Orwin shifts away from Tolstoy in chapter five, which features nuanced discussion of "romantic longing" in Turgenev's "Andrei Kolosov" and *Sportsman's Sketches*, and in chapter six, which describes Dostoevsky's complex reaction to the older writer and his "eros for wholeness" (admiring early on, then slyly critical in *The Demons*). Chapter seven provides a penetrating account of the potentialities and limitations of "reflection as a tool for understanding" in Dostoevsky's *Notes from the House of the Dead.* Chapters 8 and 9 return to Tolstoy. First Orwin traces the subtle influence that Tolstoy and Dostoevsky (who always maintained a respectful, almost courtly distance) exerted on each other in their treatment of childhood (here Dickens, instead of Turgenev is the hinge). Then she uncovers, with detective-like acuity, the "intense though hidden discussion" on "the psychological root of evil" (158) that the two writers conducted over a lengthy period of time and through a long series of works (including Tolstoy's *Boyhood*, "The Woodcutting," *Resurrection*, and *The Kreutzer Sonata*; and Dostoevsky's *Notes from the House of the Dead* and *The Demons*).

Turgenev, speaking for himself and for educated Russians of his time, remarked memorably that "reflection is our strength and our weakness, our destruction and our salvation" (12). Probably nobody felt and embodied more fully the contradictory costs and benefits of this consciousness than did Tolstoy, who was both powerfully drawn to a utopian idea of a natural, Rosseauvian state of minimal (self-) consciousness, and yet at the same was possessed with an incredibly keen moral sensibility and an oversized and relentlessly deconstructive brain that tended always to work in overdrive. When Pierre Bezukhov says of Anatole, "Yes, there goes a true sage. He sees nothing beyond the enjoyment of the moment. Nothing worries him and so he is always cheerful, satisfied, and serene. What I wouldn't give to be like him" (2: 5: 19), his envy is Tolstoy's, and in some sense is utterly genuine—yet we also know that neither Pierre nor Tolstoy really wants to be like Anatole.

Orwin always manages, with a certain serene, cerebral finesse, to do full justice to the complexity of Tolstoy's artistic treatment of the consciousness-unconsciousness conundrum. Nowhere is this more evident than in her discussion of Stiva Oblonsky (66-69), the child-like adult whom we cannot help but like even as we tut-tut him, and who, in Orwin's pithy formulation, "lives at the level of content that makes up existence, and … declines to think about it" (66). Her analysis of his character—and of our reaction to him—is the most supple and astute that I have ever encountered, and in many ways encapsulates for me the virtues of the book as a whole. In a precise yet generous and open-ended way, Orwin is able throughout this volume to articulate why nineteenth-century Russian psychological prose, so far removed from us in time and space, still seems so familiar and pertinent, and still has such an enduring and powerful effect on us.

Thomas Newlin
Oberlin College

Ungurianu, Dan. *Plotting History: The Russian Historical Novel in the Imperial Age.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2007. i-xii, 335 pages. ISBN 9780299225001.

Dan Ungurianu's book begins with a conundrum: "If one reads Pushkin's *Captain's Daughter* and Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, it would appear that these works, separated by only three decades and written by men belonging to the same circles of the Russian aristocracy, were produced by inhabitants of different planets" (xi). Ungurianu's purpose, as he puts it, is "to establish the poetics of the genre [in Russia] that arises at the intersection of fact and fiction" (5). Ungurianu argues that the ideas of history and fiction have undergone "drastic changes over the

past two centuries, and it is impossible to find a common denominator based on Russianness or any other criteria" (8). He turns to the semiotic approach of Lotman, Uspensky, Ginzburg, and others and does not embrace "the concept of dialogue" as a scheme that can fit equally well when applied to all authors and periods (8). It is the work of Yury Tynianov, particularly his essay "On Literary Evolution," which offers Ungurianu his fruitful starting point for arguing that each of the periods with which he is engaged—romanticism, realism, and early modernism—produced its own type of historical novel. One of the extremely valuable features of this book is that Ungurianu develops a poetics of the genre of the historical novel while at the same time offering readers a history of the genre in Russia that comprises analysis of canonical works by Pushkin, Gogol, and Tolstoy as well as of lesser known novels by Zagoskin, Bulgarin, Zotov, Lazhechnikov, Svinyin, A. K. Tolstoy, Kostomarov, Kelsiev, and others.

Plotting History, moreover, contains over one-hundred pages of useful appendices, bibliographies, and charts. These have been assembled with extraordinary meticulousness and include a list of all Russian historical novels of the period arranged by year of publication and by subject, as well as other statistics. Ungurianu has also provided short biographical and bibliographical entries on practitioners of the genre. He has undertaken simultaneously to articulate the evolution of the poetics of historical fiction in Russia in the imperial period, while also producing a quantified study. (For example, he tells us that between 1829—with the appearance of Mikhail Zagoskin's *Yury Miloslavsky, or Russians in the Year 1612*—and the Revolution of 1917, there were 120 authors who produced over 800 historical novels.) His book also contains a heady sampling of some 28 illustrations. Leafing through these figures offers a memorable visual snapshot of the evolution of a genre. The outstanding array of supporting materials which Ungurianu has developed constitutes an invaluable feature of this remarkable book. For those of us whose primary interest is in Tolstoy, Ungurianu successfully places Tolstoy's work into the context of the historical novel in Russia and into the framework of a theory of poetics derived from the critics mentioned above, but primarily stamped with the author's own critical and historical insights.

Ungurianu demonstrates that not only Walter Scott but also Victor Hugo, Alexandre Dumas père, and James Fenimore Cooper were important influences on the historical novel of the 1830s. He suggests that the only "true" adaptation of the Scottian novel is Pushkin's *Captain's Daughter*. Ungurianu's primary effort, however, is to reinsert both Pushkin's novel and Gogol's *Taras Bulba* within the general context of the historical novel in Russia of the 1830s. He also underscores how these two novels represent opposing models of the historical novel—one that focuses on a whole span of time, the other upon a particular event: "Gogol creates an epic meant to reflect the entirety of the Ukraine's medieval history, while Pushkin presents an archetypal vision of Russian history in his brilliant portrayal of the Pugachev rebellion" (76-77).

It seems to this reader that Ungurianu's fascination with *The Captain's Daughter* may have been the inspiration for the present volume with its dual focus on the evolution of the historical novel generally and the articulation of a poetics of the genre. "Unmistakably Scottian is the overall mode of *The Captain's Daughter*, which is perhaps the only Russian novel that faithfully follows Scott both in terms of formal devices and in conveying the insoluble tragedy of history. Nevertheless, Pushkin's concentrated, dynamic, and tantalizingly 'simple' novel, built around a tight grid of internal 'rhymes,' stands worlds apart from the unhurried narratives of the garrulous Scott" (88). Despite his interest in Scott's importance for Pushkin, Ungurianu's focus in writing about *The*

Captain's Daughter remains its Russian backgrounds. To illustrate this, he uses the snowstorm episode to demonstrate the novel's Russian connections.

The longest of the eight chapters of this book is devoted to Tolstoy.

Ungurianu establishes how in the mid-nineteenth century the romantic historical novel virtually vanished from the literary scene. He quotes Turgenev's 1853 comment, "I so fear Russian historical novels" (97). Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, however, "introduced a new paradigm for historical fiction" (97). It is here that the Tynianovian aspects of Ungurianu's approach come decidedly to the fore. He argues that in *War and Peace*, Tolstoy is not intentionally subverting the old romantic paradigm of the 1830s and 40s, but that rather in this work "older elements acquire different functions as they become part of a new system. Whereas the romantic novel is based on a dualistic outlook, with the ensuing tension between fact and fiction, Tolstoy proceeds from the monistic premises of realism, where fact and fiction supplement each other, with the novel now transformed into a synthetic genre of quasi-scientific analysis" (102). It is unfortunate that at this important juncture in Ungurianu's argument, his prose, usually so clear and precise, becomes somewhat opaque.

Nevertheless, the chapter on Tolstoy's work offers a wealth of fascinating material and analysis while managing to situate *War and Peace* firmly within the context of other Russian historical novels. For example, "Tolstoy's favorite idea that the battlefield is the realm of chaos and instincts finds a parallel in Zotov's account of the conflict at Eylau" (106). He demonstrates how Tolstoy's set-apart historical chapters, his digressions, and his account of Napoleon's retreat from Moscow echo similar features in the work of Zagoskin.

Ungurianu also puts forth a detailed comparison of Vyazemsky's account of his experience at the battle of Borodino which "unwittingly supports Tolstoy's favorite idea that great historical events are made up the mundane concerns of ordinary men" (111). He establishes this connection by highlighting Vyazemsky's haunting account of the night following the battle when he had encountered a cat in his cabin. Repelled by the animal, he had chased the poor creature into the stove and shut its door. This cruel, petty act had bothered Vyazemsky subsequently and became associated in his mind with the battle. As Ungurianu convincingly demonstrates, the conclusion of Vyazemsky's report sounds almost like a quotation from Tolstoy:

> During the battle I was as if in a dark or, rather, burning forest. Owing to my shortsightedness I saw poorly what was before my eyes. Owing to my lack of any military abilities or mere experience, I could not understand anything of what was going one […] And I might well be inquiring during the battle: 'Are we beating them or are they beating us?'" (111-12).

It is important, however, to realize that it is likely that neither writer influenced the other. Ungurianu tells us this in an endnote (the contents of which might have been more useful within the main body of the text). "Vyazmesky wrote his memoirs after reading Tolstoy's description of Borodino, but given his aversion to *War and Peace*, it is unlikely that he was somehow unconsciously influenced by Tolstoy. The latter was not familiar with the details of Vyazemsky's exploits at the time he composed the Borodino chapters, although he was probably aware of Vyazemsky's peculiar role during the battle" (296). One does still wonder, however, if on Vyazemsky's part the resemblance of his autobiographical account to Tolstoy's fictional one could in fact be a moment either of unconscious or "anxious" influence.

Ungurianu reads *War and Peace* as "quintessentially monistic," as a work in which "the dichotomy of truths gives way to the concept of a

single universal truth" (122). At this point his argument would have been sharpened in an important way had he tried to articulate that single universal truth. He goes on to take strong issue with the readings of Morson and Andrew Watchtel who have, as he puts it, extended to Tolstoy "the modified concepts of Bahtinian dialogue" (122). *Tolstovedi*, whatever their critical approach, will find this section of the book (119-24) thought provoking as it crystallizes in no uncertain terms two divergent strategies for reading *War and Peace*. Ungurianu concludes, "[i]n striving to demythologize history, Tolstoy paradoxically created his own myth of 1812, which was so powerful and compelling that it became firmly ingrained in the Russian national consciousness" (124).

Ungurianu goes on to show how *War and Peace* revitalized for the 1870s and 1880s the genre of the historical novel in Russia. During this period he estimates that some sixty authors cultivated the genre. He demonstrates, however, how these more realist novels still contained certain "birthmarks" of the romantic tradition, such as the device of the found manuscript, epigraphs, folk divertimentos, and references to lore and legend (139-40). But, again following the model of Tynianov, Ungurianu traces how these romantic elements underwent a transformation that significantly changed their function.

By the turn of the century and until the revolution, Ungurianu calculates that over one-hundred writers cultivated the genre of historical fiction, the most important of this group being Dmitry Merezhkovsky (and to a lesser degree Valery Bryusov and Vasily Kamensky). During this period the focus "shifted to western European history" and thus paralleled the preoccupation of the visual arts as well. Moreover, the positivist approach began to erode and was replaced with a growing interest in mysticism and the occult. "As Nikolai Berdyaev would later conclude in *The End of Our Time*, historical explanation as a generator of meanings had been discredited … Instead, history was now perceived as a multidimensional projection of a-temporal archetypes. Ultimately modernist thought took the leap from the realm of history into that of metahistory" (160).

In his final chapter, "In Lieu of a Conclusion," Ungurianu filters his argument through the various reincarnations of St. Petersburg in the historical novel. He uses as his prime example from the romantic period Lazehechnikov's portrayal of the city in *Ice Palace* and discovers there one of the "ur-texts" of the Petersburgian tradition (193). Here the city is like a giant theatrical set, "its reality both unreliable and illusory" (195). In the second wave of the historical novel (the realist tradition), "[a]rchaeological portrayals of the city abound" (199). Although Ungurianu suggests many compelling examples of representations of St. Petersburg from the second-rank novelists of the period, it would have been more effective had he also offered a deeper analysis of Tolstoy's representation of it instead of the rather cursory account he gives here. In the third, modernist period of the historical novel, he maintains that the vision of St. Petersburg is more apocalyptic, mythological, and subject to cyclical development. This summary cannot do justice to the variety of material that Ungurianu has amassed to buttress his conclusions.

Ungurianu's meticulous work elucidates and encapsulates the development of the historical novel in Russia. With frequently stunning scholarship, he puts forth his own distinct analysis of the history and the poetics of the genre. The result is an excellent and ambitious book.

Robin Feuer Miller
Brandeis University