well as the feverish mysticism of the symbolist novels at the beginning of the twentieth century. His prose is classical in style, uncontaminated by the ornamentalism of Remizov and the experiments of Rozanov and Sologub. He seems to embody the norms of nineteenth-century prose. Yet, there is something profoundly unTolstoyan in his craft that should give us pause in bringing him too close to Tolstoy. He is like Tolstoy in the clarity and precision of his description of nature and the concrete world about him, but unlike him in that the natural world is not a key to the internal world. Every detail, no matter how small and insignificant has, for Tolstoy, a human meaning. There is no purely objective world for Tolstoy; everything is in contact with our inside and everything inside is also outside. Not so for Bunin. The world for him is sense, and there is nothing beyond sense. Even in such a magnificent story as *Solnechny Udar*, the personnages have no "inside;" they are part of a dense network of sense data. They are overwritten by sense, and are what the sense-world makes them. There are no Prince Andreis in Bunin's works. His characters do not ponder the meaning of their lives and indeed his characters do not have characters. Even his celebrated difficult Russian seems to reflect this, with its dense network of participial constructions, which seem to make of language itself a tangible extension of the sense world.

But if he is not Tolstoy, he is Bunin and has his own creative centre. His works look back less to the nineteenth century and more to the twentieth century. He is at times astonishingly modern, for his characters live in a world devoid of reflective consciousness, anticipating the twentieth-century deconstruction of "personality" and autonomous consciousness. The world for him consists of bits and pieces, and it takes all the effort of art to make it whole and even then it is not whole. It is not surprising that he has little to tell us about Tolstoy, and that he leans so heavily on the words of others.

Osvobozhdnie Tolstogo is put together from patches of other people's reminiscences, quotations from Tolstoy's works, biographical remnants and random comments on Tolstoy's life. There is no beginning and no end and the middle is everywhere; It is a miscellany of other people's views, and as such it may reflect Bunin's own difficulty in finding something of his own to say. Nor is it clear what the title means by "The Liberation of Tolstoy." Liberation from what? From, I suppose, the sins of the flesh and of material life, but Tolstoy was too complex to cut him down to such a state.

This volume, too, is strange in that the notes overwhelm the text. Bunin's text occupies 142 pages in Marullo's edition and the notes number more than 200. Why so much in notes? Not because Bunin's text requires such industry, not because accuracy and care require it, and not because originality or research require it. It is apparently Marullo's passion for Bunin and Tolstoy that require it. The result is a mini-encylopedia on Tolstoy and Russian literature: entries (sometimes of essay length) on Tolstoy's last days, on similarities to Buddhist teachings, his relations with his wife, the comments of family members and friends, and random notes on everything that Tolstoy touched and touched him. And most of it taken from secondary sources.

Professor Marrullo has dedicated his professional life to editing and commenting on Bunin's works. He has established, as has no other scholar, the presence and importance of Bunin in Russian literature. This volume adds to that presence.

EDWARD WASIOLEK
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Anna Karenina on Page & Screen. Studies in Slavic Cultures II. Eds. Helena Goscilo and Petre Petrov. Pittsburgh: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures and Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 2001.

Anna Karenina on Page & Screen is the second issue of Studies in Slavic Cultures (SISC), "a scholarly, illustration-friendly journal published by members of the Slavic Department at the University of Pittsburgh, with support from the Center for Russian and East European Studies. SISC appears annually,[…] and consists entirely of analytical articles by graduate students devoted to aspects of verbal, visual, and aural culture in Russia and Eastern Europe" (http://www.pitt.edu/~slavic/sisc/). Helena Goscilo is the general editor of Studies in Slavic Cultures; and she is coeditor, with Petre Petrov, of this volume on *Anna Karenina*, the topic for which grew out of Goscilo's course on the novel at the University of Pittsburgh.

Each of the essays in *Anna Karenina on Page & Screen* is interesting in its own right, but the overall impression the collection conveys is of a volume dedicated not in any extraordinary measure to written versus cinematic aspects of *Anna Karenina* but rather to those traditional matters of lasting importance for both general readers and Tolstoy scholars. Where does truth reside in Tolstoy's fictional world? What is the ideal family, and what constitutes a happy marriage? Which social functions disguise versus disclose the authentic life for Tolstoy? Irina Makoveeva's cogent treatment of the numerous film adaptations of *Anna Karenina* ("Cinematic Adaptations of *Anna Karenina* ") thus stands somewhat apart from the other articles, since it explicitly addresses film rather than text. Makoveeva's argument that the remarkable visual metaphors of the 1967 Zarkhi film derive from an attentive "reading" of the original novel (125) is especially persuasive.

Although there are no illustrations in *Anna Karenina on Page & Screen* (which is somewhat surprising, given the mission statement of the journal), most of the essays pay considerable attention to a foundational dichotomy between what is/may be seen and what is not/may not be seen in the world of Tolstoy's fiction. Valeria Sobol's "Reading the Invisible: The Mind, the Body, and the Medical Examiner in Lev Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*," for example, considers how Tolstoy represents the limitations of positivist epistemology in light of nineteenth-century concepts of love sickness in general and Kitty's encounter with the doctors in particular. Sobol aptly juxtaposes Chernyshevsky's *What is to Be Done?* to Tolstoy's novel. In "Communion or Camouflage: Food and Focal Locales in *Anna Karenina*," Saera Yoon also treats the visual as deceptive, especially when it involves the theatricality of social dining in the city; for "[t]he ritual of eating and drinking in high society ultimately serves as a camouflage or displacement enacted by privileged consumers" (141). Thus while publicly displaying their dining, high society's actors conceal more telling behaviour—lying, cheating, stealing, etc. Yoon makes clear, of course, that such simple dichotomies of unseen and seen in Tolstoy are rarely so simplistic. In "The Truth of the Body, from *War and Peace* to *Anna Karenina*" Petre Petrov reminds us that for Tolstoy mind and body, perhaps the ultimate unseen/seen pair, are inextricable from one another. Specifically, Petrov analyzes how the body divulges meaning differently in Tolstoy's two most famous novels. Just how exactly are Tolstoy's portraits of the body "physiologically truthful," he asks (29)? Merezhkovskii, Petrov continues, did not distinguish Tolstoy's omniscient narrations of the body from those seen 'through the eyes', of Tolstoy's characters. "By failing to separate those two gazes, Merezhkovskii and, after him, all Tolstoy scholars who have written on the subject miss an opportunity and realize the Biblical saying, 'They have eyes that they might not see'" (32). Petrov sees a significant stylistic difference between the way the physical world gives shape to consciousness in *War and Peace* and consciousness (de)forms the appearance of bodies in *Anna Karenina*.

Like many of us, I think, the contributors to *Anna Karenina on Page & Screen* are fascinated by Tolstoy's penchant for almost taxonomic analysis followed by revisions that make his original analysis seem artificial. Makoveeva's useful categorization of film realizations of *Anna Karenina* and Olga Karpushina's "moral hierarchy" of the family ("The Idea of the Family in Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*: The Moral Hierarchy of Families") describe this Tolstoyan tendency. Karpushina suggests a moral categorization that includes fidelity, family heritage, place of residence, as well as other criteria—and Tolstoy might have agreed with these categorizations, though one wants to repeat here the accepted wisdom that Tolstoy's genius lays in how he breaks out of his own categorizations. As he proved over and over again, even Tolstoy didn't want to live in Tolstoy's world of moral hierarchy. And Levin does not want to live in the world of ossified social categories, as Elizabeth Blake argues in "Toward a Happy Marriage: Transcending Gendered Social Roles in *Anna Karenina.*" "Levin's failure to adopt this essentially antagonistic attitude toward the women's sphere of influence allows him to transcend the genderification of social roles in Tolstoy's novel and thus contributes to the success of his marriage to Kitty" (94). Levin's willingness to scorn traditional masculine registers of social value is well documented, and in a longer article Blake would no doubt have followed up by reformulating the central dilemma of the novel: why is Levin rewarded when he transcends gender limitations and Anna "punished'?

On a broader editorial level *Anna Karenina on Page & Screen* is a perfectly good production, and its format and range of subject bodes well for future issues of the journal. There are only a few small copyediting/formatting problems, but nothing significant enough to distract the reader. One looks forward to the next issue of Studies in Slavic Culture, which will be devoted to the subject of the body in Slavic culture.

JUSTIN WEIR
HARVARD UNIVERSITY