

poetry and non-Realist prose. Tolstoy offers the thread which binds a very rich tradition of epiphanies in European letters with its rebirth in the symbolist-influenced prose of Proust, Bely, Joyce, and Woolf. There is only one other Realist novelist who perhaps belongs in *Patterns of Epiphany*, but that novelist is Fyodor Dostoevsky and one misses him here.

JOHN M. KOPPER
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

Pier Cesare Bori. *L'altro Tolstoj*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1995.

The publication of *L'altro Tolstoj* will bring the fruits of recent critical and philological work on Tolstoy to those who read Italian. Inevitably, this book will take its place among those studies which reevaluate Tolstoy's religious "crisis" as not only an important aspect of his aesthetics but an almost inevitable epistemological move, even a predictable one, in relation to his other work.

In the introduction, Bori claims that he will investigate the unknown or misunderstood aspects of Tolstoy. If one asked, "By whom is Tolstoy misunderstood?" the answer would be, presumably, "By those critics on both sides of the Atlantic who see Tolstoy's ethical-religious position as a mid-life aberration." Bori's study may be aimed at an Italian critical audience which is not in complete agreement with recent critical insights in the English-language field of Tolstoy studies, nor with the position which Bori expounds with respect to Tolstoy. In the best Italian philological tradition, however, it reveals an exhaustive familiarity with the ninety-odd volumes of Tolstoy's complete *oeuvre* as well as an acquaintance with some of the major Tolstoy criticism written in the United States and Britain by A. N. Wilson, D. Tussing Orwin, Richard Gustafson, P. C. Roule, and Victor Terras.

A specialist in moral philosophy and the history of theology at the University of Bologna, Bori is especially interested in the ethical-religious ("etico-religiosa") quality of Tolstoy's particular quest. He competently handles the points at which philosophy and theology dovetail, even the com-

plex ways in which this occurs in Tolstoy's writings. Bori is also the author of a work called *Tolstoy oltre la letteratura* (*Tolstoy Beyond Literature*) and a work called *Gandhi and Tolstoy*, as well as several other volumes on art history, culture and ethics, and critical theory (*L'interpretation infinita*).

In this book, Bori expends great philological effort in tracing the development of the writer as thinker, often juxtaposing different genres in Tolstoy's *oeuvre* to demonstrate the unity of his thought. Bori positions himself in opposition to critics who resist this reading, perhaps unnecessarily, for quite a few Tolstoy scholars would agree with him.

One thinks of Rimvydas Silbajoris's book *Tolstoy's Aesthetics and His Art* (1991), in which the "unity and consistency" of Tolstoy's work is emphasized, the writing and the philosophy being inseparable.

One can almost predict the marriage of Tolstoy's art, aesthetics, and philosophical theory from a combination of his existential *angst*, his Christian universalist brotherhood, and his belief in the osmotic and transcendent properties of the work of art (culminating in the 1898 work *What is Art?*). In this late work, Tolstoy claims that true art ideally dissolves the boundaries between the artist and the recipient of the aesthetic experience. (Considering that he is espousing these theories a full century in advance of reader-response criticism, there suddenly appears to be method in his madness.) In her book, *Framing Anna Karenina*, Tolstoy scholar Amy Mandelker has formulated the phrase "iconic aesthetics" to describe this phenomenon in Tolstoy, in which the work of art ideally functions much the way an icon functions in the Orthodox Christian tradition: as representation and essence simultaneously.

Bori's reading differs from Mandelker's in this crucial respect, perhaps because of his different understanding of the ekphrastic and metaphorical sense in which "icon" is used in Tolstoy criticism. The religion of Tolstoy is "without icons, without relics, without miracles." Bori asserts that Tolstoy's ontological dualism is not founded on a Greco-Russian Orthodox basis, but one consisting of biblical roots and Enlightenment foundations,

consolidated with borrowings from Stoic and Chinese philosophy (in the last chapter):

One encounters this ontological dualism, then, in the positivism of Tolstoyan anthropology, with its Biblical roots and its Enlightenment foundations, upon which are consolidated borrowings from, above all, Chinese and Stoic philosophy (situating Tolstoy within the foundations of the Greco-Russian Orthodox tradition appears less plausible). (164)

L'altro Tolstoj begins on a note of spiritual crisis, in which Tolstoy, in his simultaneously private and public theological and philosophical journey, seems to find himself in a Dantesque dark wood of error. Several of Tolstoy's characters (Levin, the madman) experience the same "horror" as he voices in a description of a night of dread in Arzamas. Here is Tolstoy's voice speaking through the madman:

There is nothing on the horizon but death, and death should not be there. I tried to think of that with which I had been most occupied, with business, with my wife—and not only was there nothing pleasing, but everything had become a blank, a nothing. Everything had become covered up by the horror of my end which was ending. I needed to sleep. I wanted to retire for the night. But as soon as I lay down, I suddenly jumped up, from terror. And an anguish, an anguish, the same spiritual anguish which one feels before an attack of vomiting, not only physical, but it was spiritual . . . (11)

In the first chapter, "Return Home," Bori brings together the epistolary and the fictional genres in order to draw parallels between Tolstoy's journal entries, his own dark night of the soul (in the letter written to his wife from Arzamas), and that of his principal character Levin in *Anna Karenina*. Similarly, he juxtaposes *Memoirs of a Christian* (1881) and *Memoirs of a Madman* (1884) from which the above passage is taken.

At the beginning of a critical work, this contamination of categories may seem disturbing, but as one reads on, the passages are skillfully culled in order to trace threads of Tolstoy's thought which sometimes appears in various modes, sometimes almost verbatim from one genre to another.

Rousseau and Pascal are often cited as influences, and for some time Tolstoy is extremely influenced by these philosophers, as Bori notes. He is especially taken with Pascal's formula of observing the outward rituals of the (Catholic) faith to show respect for tradition. Eventually, however, Tolstoy not only rejects these rituals, but launches a full-scale attack on canonical Orthodox theology, beginning with the writings of the theologians of the seventh and eighth centuries and culminating in that of his contemporaries, such as Makarii Bulgakov. The ferocity of Tolstoy's response may arise from the seriousness of his intent and the length of time he spent studying these authors:

I have read the so-called blasphemous works of Voltaire and Hume, but I have never had such a clear sense of finding myself in the presence of a person absolutely deprived of faith as in the presence of the authors of these catechisms and these theological works. (47)

Tolstoy's objections do not begin and end with impressions, however. One of his most serious objections is the military role taken by the church (the liturgy includes prayers for the military):

And even in church, they pray for the success of our armies and the masters of the faith consider this homicide to be something that derives from the faith. And not only such killing in war[time,] but during the times of inspection riots during the war, I have seen members of the church, its masters . . . approve the killing of the young and wayward, and abandoned them to themselves. And I turn my attention once more to all that has been done by men who profess themselves to be Christians and I am appalled. (36)

Bori seems to have a talent for locating the passages which summarize Tolstoy's thought most pithily. Through much time spent among the original documents, he is performing a detailed philological life-and-works (or faith-and-works) analysis. In many quoted passages, Bori indicates words which are crossed out or replaced, thus revealing Tolstoy's original thoughts and personal editorial changes. For example, in the following passage Tolstoy's divergence with traditional

belief is shown by his refusal to let stand without crossing out (even in his journal) reference to Orthodoxy as the true faith:

Orthodox catechism is an instruction in the true faith (orthodox, *crossed out*), to bring to each man in general—and to the faithful Orthodox in particular—the salvation of the soul [of life, *crossed out*. (26)

Bori quotes, in reference to Tolstoy's reading of Max Muller in a letter to Strakhov, "The sum of the givens of science is the religion of our time" (23). One is reminded of Mayakovsky's famous statement that the image of a single black square is "the icon of our time." The epoch may have been one of secular, anti-Christian sentiment, but there was also a current of millennialism, and Tolstoy's prophetic stance is well-noted here. From Tolstoy's correspondence, Bori concludes that he was going against the *zeitgeist* and knew it, just as he knew that people close to him would object to the vehemence and the uncompromising singularity of his beliefs. He also knew, however, that he and his contemporaries had exhausted the possibilities of a perfunctory faith and the lifestyle of the educated, Westernized Russian aristocrat. The following quote occurs in the conclusion: "It is ridiculous to wish to find repose in the company of our peers: miserable like us, impotent like us, these will not provide any help: one dies alone" (164). Often quoted elsewhere by Bori is the Pascalian phrase, "il faut mourir seul."

It is true that in his old age, Tolstoy argues against secular philosophies, either material-positivistic, or progressive: ". . . therefore, the Europeans live without religion, yet religion is an indispensable condition of life. And yet I find in the conceptions of the materialists, the positivists, and the progressives, the same religion: a religion which confronts life, but not death" (23). In other words, all of the speculations of these philosophies were only useful in dealing with the problems of life, and were certainly useless in confronting death. One final important point in Bori's last chapter qualifies the Tolstoyan conception of reason (*razumenie*): it is not the reason exercised abstractly upon some object, nor reasonableness,

but an emphasis upon wisdom as prior to knowledge and transcending the individual. This would fit in with the current of literary gnosticism which follows Tolstoy and runs throughout the Symbolist period of Russian literature in the works of Solov'ev, Bély, Blok, Ivanov, and Solovyev.

In his investigations of Tolstoy's philosophical questionings in the 1870s, Bori views the "ethico-religious" aspect as primary, and the material examined in this book centers around these concerns. By drawing his selections from texts in various genres, such as the interior monologues of Tolstoy's literary characters, the private correspondence, and Tolstoy's journals, and applying his own specialized knowledge in ethical philosophy and theology, Bori reveals Tolstoy's consistency and unity in a profound way. In lieu of a conclusion, the section at the end is appropriately entitled "results and problems". This book, the work of a serious multilingual philologist and scholar of philosophy and theology, will be of great help to readers of Italian who wish to deepen their knowledge of Tolstoy as writer, thinker, and great soul.

ELIZABETH A. PALLITTO
CUNY GRADUATE CENTER,
NEW YORK

I. Borisova, ed. *Neivestnyi Tolstoi v arkhivakh Rossii i SShA*. Moscow: AO Tekhna-2, 1994.

This miscellany appears in connection with the eightieth anniversary of Tolstoy's death (1910-1990) and with the work being done in archives round the world to examine materials relevant to the new edition of Tolstoy's works. Like most miscellanies, it is very much of a mixture and, since it lacks an introduction, your reviewer sees it as his task to create some order. Its contents divide, roughly speaking, into four categories: the first publication of a few things written by Tolstoy himself, including letters; other people's letters; memoirs and analogous materials; and articles. Nearly everything is either new or published for the first time or published in Russian for the first