list no national martyrs; e.g., he excludes the homily for Boris and Gleb;

5) Tolstoy’s reliance on the poetic quality (richness) of the legends and vitae, their artistic potentials (35);

6) Exclusions of the lives of the Princes and church hierarchs (34);

7) Tolstoy’s reluctance to include lives of canonical saints or “hagiographic untouchables” (e.g., Tikhon of Zadonsk, Iulianiia Lazarevskaia), preference for the lives of Fools in Christ (e.g., Andrei Iurodivyi);

8) Tolstoy’s avoidance of direct historical or chronological reference, “timelessness” of a tale (41);

9) the choice of tales characterized by lack of extraordinariness and exuberance;

10) tales from the *Paterikon* chosen predominantly over other sources (36-7);

11) few selections made by Tolstoy from specifically Russian national hagiographic and legendary lore compared to those selected from international banks of legendary wisdom(50).

Some of these points deserve to be dwelt upon. Many national monuments repelled Tolstoy by their violence, including the ever-popular *byliny*,

explains Grodetskaia. In the 1870s Tolstoy no longer believed that popular spirituality rests on a natural sense of poetry and patriotism. A policy of expurgating all saints' and Princes' lives (such as Iosif of Volotsk and Michael of Chernigov) from his *Primers* and legend collections resulted in a sacrifice of historical accuracy, which we thus assume not to be of any great concern for his educational policies (30). Instead, and against the recommendation of Strakhov, he insisted on the inclusion of poorly known tales of heroic asceticism [*podvizhnichestvo*] of Evlogy and Iosif Volokolamsky.

Moral tensions in legends needed to be supplemented by poetic tensions. But in regard to poetry, in the 1870s, as Grodetskaia demonstrates, Tolstoy still equated the concept of "popular" [*narodnyi*] with that of the "genuinely artistic" [*khudozhestvennyi*] and for this reason it is precisely legends, tales, and parables of all stripes that dominate other selections in his *Primers* (35). The reworking of a plot by legends [*obrabotka predaniem*] led Tolstoy to believe that new productive forms of language could be found naturally; moral imperatives alone did not dictate his choices as they would happen in the 1880s. The *Paterikon*'s primacy in the *Primer* (out of six vitae included, four are from it) is explained by Grodetskaia not by the especially upright, stoic, and heroically unbending nature of its legends but because among all other hagiographic exempli they possessed the most folkloric flair. The most important factor, however, to Tolstoy the elemental Christian at least, is that *Paterikon* stories predate the formation of the hagiographic canon, and constitute a quasi-Christian genre, practically a secular one, or, as Grodetskaia puts it, they are "tales of popular Christianity" [*skazaniia narodnogo Khristianstva*]. (In Grodetskaia's account the relevance of this factor for Tolstoy appears somewhat hidden by lengthy and unnecessary excursions into extant generic definitions of *Paterikon*).

One of the longstanding Soviet-era myths about Tolstoy's hagiographic selections debunked by Grodetskaia is their loving compliance with unimpeachable national canons. Tolstoy's *Primers* and collections were anything but traditional, she

says, disagreeing point blank with the commentators to volumes 21 and 22: "ni v odnu khrestomatiiu togo vremeni ni zhitia, ni letopis"—v podlinnom vide, ne v perelozhenniakh—ne vkhodili." After all, a *Primer*, she reminds us, was meant to introduce a child to the fundamentals of learning (45). Tolstoy's view of *predanie*, we can infer, is that its chains of wisdom were so spiritually nutritional that they could be implanted bit by bit and early on into a child's learning routine. Above all, in the 1870s Tolstoy was thoroughly convinced of the legends' educational significance. Of course, as Grodetskaia rightly concludes, all of Tolstoy's selections and rearrangements destroyed the integrity of the hagiographic monument as we know it. But Tolstoy, as Grodetskaia points out, was, as always, after a bigger game. In the mid-1870s, he had plans of publishing a book of saints' vitae "according to Tolstoy" and sought a collaboration with Archimandrite Leonid (L. A. Kavelin) (56). (Leonid agreed to participate, but the project did not go ahead.) Only two saints' lives (both passions) were attempted by Tolstoy as reworkings from the *Menology* after Dmitri of Rostov, to be published by *Posrednik* in 1885: "Stradaniia sviatogo muchenika Feodora, i Pergii Pamfiliskoi" (1886; 25: 462), "May 18. Stradaniia sviatykh Petra, Dionisiia, Andreia, Pavla i Khtistiny" (1886; 25: 538-539).

Despite the destruction of vitae in Tolstoy's hands in the course of his selections and experiments, his "big art" was affected by it. The other two chapters in Grodetskaia's book explore the meaning of saints' lives in the lives of Tolstoy's characters. Chapter Two (98-206) is written on *Anna Karenina* and Chapter Three (207-256) on *Father Sergius*. The two chapters elaborate on the significance for Tolstoy of themes with "high artistic potential," to quote the author, most often marked by him in their entirety in different hagiographic sources, as discussed in Chapter One: temptation of the flesh, spiritual passion (temptation by glory, pride, wrath, dejection), holy foolishness, visions, prayers (as forms of conversation with God). Exploring the application of these themes in the novel and the novella, the final two chapters offer a host of brilliant insights that aid

our understanding of famous episodes in very unexpected ways. They are really written about Tolstoy's novelistic and moral vision, strictly speaking tangential to *predaniia*. *Anna Karenina* and *Father Sergius* are read in the context of *predaniia* that Tolstoy was working on when he wrote them, and the readings are not especially well integrated with the main topic of the book.

The application of vita themes and motifs to the reading of *Anna Karenina*—the Chapter is modestly entitled “Rol' predaniia v Anne Kareninnoi”—illuminate its signature antitheses in a new manner. Grodetskaia's comparisons centre around the purely novelistic binaries in Tolstoy's novel: universal happiness vs. private experience; chastity vs. lust; marriage vs. celibacy; sanctity vs. sycophancy; spontaneity vs. rigidity; struggle for meaning and transformation vs. self-deception and destruction. Beginning with a rather trite trope of three brothers (Sergei's “successfully” fruitless way, Nicholas's perilous nihilism, Konstantin's unique, “foolish” way of discovery characteristic of the undeservedly fortunate younger brothers in fairy tales) that indeed represent the triune nature [troichnost'] of every legend, Grodetskaia moves on to share more fascinating discoveries.

Grodetskaia spends a long time discussing nearsightedness in Tolstoy's most spiritual heroes as a reflection of their keen inner perception. She provides an example of a 30 May tale from the *Dmitri Rostovskii Minei* of St. Ermy [Sviatoi Ermi], in which Tolstoy marked the episode where the future saint proffers his eyes to be plucked on the strength of his conviction that a loss of physical vision [oches moikh telesnykh] is inconsequential to the health of his inner eye [ochi serdechnii]. Certainly knowledge of the heart (or Pascal's *raison de cœur*) is central to Tolstoy's philosophical engagements in the 1870s. It is regrettable that Grodetskaia did not vigorously pursue Anna's physical and spiritual nearsightedness. Definitely important would have been a discussion of high-society's habit of squinting and feigning nearsightedness: wearing spectacles all the time was considered to be a bourgeois or overly intellectual trait. Here we have Tolstoy's deliberate play not only on a legendary antimony between the flesh and the

soul but also on a Pascalian demand of spiritual honesty with oneself in the face of social pretense (in the mid- to late-1870s he read Pascal at least as actively as popular legends). This is a case where we could have been guided into a more sophisticated unfolding of Tolstoy's communication with the spiritual lore. The author's preference not to deviate from the legends pays off, however, thanks to her concentration on finding these unexpected “miracles of coincidence” between the legends and the novels' episodes.

Tolstoy's intense interest in the tales of the Russian Baroque, which teem with accounts of satanic profligacy and sexual allure, deserves special mention. This interest, says Grodetskaia, is especially visible in the drafts of *Anna Karenina*. Tolstoy's marginalia next to such tales of licentious sinners as Mary of Egypt, Theodora, and Taisia help to identify a whole array of hidden quotations from the legends, preserved in the drafts practically intact. In the legends that Grodetskaia offers for comparison, *prelest'* [charm] is always *prel'shchenie* [a game of seduction] in *Anna Karenina*. It is possible to go a little further and suggest that Tolstoy, who wrote that “there was something terrible and cruel in her [Anna's] beauty” (PSS 18: 89) no less than Dostoevsky was aware that “beauty is a terrible force. . . .” What we perhaps have underestimated up to this point is how much Tolstoy's later rejection of beauty as a self-sufficient category in art might have owed to the influence of the tales in *Minei* and *Paterikon* which tend to punish it. These tales, Grodetskaia reminds us, are famous for the ferocious endings that await the lustful beauty, whether she repents or not. It is only natural to inquire into Anna's death from the point of view of the sinner's tropological death penalty in the legends.

The following remarkable chain of thought is typical for this chapter. Anna has a number of visions in the novel, and one of the visions might have saved her. Hallucinating in postpartum fever, she remembers the story of Maria of Egypt told her by her nanny, and repents to Karenin, forgiving him, calling him, a man whom she has wronged, a saint (“on sviatoi”; 18: 434). Not only a deathbed repentance but a resulting chain of conversions (in

Karenin and Vronsky) is in the spirit of a legend, insists Grodetskaya (160-1). The ease of maintaining oneself in this “converted” state within a legend compared with a decisive difficulty of doing this in life, or in a novel of family life leads to a new discussion. Why, indeed, does Maria of Egypt succeed in returning into the temple of God during the Holiday of the Cross while Anna living on Vronsky’s estate called Vozdvizhenskoe, derived from Vozdvizhenie, Krestovozdvizhenie, the Erection of the Holy Cross (a major Church holiday) does not? Certainly this constitutes a novel and fruitful approach to “the idea of the family” [*mysl’ semeinaia*]!

The account of Chapter Two would remain incomplete if we did not mention Grodetskaia’s deciphering of Anna’s struggles with her “little red clutching bag” seconds before the suicide, the little red bag that almost frustrated her plot, made her late, and could have kept her alive, ever a moot topic among Tolstoy scholars. In the tale of St. Theodora (*Prolog*, 30th December) the red bag, or “*krasnyi meshchets*,” writes Grodetskaia, was filled with the labours and sweat [*trudy i poty*] of Basil the Righteous, which was offered to atone for Theodora’s sin (129-130). This observation belongs in the repertoire of descriptive symbolism. Although most instances of symbolist refraction from the legends into the novel would seem more evocative than exact, this is indeed a discovery that every scholar would be most happy to make and one of many other examples that should make us grateful to Grodetskaia.

Compared to Anna’s false, deceptive visions, almost not given up even at the moment of *parousiia*, Levin’s highly pronounced transformative visions at the end of the novel seem to Grodetskaia to fulfill the prophecy of *predaniia*. It is in his ability to recognize grace and accept it, be serious about it, not play with sorcery and charm bracelets offered by the life in the world that Grodetskaia sees the final meaning of *predanie* in the novel.

The final chapter, “Moral’ paterikovogo zhitia v ‘Ottse Sergii’,” strikes me as a misnomer because the author does much more than search for mechanical coincidences of themes and transpositions of plotlines. In fact, after collating various possible

prototypes, Grodetskaia maintains that no one legend can be considered a prototype for Tolstoy’s story. (But thanks to her fastidious sorting through all the possibilities in this regard, Grodetskaia’s chapter is easily the most complete summary in any language of the critical literature on the sources to *Father Sergius*.) There is nothing new in Grodetskaia’s thesis that Tolstoy is not so much “redoing” as “undoing” a saint’s life; what is new in her exegesis is *how* he “undoes” it. In the writing of *Father Sergius*, Tolstoy was guided by the lives from *Prolog* (“Tale of a Black Cloak”), *Cave Paterikon* (“Tale of Jacob the Faster”), *Minei* (“Life of Martinian”), and *Lavsaiik* (or “Egyptian” Paterik). Grodetskaia leads us through a maze of options open to Tolstoy (he had bookmarks placed in respective sections of the tales) to demonstrate the complicated workings of imagination that determined his own final choice. The *Prolog* tale contained one episode of the elder’s fall to the lustful cavils of the “devil’s daughter” [*dshcher’ besnaia*], and the *Minei* versions contained descriptions of both a seduction and a fall (210). Tolstoy definitely tapped into a description of the elder’s struggle from *Prolog*, striking in intensity and sophistication, letting go of the unsatisfying finale in which the elder resurrects the seductress whom he murdered after falling to her. The *Minei* versions, full of picaresque motifs of profligate roguery (wagers to seduce holy men), surely found their reflection in Tolstoy’s description of Makovkina in the company of revelers plotting to seduce Sergius in his cave and, earlier, similar plots of inveiglement during Sergius’ tenure in the monasteries, by curious generals and a rich lady. The most illuminating are the self-punishments chosen by Tolstoy for Sergius that, Grodetskaia insists, testify to his parodying of the lives *from within the canon of Pateriki* themselves, which often expressed popular dislike of hermits. Because the burning of fingers in the flame turned into a ritualistic gesture of the black monks and the hermits and also because the behaviour of his own heroes perpetrating villainy against the source of their sexual distress in the late 1880s was itself turning into a *cliché*, Tolstoy parodied these radical precepts of self-punishment and has Sergius chop off, not burn, his finger.

After his real, beneficial fall, he throws away the axe altogether. Finally, Grodetskaia makes a very interesting suggestion that “a vision from God” [*videnie ot Boga*], which spurs Sergius to flee from the cave and seek Pashen’ka, was in reality one of the least “undone” motifs ever borrowed by Tolstoy from *vitae* (she means *Lavsaik* 37, 38) and perhaps a cause why he never tried hard enough to publish the novella during his lifetime (229).

Despite all these truly remarkable insights, it is in the last two chapters especially that we witness a decisive weakness of the book, its inability to draw a definitive line between a popular *predanie*, apocrypha, and “straight” hagiography, absorbed by Orthodoxy and sponsored by it. Although Grodetskaia does not confine herself exclusively to determining a precise role of all these different substrata of hagiography in Tolstoy’s spiritual quest, a greater discrimination would be very welcome indeed. She limits her possibilities by designating *predaniia* as “saint’s *vitae*” [*zhitiia sviatykh*] and rather obliquely pointing to their role in this life-long quest of Tolstoy. Compared with other innumerable inspirations that fueled this quest, the role of hagiography in Tolstoy’s life is minimal, at least in its pure form. Toward the end of her chapter on Father Sergius Grodetskaia does note that from the 1870s and throughout the 1880s and into the 1890s Tolstoy’s attitude to hagiography markedly changed. She attributes this change, with absolute justice, to Tolstoy’s *now complete* intolerance of sainthood and spiritual separation from the covenant of love of any sort, but especially in the practices of hermits and cave recluses.

Unfortunately, Grodetskaia does not distinguish between the selections for the *Primers*, *Slavic Books*, *Russian Books*, *Tsvetnik*, *Posrednik*, and Tolstoy’s late-life calendars of maxims compiled between 1904 and 1910. Certain changes of policies for all these publishing ventures did occur and they certainly could better explain Tolstoy’s own discrimination between types of hagiography. How can we explain a progression or a progress from *Azbuki* to, say, *Put’ zhizni*? I would have also welcomed a serious comparative analysis of Tolstoy’s rewriting of the proto-legends, such as “Krestnik,” “Chem liudi zhivy,” “Kaiushchiisia

greshnik,” and many others, which, after all, best illustrates his selectiveness and his creative approach to *predanie*. A separate chapter should perhaps have been reserved specifically for these remakes of hagiographic tales.

Grodetskaia apparently did not have access to the fine scholarship written on related topics by Western scholars. Except for several fleeting and rather tangential references to Richard Gustafson and one reference to Andrew Wachtel, she does not mention the work of American colleagues. A glaring short-change in this regard is of course Margaret Ziolkowski’s classic *Hagiography in Modern Russian Literature*, with a whole chapter on Tolstoy’s hagiographic anarchism. I would also add here an essay “Father Sergius and the Paradox of the Fortunate Fall” (1996) by Robert Louis Jackson which raises many points germane to the development of argument in Grodetskaia and predates her book by four years. Additionally, there were very fine studies done on Tolstoy’s popular projects, and specifically on his folklore stylizations by Gary Jahn and dramatic adaptations by Andrew Donskov which overlap significantly with Chapter One of Grodetskaia.

From the perspective of the format and exposition, the book is not very user-friendly. It is written in the “technical” Soviet academic tradition: facts, textological minutiae, and references in footnotes make this volume conveniently functional for specialists but its reluctance to extend, focus, deliberate, analyze might discourage those looking for a well-defined argument (especially because chapters are not efficiently structured or divided into logical clusters). It also lacks an index.

For all these caveats—insubstantial in view of the author’s achievement—we should state that “Otvety predaniia” is a major work on the topic. It supplies so much information that is sorely needed and provides so many new clues that no Tolstoy scholar can afford to ignore it, and neither can any Slavist interested in modern remakes of hagiography. Chapters of the book can be fruitfully incorporated into curricula of graduate seminars on Tolstoy and seminars on the history of genres. Grodetskaia’s book is highly recommended for everybody who loves Tolstoy and can read Rus-

sian. Ideally, it should find its way onto shelves of every major research library in North America.

INESA MEDZHIBOVSKAYA  
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

**Donna Tussing Orwin, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 271 pp (cloth).\***

The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy is a very welcome development for teachers and students of Russian literature alike. The Cambridge Companions to Literature series is best known for providing multi-specialist guidance on genres such as English Renaissance Drama and Victorian Poetry. The series also features volumes devoted to major individual authors from the Anglo-American tradition as well as a few towering figures of world literature, among them Goethe, Kafka, Mann, and Proust. Russian literature has recently begun to take its place in the Cambridge canon, with volumes on Modern Russian Culture and The Classic Russian Novel published in 1998, a Companion to Chekhov in 2000, and Companions to both Dostoevsky and Tolstoy appearing in 2002. The Cambridge Companions make excellent resources for teaching, and, in treating authors rather than individual works, they complement the MLA Approaches to Teaching World Literature series and the Northwestern/AATSEEL Critical Companions to Russian Literature.

The Companion to Tolstoy features a distinguished list of contributors, most of them emeriti and senior scholars in the field of Russian literature, and provides a representative sampling of the best English-language scholarship on this master Russian realist. The Companion strives to emphasize areas “most accessible to the general reader,” while making “brief excursions into more remote

territory” (xii), and thus concentrates on fiction. Donna Orwin’s introduction “Tolstoy as Artist and Public Figure” sets the tone for the volume with an incisive, balanced account that draws parallels across periods in the author’s life and suggests thoughtful connections between his fictional and non-fictional writing. Orwin identifies Tolstoy’s view of the individual as a guiding theme of his life, responsible for the uniquely Tolstoyan poetics that appeal to the reader’s sense perceptions and memories.

Part 1 of the Companion is devoted to “The Three Novels” and includes essays by Gary Saul Morson on *War and Peace*, Barbara Lönnqvist on *Anna Karenina*, and Hugh McLean on *Resurrection*. Morson outlines six sample “fallacies” to which both historiography and fictional characters are subject, in contrast to the four central Tolstoyan precepts taught by the novel—contingency, the ordinary, “presentness,” and prosaic knowledge. Lönnqvist raises central preoccupations that have guided numerous studies of *Anna Karenina*, among them the family, the epigraph, irreducible linkages, and the realist details such as Anna’s red handbag that evolve into powerful symbols. Lönnqvist traces the larger patterns formed by several such details through the novel, providing a model for the attentive reader. McLean describes the inception and evolution of Tolstoy’s third novel, particularly emphasizing the contrast between eros and agape and the problem of the ending, characterized as “the novel’s fadeout in a long series of Gospel quotations” (109).

Part 2 of the Companion treats Tolstoyan “Genres.” Gary Jahn illuminates “Tolstoy as a Writer of Popular Literature” (*narodnaia literatura*) and characterizes these works in terms of their most prominent literary features. Jahn points to the “innovative and coherent writing style” of these stories, “with their absence of complex metaphorical language, maximally simplified syntax, syntactic inversion, peasant words and expressions, and the use of many devices and motifs from both folklore and Scripture” (119). Richard Freeborn discusses “The Long Short Story in Tolstoy’s Fiction,” namely “The Death of Ivan Ilych,” “The Kreutzer Sonata,” “Father Sergius,” and “Master

\*To avoid conflict of interest, this review has been solicited and edited by Amy Mandelker, a former editor of *Tolstoy Studies Journal*.