

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, Bely, 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. *Neinvestnyi 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

time. The extent of notes and commentary appended to each piece varies considerably and seems sometimes excessive, at other times sparse.

Pride of place has to go to the first publication of Tolstoy's own writings. It is fitting that the volume begins with some draft material for *War and Peace* and ends with some draft material for *Anna Karenina*. That for *War and Peace* includes the deaths of Andrei and of Karataev and Natasha's return to life after Andrei's death. Most interesting here is what the commentator calls "the culmination of the book's philosophical theme" (42), i.e., Pierre's thoughts in captivity as his dream of the globe is repeated and as Tolstoy inserts into his text the tale of the merchant. The draft material for *Anna Karenina* comes from insertions at the proof-stage concerning Levin's plans to re-order his life, Anna and Vronskii quarrelling after Levin's visit, and Levin and Kitty discussing Koznyshev and Varen'ka (where Tiutchev's 'Silentium' is quoted). Besides these drafts for literary works, we are given the first chapter of a religious work, written in late 1879 and known as "The Search for a True Faith" that subsequently was developed into *Confession* and other writings. In addition Tolstoy provided (195) a one-page outline for an account of a Doukhor's experiences: the man is identified as in all probability V. Pozdniakov, an excerpt from whose writings is republished. Finally, two batches of Tolstoy's letters are published for the first time: one group is taken from the copies that were normally made of his letters by 1908-9; and a second group comes from the USA and comprises letters of 1896-1903 to Ernest Crosby and of 1892 to Isabel Hapgood (who refused to translate both *The Kingdom of God is within You* and *The Kreutzer Sonata*).

Others letters begin with some from Tolstoy's father to his family when he was serving in the army during the French retreat of 1812-13; these are one of the few items in the book that are relevant to the early or antenatal Tolstoy rather than to the late or posthumous Tolstoy. Two other groups of letters come from his lifetime: letters of 1890 from his daughter, Mar'ia L'vovna, and his wife, Sof'ia Andreevna, to Gorbunov-Posadov, the editor of *Posrednik*; and letters of 1890 from Adin

Ballou, an American pacifist seen here disputing some points with Tolstoy (whose letters to Ballou are published in the Jubilee Edition). And two more groups of letters come from after his death: letters of Aleksandra L'vovna in emigration (she claims to know that her mother's published Diaries contain untruths about relations with her father), and letters to Tat'iana L'vovna in emigration (from Remizov, Tsvetaeva, Bunin, and Merezhkovskii).

Some interesting details of places and people are provided in an excerpt from the memoirs of I. M. Ivakin, who was tutor to Tolstoy's older boys in the early 1880s; more of his memoirs has been published in *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo* 69:II (1961). A Russian translation is given of excerpts from the memoirs (already published in English) of Henry George Jr. (referring to 1909) and Peter MacQueen (referring to 1901). In 1908 a congratulatory volume for Tolstoy's eightieth birthday was projected but never published. Brief pieces submitted for it appear here for the first time: by Andrei Belyi, Evgenii Anichkov (who calls for a national re-evaluation analogous to that stimulated by the Pushkin celebrations of 1880), and Baudouin de Courtenay. An account of Tolstoy's funeral by A. F. Bobkov, a student at Moscow University, confirms that the local peasants disliked Countess Tolstaia. And a Russian translation of the epilogue to Serge (Sergei Mikhailovich) Tolstoi, *Tolstoi et les Tolstoi* (Paris, 1980) draws on family traditions to attempt a general characterization and assessment of his eminent grandfather, but is clearly imprecise when he claims that Tolstoy learnt Greek only when he was past fifty (466).

The articles in this volume are in themselves a mixed bag. Eduard Babaev, in an erudite article, emphasizes that Tolstoy was a poet not just when he was sitting in concentration at his desk: he picked up ideas for his works everywhere, especially in the open air, e.g., when skating (most of his illustrations come from *Anna Karenina*). One of the few pieces to have been published previously in Russian is a memoir, written in late 1918 by S. Ol'denburg, that assesses the continuing relevance of Tolstoy's teaching in the face of world war, revolution, and the beginnings of civil war. The Zaidenshnur chapter is tripartite: first some autobiographical notes; then an assessment

of her career and her work on the texts of Tolstoy, from which the full benefits have yet to be reaped; and lastly the text of a paper she gave on folklore in Tolstoy's works. Boris Stechkin, himself a mathematician, dedicates to Zaidenshnur an article in which he points out two apparent anomalies with regard to the "number of the beast" in *War and Peace* and explores number-mysticism and apocalyptic expectations in connection with Napoleon that suggest some possible sources for Tolstoy. Finally Patricia Carden's fine article on "Tolstoj and the Plutarchan Tradition" (*American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists [Sofia, September 1988]: Literature*) appears in Russian for the first time.

Two pairs of items in this volume do not fit easily into the above categories. One short piece tells us about D. V. Nikitin, family doctor to Tolstoy in 1902-3, and his photographs of Tolstoy; and another, in more detail and surprisingly fruitfully, discusses Chertkov as a photographer of Tolstoy. A few (uncorrected) compositions by pupils at the Iasnaia Poliana school of the early 1860s give us some further notion of the models from which Tolstoy claimed to be learning to write. And some similarly unpolished excerpts from the writings of M. P. Novikov, a peasant who was close to Tolstoy especially at the end of his life, begin by reporting on conversations with Tolstoy in which he is frank about his household dilemma and end, in a letter to Stalin of January 1927, by challenging the Party leaders and their wives to set an example of communal living!

Over a hundred photographs are reproduced, many of them showing Tolstoy in his last years, some of them taken by Nikitin or Chertkov, and some more interesting than others; that on p. 265 intriguingly keeps its English caption ("One Thing: He had my Mother") with no further caption or attribution. There are a number of misprints, mostly venial, but p. 173 n. 3 gives Tolstoy's brother, Nikolai Nikolaevich, an extra year of life. It may be worth noting that another and slighter volume, also called *Neizvestnyi Tolstoi*, appeared in Khar'kov one year earlier.

C. J. G. TURNER

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Andrew Donskov and John Woodsworth, eds. *Lev Tolstoy and the Concept of Brotherhood. Proceedings of a Conference Held at the University of Ottawa 22-24 February 1996. New York-Ottawa-Toronto: Legas, 1996. Pp. 228 + xiv.***

The essays in this excellent collection serve to correct the dualist tendency to view Tolstoy the artist and Tolstoy the moralist as separate entities. Or rather, the volume explores the mysterious ways in which the different Tolstoys form one nature. Writing to Turgenev about *War and Peace*, Flaubert, annoyed that Tolstoy was repeating himself and philosophizing, commented that in the last part of the novel one begins to see "le monsieur, l'auteur, et le Russe" instead of Nature and Humanity.<sup>1</sup> The essays in this volume unabashedly bring us face to face with "le monsieur, l'auteur, et le Russe" (all at once)—and maintain that this encounter reveals something about nature and humanity. The two opening articles by Lidia Gromova-Opul'skaia ("The Philosophy and Aesthetics of Brotherhood in Tolstoy's Fiction") and Galina Galgan ("The Idea of World Renewal") establish the privileged place of the concept of brotherhood in Tolstoy's ethics and philosophy.

Implicitly or explicitly, the other articles ask whether Tolstoy "exists only as a myth" or whether he exists as our (modal) brother. These questions are eloquently and directly posed in the articles by the Richard Gustafson ("Tolstoy and the Twenty-First Century") and George Gibian ("Tolstoy and the Next Century: Familiarization and Residual Mysteries"), presented at a forum on Tolstoy "at the threshold of the twenty-first century."<sup>2</sup> Gibian and Gustafson are united in their view that Tolstoy's power lies partly at least in his ability to "foster" the concept of brotherhood, or as Gibian suggests, to "wrap us in a cloak of author-reader *sobornost'* [commonality]." Gustafson emphasizes the timeliness of Tolstoy's views, especially his conviction that individuals are responsible for evil around them and have the duty and power to change it. In a similar vein, in "Discovering the Brotherhood of the Destitute: Tolstoy's Insight into the Causes of Urban Poverty," Walter Smyr-