

While Donskoy and Galagan have added very helpful footnotes and commentary to the excerpts, they leave the texts to speak for themselves and the scholar to interpret them. Sometimes a bit more contextualization would have been helpful. This is, however, only a slight disadvantage of this otherwise very insightful contribution to Tolstoy scholarship.

Karin Beck
Columbia University



Андреев (Фейн), Герман. Чему учил Граф Лев Толстой.
Москва: Издательский дом «Стратегия», 2004. 334
ст.; 79.00 р.

German Andreev's book is an attempt to spark new interest in Tolstoy "the great humanist" among Russians. Andreev is a propagandist for the relevance of Tolstoyan religious-philosophical thinking to Russia today. In his long introduction (3-35) he laments the sorry legacy of Soviet Communism which has yet to be overcome, namely, "egoism, human relationships not based on love, priority of impersonal structures (the government, parties, etc.) over the individual human being, boorish behavior [хамство] of people in their relations with one other, widespread prevalence of alcoholism, disrespect for the property of others, chauvinism, disregard for the rights of minorities, and so on" (3). According to Andreev, all of these problems would be exposed for what they are and would possibly even be mitigated if Tolstoy's worldview were given the recognition it deserves within the new Russia. But even before the victory of Bolshevism over the old Russia some great Russian thinkers failed to recognize or even denigrated the potential of Tolstoyan religious teachings. Andreev cannot abide the sometimes negative evaluations of Tolstoy made by the likes of Sergei Bulgakov, Ivan Il'in, Konstantin Leont'ev, Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, Vasilii Rozanov, Pavel Florenskii, Semen Frank, and a few others. To quote just one of Tolstoy's critics: "The faith in reason preached by Tolstoy is a vileness and a stench [гнусность и смрад]. Tolstoy's faith is a calloused, evil, and cruel stony growth in the heart which does not permit it to approach God; it is sedition against God; it is a monstrous extension of the human organism which wishes to subordinate even God to itself" (8). These fighting words of the good Father

Florenskii indicate what Andreev believes he must overcome in order to convince his fellow Russians that Tolstoy can contribute to the spiritual revitalization of Russia today. Even Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and assorted other former Soviet dissidents sometimes get in the way of recognizing what Tolstoy has to offer to the Russians. (A long appendix [306-334] reprints Andreev's 1975 article attacking the volume of Soviet dissident writings *Из-под глыб* [1974] from a Tolstoyan viewpoint.) Tolstoy—unlike Solzhenitsyn, Shafarevich, and some other dissidents—did not have much use for Russian nationalism or for the Russian Orthodox Church. What Tolstoy wanted for Russians is what Russians still need today: simplicity of daily life, hard work, love of God and of one's neighbor, noninterference of the Orthodox Church in the lives of Russians, no participation in violence of any kind, and no nationalist or imperial pretensions. Andreev is a true Tolstoyan believer. Utilizing Solzhenitsyn's metaphor, he declares, "we need to pull the teachings of Tolstoy out from under the rubble" (333).

Andreev's book is divided into three parts. The first deals with Tolstoy's religious teachings overall: Tolstoy's concept of God (and of the Devil), the relationship of this God to Christ, the "meaning of life" in Tolstoy's worldview, and the importance of sin. The second part considers Tolstoy's religious teachings in relation to so-called "Russian national character," to the Russian government of Tolstoy's day, and to the revolutionary ferment of Tolstoy's time. The third part deals with the two most prominent frictions stirred up by Tolstoyan thought: religion versus science, and religion versus the Russian Orthodox Church. All three sections provide fairly accurate reports of what is generally known to Tolstoy scholars on these subjects, including the many changes of mind Tolstoy underwent and the many contradictions in his writings on these topics, so there is no need to summarize Andreev's sections here. The text is of course peppered with digressions on the current situation in Russia and on the many developments in Russian history which influenced Tolstoy or which Tolstoy influenced.

Andreev admits that Tolstoy was a "heretic," but points out that Tolstoy was also more tolerant than his Orthodox critics and the Russian Orthodox Church that essentially excommunicated him. Andreev grants that Tolstoy could be rather capricious in his recognition of authorities within the Bible—criticizing Paul's epistles

but foregrounding John's gospel, for example; or rejecting the violence perpetrated by the God of the Old Testament while welcoming the preaching of moral masochism by Jesus. But Andreev argues that Tolstoy tried to extract what was sensible and relevant from the Bible, a book which in any case is full of inconsistencies because it is the work of many authors over many centuries. In so picking and choosing, Andreev admits, Tolstoy did indeed create a new religion—however much he protested that he was just repeating the gospel message of righteousness, love, and peace.

Some interesting comparisons are made between Tolstoy and other Russian thinkers, especially Berdiaev, Il'in, and Solzhenitsyn. The last of these is especially important for Andreev. As is well known, Tolstoy repeatedly expressed a desire to be thrown into prison for his views, while Solzhenitsyn wrote more authoritatively on this subject, having experienced the Gulag himself. Both authors treasured the essential Christian value of suffering and renunciation of the world. Tolstoy went further than Solzhenitsyn, however, placing the highest possible value on nonresistance to evil as preached by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. Solzhenitsyn did not follow Tolstoy in this respect, nor did Ivan Il'in, who even took the trouble of writing an entire book attacking Tolstoyan nonresistance. As for Andreev, he comes down on the side of Tolstoy, allowing however, that the master of *Yasnaya Polyana* was himself inconsistent in his advocacy of nonresistance to evil.

To defend his assertions about Tolstoy, Andreev quotes generously from autobiographical works, religious tracts, personal correspondence, literary works, journalistic pieces, and so on. Curiously, though, very little from the mountain of memoirs about Tolstoy is mentioned, as if to avoid insightful witnesses to the real life of Saint Leo. The absence of any reference to Dushan Makovitskii's rich four-volume memoir is a mystery, given the in-depth conversations about religion Tolstoy conducted with many people in the presence of this devoted stenographer.

It has to be said that German Andreev idealizes Tolstoy's teachings rather than providing a scholarly analysis of them. The bibliography of 182 entries contains only three items written in languages other than Russian. (Within the text Andreev will sometimes discuss or quote a non-Russian source such as Teilhard de Chardin or Hegel or Feuerbach, but without bothering to make a

footnote.) No consideration whatsoever is given to Western scholarship on Tolstoy's religious views, despite the fact that Andreev emigrated from the Soviet Union and has been teaching in German universities since 1975. At a minimum the work of Hugh McLean, Richard Gustafson, Nicolas Weisbein, David Matual, and G. W. Spence should have been taken into consideration. Clearly this is a book written by a Russian exclusively for fellow-Russians. And yet, another drawback is lack of reference even to Russian scholarly research on Tolstoy's religious-philosophical views—for example the work of Iurii Kvitko, Anna Grodetskaia, and K. N. Lomunov.

Andreev's book will be more interesting for scholars of Russian intellectual history than for Tolstoy scholars per se. Andreev participates in an ongoing debate about the validity of Tolstoyanism rather than offering a detached, scholarly investigation.

Daniel Rancour-Laferriere
University of California, Davis



Billington, Josie. *Faithful Realism: Elizabeth Gaskell and Leo Tolstoy: A Comparative Study*. Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 2002. 227 pp.; \$43.50 (hardcover); ISBN 0838754589.

Josie Billington devotes half of her interesting book, *Faithful Realism: Elizabeth Gaskell and Leo Tolstoy*, to forging readings of both these writers as "religious realists." One of her primary efforts is to place Elizabeth Gaskell within the mainstream of the nineteenth-century novel. She "puts the case that *Wives and Daughters* is the nearest equivalent...in England to...*Anna Karenina*" (9). In her preface she alerts readers that as her argument developed it became clear to her that Tolstoy is crucial ("the great missing figure") not only for Gaskell, but for the Victorian period generally.

In Chapter 4 "Gaskell and Tolstoy: From *The Cossacks* to *Anna Karenina*," Billington offers readings of both novels. At times it is difficult to follow her meaning, as when she writes that in contrast to Berlin, she is arguing "that Tolstoy was a fox, seeing many things, only because he was a hedgehog, looking for one big thing. He could not understand the existence of other things. What is it, he wanted to know, that connects all these 'strands'? What is it that holds all of this together?" At this point, I found myself quite confused. But then, she continues,