

Meyer states that Tolstoy's antidote to the decadence he found in the French novel of adultery is made up of the ideals of Rousseau and the eternal authority of the Gospels. Her detailed discussion of the way Tolstoy reworks *Emile et Sophie* is illuminating and immediately relevant to the development both of Levin and of Anna Karenina. My only quibble with Meyer's careful analysis of the relationship between the two works is the statement: "In both cases, the atmosphere of the capital affects women whose incomplete marriage makes them vulnerable, Petersburg society ladies having acquired from Paris looser attitudes towards adultery" (158). Yet the crucial first step in Anna's adultery happens in Moscow, not St Petersburg. Ironically, Anna is there trying to smooth over the effects of Stiva's philandering on his marriage, but she has not thereby acquired a looser attitude towards adultery in regard to her own conduct.

Curiously, Tolstoy is not recorded as having said much about *Madame Bovary*. Yet the fullest, unmistakably subtextual relationship Meyer treats is the one between *Anna Karenina* and *Madame Bovary*. This comparison is not a new one, but the detail in which Meyer works out the transformations is exceptional (even down to a consideration of the uses of manure and the importance of cigar cases. In these two novels, a cigar is not just a cigar... but it is one too). In the final section of her chapter on *Anna Karenina*, Meyer shows how Tolstoy's antidote to adultery, and indeed to all the decadence that these French novels represent to him, required "not only the ideals of Rousseau but also the eternal authority of the Gospels" (200).

Meyer's *Anna Karenina* chapter deserves the close attention not only of comparatists but also of all readers of Tolstoy who want to see the artisan/artist at work on his subtextual materials. Her Dostoevsky chapter is perhaps even more useful than the one on Tolstoy, since the materials discussed in it are not as well-known to the

general reader as those transformed by Tolstoy. Meyer is generous in her extensive notes, acknowledging relevant contributions to her argument by other scholars (e.g., a nod to Liza Knapp's "Tue-la,! Tue-le!" or to Thomas Barran's discussion of the importance of Rousseau's "Confession of a Savoyard Vicar" for Levin's quest for the meaning of his life). Other notes acknowledge colleagues and students who have provided important insights about subtexts. There are, however, two odd exceptions. In her chapter on Dostoevsky, Meyer is uncharacteristically dismissive of the work of Donald Fanger. As for the scholarship on Tolstoy, Amy Mandelker does not even appear in the bibliography, which may be because it is a little out of date (the last entry I noticed was from 2002). Nevertheless, the bibliography is a useful resource, as is the whole book, which will be a boon not only to all close readers of these three major novels, but also to readers for whom the "subtexts" are the primary points of reference.

Elizabeth Klosty Beaujour
Hunter College
and the CUNY Graduate Center



Croskey, Robert. *The Legacy of Tolstoy. Alexandra Tolstoy and the Soviet Regime in the 1920s.* Seattle; London: U of Washington, 2008. 84 pages. ISBN: 9780295988771.

This rather small volume is painstakingly researched. It focuses on the relations between Alexandra Tolstoy and the new Soviet regime, but as the author acknowledges in the introduction, the study "reflects some other themes found in the scholarship of the 1920s, such as the question of continuity across the divide of revolution, conflict over cultural policy, the position of the old Imperial intelligentsia in Soviet society, and the importance of patronage

networks" (4). Since the author makes abundant use of archival material, these other themes rival the main one in terms of scholarly interest. Unfortunately, there is no index; all chapters are followed by extensive footnotes. Not all the footnotes are pertinent to the subject matter under discussion and their legibility would have been improved had they been shortened. Another disadvantage is that the footnotes do not list place of publication or year. The introduction is followed by chapters on "Before the Revolution," "Civil War," "Iasnaia Poliana," "Commune and Community," "The Tolstoy Jubilee Celebration," "The Jubilee Edition of Tolstoy's Works," "Leaving the Soviet Union," and "Conclusion." There are two appendices.

In "Before the Revolution," the reader learns that the Yasnaya Polyana archive revealed that after 1915 the land at Yasnaya Polyana, owned by Alexandra, was to be turned over to the peasants. The Socialist Revolutionary Land Policy enabled Alexandra to turn the land over to the peasants and not to the pre-Revolutionary peasant commune. It is also worth mentioning that Alexandra enlisted as a military nurse. "Her work during the war earned her two medals of St. George" (11). In November 1917 she returned to Moscow. In "Civil War" the new regime's wrangling with its position regarding the publication of Tolstoy's complete works becomes abundantly clear. Although not all sources are archival, the reader will be surprised to learn that during the period 1917-1921 Alexandra Tolstoy was incarcerated at least five times for her alleged anti-Bolshevik connections. It is also interesting to note that during this period preparations were made to publish Tolstoy's complete works with Alexandra's involvement. Although many Tolstoy scholars collaborated on this project, "the obstacle was the nationalization of the actual manuscripts of Russian writers held in state repositories in July 1919" (17). Thus, this edition never came to fruition.

Needless to say, after the revolution there was much debate on how to run Yasnaya Polyana. In May of 1919, the estate came under the control of the People's Commissariat of Agriculture. "In August 1918, the Commissariat of Education approved [already] the construction of a model school at [Yasnaya Polyana]" (25). In her effort to remain as much in charge of the management of the estate as possible, Alexandra Tolstoy was appointed Commissar of Yasnaya Polyana. On June 10, 1921 Yasnaya Polyana was declared a reserve by state decree, giving the new museum much needed stability. It is surprising to note that the agricultural work would "be carried out by a commune of Tolstoyans who were to develop a model farm" (27). It seems almost incredible that "Lenin also supported the project of using the sectarians as models for rural social and economic organizations" (27), in the light of the fact that Tolstoyans were later persecuted by the regime. The State Archive of the Russian Federation shows that "by 1932 there were thirty institutions of cultural and educational importance at [Yasnaya Polyana]" (34). "In many ways what happened at Yasnaya Polyana in the 1920s reflected the experience of the country as a whole, which was characterized by electrification, experimental agricultural organization, and emphasis on literacy and education" (40).

"The Tolstoy Jubilee Celebration" is the most informative chapter of the book. The Soviets had to leap a major hurdle to properly celebrate the event. Several committees were formed but the major opposing sides were Lunacharsky's and Aleksandra L'vovna's. Only three days before the official opening of the festivities on September 10, 1928, Lunacharskii wrote in an article: "People of the October Revolution must arm themselves properly to refute all attempts of the Tolstoyans to exaggerate the significance of Tolstoy [...] [these attempts] seemed to Lenin simply ridiculous" (44). Aleksandra wanted to promote a comprehensive portrayal of her father,

not shying away from his doctrine of non-resistance to evil and his religious views. Only a handful of foreigners came to the event, which failed to evoke wider public interest as hoped.

The intention to publish the complete works of Lev Tolstoy was naturally linked to the preparations for the Jubilee Celebration. In the initial stage, the major forces behind the project were Aleksandra L'vovna and Chertkov who "on 10 November 1925 ... reached a general agreement on the editing of Tolstoy's work" (64). Chertkov did the actual work since Aleksandra L'vovna had lost interest in the project once Tolstoy's works were put in the hands of the State. Nevertheless, the project came to fruition as all Tolstoy scholars know. The first volume, which contained *Childhood*, appeared in September 1928.

Aleksandra L'vovna and the government reached an agreement that the schools at Yasnaya Polyana would be exempt from teaching anti-religion and militarism as they were contrary to Tolstoy's teachings. This agreement, however,

had changed by 1929 when "the schools became ordinary Soviet Institutions, teaching the standard curriculum, including atheism and revolutionary militarism" (78). The situation was intolerable for Aleksandra L'vovna. She received permission to go to Japan, among others foreign states, to give lectures about her father. By this time, the courageous woman had already decided not to return to the Soviet Union.

This slim volume is not only interesting for Slavists due to its account of Tolstoy's confrontation with the Soviet regime during the 1920s, but also for its account of the new regime's slow process to cope with the culture, and in particular, with literature of the past. More strongly expressed: the new regime's lack of a socialist cultural policy is exemplified by the Formalist critic Boris Eikhenbaum's *Tolstoy*, volume one of 1928 and volume two of 1931.

A. F. Zweers
University of Waterloo