

decades. An introduction that contextualized the work as what it clearly is—a lifelong labour of love of film and Tolstoy—might have lent the book a bit more coherence and significance. Finally, if one is to trust the typographical notes at the end of the book, only three hundred copies of *Hunt for Leo* were printed, and given the state of today's Russian academic press I doubt there will be more runs. Anyone who wants a copy of *Hunt for Leo* might indeed be faced with a challenging hunt for Lev Anninsky's book.

*\*Editor's note.* There is now a complete filmography of Tolstoy's works, prepared by Michael Denner, on the Tolstoy web site. See [www.tolstoystudies.org](http://www.tolstoystudies.org).

MICHAEL DENNER  
STETSON UNIVERSITY

**A. D. Donskov, ed., Z. N. Ivanova and L. D. Gromova, compilers. *Iz arkhiva N. N. Guseva: Novye materialy o L. N. Tolstom*. Ottawa: Slavic Research Group at the University of Ottawa and State L. N. Tolstoy Museum, Moscow, 2002.\***

Robert Whittaker, writing in volume IX (1997) of this journal, wrote that this editorial collective's first anthology of extracts from Gusev's Tolstoy archive "sparkles like a colorful, multifaceted mosaic of brilliant gems" and "reflects the highest standards of Russian textual criticism." Just the same may be said of this second volume, containing 45 letters from Gusev to Tolstoy and eight reminiscences of Tolstoy by divers hands. Indeed, Tolstoy studies generally owe a continuing debt to the very productive collaboration of the Slavic Research Group at the University of Ottawa and the State L. N. Tolstoy Museum in Moscow.

Nikolai Nikolaevich Gusev (1882-1967) may be said to have devoted his life to the study of Tolstoy and his teachings. From his first letter to Tolstoy, in 1903, through his two years (1907-09) of service as Tolstoy's personal secretary (his "priceless assistant," as Tolstoy called him) and

two years in exile (1909-11) following his arrest for spreading the teachings of his mentor, and culminating in a long and very fruitful research career which lasted right up until his death. He is best remembered for his monumental biographical research (*Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva L. N. Tolstogo* [*Chronicle of the Life and Work of L. N. Tolstoy*, 1958], four volumes of *Materialy k biografii L. N. Tolstogo* [*Materials for the Biography of L. N. Tolstoy*, 1954, 1958, 1963, 1970], and his personal reminiscence of his years as Tolstoy's secretary (*Dva goda s L. N. Tolstym* [*Two Years with Tolstoy*, ed. V. V. Grigorenko, 1973]). He was also instrumental in the production of the Jubilee Edition of Tolstoy's *Complete Collected Works*.

The letters from Gusev to Tolstoy cover the entire period of their acquaintance. The earliest letters offer a wonderful insight into the inner world of an idealistic young man beginning for the first time to grapple with Tolstoy's most serious questions and his answers to them. In this regard, Gusev's letter of 2 January 1910 (119-122) supplements the account of Gusev's own first acquaintance with Tolstoy with a description of Tolstoy's influence on the development of a young revolutionary.

Especially instructive are the letters Gusev wrote to Tolstoy while Gusev was in exile between August, 1909, and Tolstoy's death in November, 1910. One gains a new appreciation of what condemnation and exile for political reasons entailed, both physically and emotionally, in those days. The letter of 3 November 1909 (98-102) provides interesting comments on the reasons underlying the enmity of the Orthodox Church toward Tolstoy. The same letter asserts Gusev's opinion that Dostoevsky was, of all Tolstoy's contemporaries, closest to him in the spirit of his ideas. He singled out several passages from Dostoevsky's *Zapiski iz mertvogo doma* (*Notes from the Dead House*) as being particularly in sympathy with Tolstoy's ideas. There is also an interesting comment about Dostoevsky in the letter of 18 April 1910.

Of the reminiscences, that of Morozov called "Pozhar v Iasnnoi Poliane" ("A Fire at Iasnaia Poliana," 201-210) has a wonderful portrait of Tolstoy's kindness and charity toward the peasants

following a disastrous fire in the village. The author was one of Tolstoy's pupils at the Iasnaia Poliana school in the early 1860s; the memoir is from much later, of course.

Most interesting to me, though, was the memoir of S. N. Everling, a university student preparing for the professoriate under the tutelage of Tolstoy's acquaintance N. Ia. Grot. Here is a wonderful picture of Tolstoy at home with guests (in the Moscow house) and an abundance of sharp comment by him on Solov'ev, Fedorov, Strakhov, and others. This is the longest selection in the anthology, 163-180. A note tells us that the material was first published in English in a magazine (evidently called *The Nineteenth Century and After*) in 1923. In 1976 a Russian journal, *Literaturnaia Rossiia*, published a Russian translation of this English material. Thus, the claim that all of the materials in this collection were previously unpublished may not be true in the strictest sense, but the obscurity and inadequacy of the previous publications leaves the substance of the claim unimpugned.

Besides the letters and reminiscences themselves, the volume is richly supplied with admirable scholarly apparatus. This includes introductory pieces by both Donskov and Ivanova (both of them given in both English and Russian) and English summaries of the contents of each of the letters and all of the reminiscences. There are also numerous illustrations and photographs (many of them new to this reviewer), a handy table describing the nature and extent of Tolstoy's connection with the various memoirists, and indices of personal names and the titles of works by Tolstoy which are mentioned anywhere in the book. Once again we must thank Professors Donskov, Gromova, and Ivanova for an excellent further contribution to our store of documents pertaining to Tolstoy.

GARY JAHN  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

*\*Editor's Note:* Excerpts from this volume are published, translated into English, in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal*.

## Tolstoy and the Legend: Questions about Answers

Anna Glebovna Grodetskaia. *Otvety predanii: zhitiia sviatykh v dukhovnom poiske L'va Tolstogo*. St.-Petersburg: Nauka, 2000. 264 pp. Cloth, 1000 copies in print.

Tolstoy's "complex attitude to the ideology of the genre, to the world outlook of a vita—is an issue that has been barely touched"—this is how the author concludes an introductory chapter of her book (22). With her immensely learned and scrupulously written account of Tolstoy's "complex attitude" to hagiography, Anna Glebovna Grodetskaia fills many a lacuna in our knowledge of Tolstoy and traditional forms of religious art. Bypassed by modern readers of Tolstoy to whom they remain largely unknown, gingerly avoided by Tolstoy scholars to whom they appear unpromising as a topic, Tolstoy's hagiographic projects can indeed be considered a patch of *terra incognita* on the map of his life.

By titling her book *otvety predanii* [answers supplied by legends] Grodetskaia takes on herself the impossibly difficult task of clarifying the murky aspects of Tolstoy's "complex attitudes." She makes no ambitious promises but sifts through every single hagiographic source or motif of relevance to Tolstoy and follows its refraction in his art and thought. Overall she succeeds admirably. The "answers" that Grodetskaia offers are not final ones; carefully extrapolated from Tolstoy's collections of popular legends, or from his own rewriting of these legends, the book's conclusions demonstrate how subtle Tolstoy's dealings with absolute rhetoric were.

It will be helpful to define the meaning of the Russian word "predanie" explicitly for the Anglo-American reader. In Grodetskaia's book no such definition is attempted, but not because the Russian audience did not need one. On the contrary, for the country that as a nation was introduced so late to its own past and then had to accommodate this knowledge to the ever-changing political realities,