Zeit]; but woe to him if he is at the same time its ward or, worse still, its crony [*Günstling*]."[33] Habermas's error, stated briefly, was in conflating being a child of one's time with being its crony. That one is a child of one's time means that one cannot spin a grasp of justice out of one's own abstract subjectivity but only in the context of the historical development of justice across all nations. That one need not be its crony means that one need not accept as legitimate any interpretation of human identity and justice in the particular form assumed in any one nation, even one's own.

Palm Desert, California

33. Friedrich Schiller, Letter 9, in *On the Aesthetic Education of Man in a Series of Letters*, trans. and ed. Elizabeth M. Wilkinson and L. A. Willoughby (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), §4 (amending the Wilkinson and Willoughby translation).

Clio 42:1 2012

INESSA MEDZHIBOVSKAYA

Russian Classics on Trial: Reflections on Critics and Criticism

God and Man according to Tolstoy. By Alexander Boot. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. 254 pages.

Between Religion and Rationality: Essays in Russian Literature and Culture. By Joseph Frank. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010. vi + 298 pages.

It is hard to imagine two books more different in genre and focus, and driven by more antagonistic impulses issuing from opposing professional, intellectual, and political backgrounds and stances of their authors than Joseph Frank's *Between Religion and Rationality: Essays in Russian Literature and Culture* and Alexander Boot's *God and Man according to Tolstoy*.

Joseph Frank's monumental Fyodor Dostoevsky biography, his works on spatial form in literature, and his first collection on Russian cultural and critical heritage, *Through the Russian Prism: Essays on Literature and Culture* (1990), are constant companions of many teachers and scholars. Only in his twenties, Frank broke onto the literary studies scene with the publication of the now classic, three-part series "Spatial Form in Modern Literature."[1] Frank's magnum opus, his five-volume biography of Dostoevsky, released by Princeton University Press between

1. Joseph Frank, "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Two Parts," *Sewanee Review* 53.2 (1945): 221–40; and "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Three Parts," *Sewanee Review* 53.3 (1945): 433–56 and 53.4 (1945): 643–53.

1976 and 2002, has now been funneled into one gigantic volume, *Dostoevsky: A Writer in His Time* (2009). In this new book, Frank has republished, as he has done many times before, many of his shorter essays, reviews, and incidental pieces, works made new again by being invigorated with fresh critical readings. Four parts and eighteen chapters make for a hefty volume, but at every stop, Frank's erudite assessments help to sample in the right order new editions of classics and other major Russian authors (Dostoevsky, Leo Tolstoy, Ivan Goncharov, and Vladimir Nabokov), outstanding books of criticism (for example, an edition of Lydia Ginzburg's *On Psychological Prose* [1989] translated by Judson Rosengrant), books testifying to outstanding careers (see a luminous chapter on historian Richard Pipes), substantial literary biographies (for example, *Pushkin: A Biography* [2002], by T. J. Binyion, and *Chekhov: Scenes from a Life* [2004], by Rosamund Bartlett), mass-market cultural histories of Russia (like *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia* [2002], by Orlando Figes), or interpretive, fictionalized adaptations of Russian themes circling around Dostoevsky (*Summer in Baden-Baden* [1981], by Leonid Tsypkin, and *The Master of Petersburg* (1995) and *Elizabeth Costello* (2003), both by J. M. Coetzee). The book gives much attention to Russian-Jewish topics, incisive writings on the costs of assimilation, and the cultural and personal effects of anti-Semitism. Along with these, readers also receive penetrating aid in following the often tragic and not easily comprehensible fates of intellectuals, writers, and cultural figures of Russia, described during decisive episodes of their lives as historical actors and willing or unwilling political activists, often as stoics, martyrs, and tricksters of history.

Dostoevsky is always Frank's favored topic, but in the volume under review we also have unforgettable essays on Prince D. S. Mirsky, eminent émigré man of letters who returned to Joseph Stalin's Russia and died in the purges, and on Abram Tertz, the defiant Jewish pseudonym of the *samizdat* (a Russian abbreviation standing for works published in the Soviet Union without the approval of the state and its authorized publishing venues) writer and critic Andrei Siniavsky, author of such twentieth-century classics as *Strolls with Pushkin* (1975), *On Socialist Realism* (1960), and *Soviet Civilization* (1989 in French; 1990 in English). Tertz is usually described as the first dissident to emerge after the Khrushchev Thaw; after serving a term as a prisoner of conscience following Khrushchev's show trial of him and his Jewish friend, writer Yury Daniel, in 1966, he was forced out of

the Soviet Union in 1973, taught at the Collège de Sorbonne, and became a spiritual and intellectual center of Russian writing abroad and a mastermind of *tamizdat* (literature denied approval by official Soviet censor but published in the West). He died in Paris in 1997. In addition to Tertz, Frank is drawn in this volume especially to careers of talented loners marginalized by willing self-exclusion, internal emigration, or deracination, and to careers of intellectual laborers daring to differ (for example, Ginzburg, Pipes, Nabokov, Tsypkin, and Ari Kovner). An unsurpassed master of making history familiar and close by vividly and scrupulously representing people swept up by the ideas of their age, Frank's new book is yet another testament to his standing reputation as one of the very best literary biographers of our time and one of the finest biographers of all times.

Those approaching Alexander Boot's new book, which is a debunking of Tolstoy's legacy written in anticipation of the 2010 centennial of his death, would probably not consider its author a household name. "A former Russian," as he calls himself, he received advanced philological training from Moscow State University and taught English and American literature before getting into some kind of trouble with the KGB. On the same wave of dissident expulsion from the Soviet Union as Tertz, Joseph Brodsky, and Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Boot immigrated to America in 1973. Disillusioned, he moved to Great Britain and now, as his biographical blurb on the back cover informs us, "divides his time between London and Burgundy." He is the father of the famous legal and military historian Max Boot, political commentator, columnist, senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, and advisor to the US Department of Defense.[2] At the urging of his son, a detail that he fondly recalls in the prefacing section, Alexander Boot wrote his first book, *How the West Was Lost* (2006), a defense of Western heritage and Western values against the modern world and its pernicious agent, "Modman" (modern man), bent on indiscriminate expansion turning global. In his first book, Boot argues that, in a world overrun by Modman and his liberally indoctrinated clique, illusions of supremacy still nourished by naive "Westman" (Western man) should be ceded. The West had started to be lost

2. Max Boot, *Out of Order: Arrogance, Corruption, and Incompetence on the Bench* (New York: Basic, 1998); *The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power* (New York: Basic, 2003); and *War Made New: Technology, Warfare, and the Course of History, 1500 to Today* (New York: Gotham, 2006).

with the first modernizing, secularist, mob-catering measures, leading to the loss of Christianity and the deprecation of the state and of cultural heritage. Boot blames this development on the ineptitude of culture's officiators, the institute of "Dead White Males" (Boot's term, revealing his tenacious longing for hoary shibboleths as well as for apocalyptic allegory). The losing battle of the Westman against the Modman, a totalitarian hell of a mixing bowl "whisking together a nihilist and a philistine" in which "Modmen want all students to be equally ignorant" and in which William Shakespeare, believed to be too "hung up on heterosexuality and gang warfare," is "replaced with Salman Rushdie, Philip Roth, Martin Amis and other 'modern classics'" would be a world in which, to Boot, the West cannot remain safe from democracy.[3]

In Boot's debut volume, a delayed European sequel to Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students* (1987), Tolstoy is not treated too badly. He is deemed to be one of the last offshoots of great Western art and in that capacity is juxtaposed to Dostoevsky, whose place is said to be near the bedsit with prostitutes and nihilists. Given his proven complicity with Modmen and in light of Boot's Westman-Modman argument, it is surprising to see Tolstoy haloed. Take Tolstoy's tract *On Shakespeare and on Drama* (1903–4), a belligerent attack on exploitative bards and bardolatry, or consider his general intolerance of autocracy, empires, cloistered art, patriotic zeal, exploitation, and organized religion. The only note of displeasure against Tolstoy that Boot sounds in 2006 is on account of his open letter of protest to Prime Minister Pyotr Stolypin, sent in the aftermath of the hanging of a large group of peasants and widely known as "I Cannot Remain Silent!" (1908). Boot calls this protest against capital punishment and public executions "silly."[4]

In his second book, however, *God and Man according to Tolstoy*, Boot fully corrects this oversight. Its twelve chapters focus their undivided attention on how to impute to Tolstoy most if not all of the evils described in *How the West Was Lost*. Chapter titles are often self-explanatory in their chummy derision; at other times they are suggestive of containing yet another form of revelation

3. Alexander Boot, *How the West Was Lost*, foreword by Theodore Dalrymple (London: I. B. Tauris, 2006), 256–57, 339.

4. Boot, *How the West Was Lost*, 248.

or exposure: "Uncovering the Secret," "What Kind of Man Would Take On God!" "Religion without Faith, Christianity without Christ," "*A Confession* That Was Not Quite One," "Tolstoy's Faith Such as It Was," "The Gospel according to Leo," "Desperately Seeking Golgotha," "Sex, Lies, and Ethics," "An Impractical Idea of a Practical Life," "Tolstoy as a Russian," and "The Lessons of Leo Tolstoy." Violent history abounds, episodes of world wars, the atrocities of the Russian Revolution and Civil War, Stalin's terror, and the nightmarish visions of the reigning counterculture appear constantly in splashes of indignation whenever Boot spies a trace of Tolstoy's direct or indirect influence on these developments. In such a peculiar format of eschatological-anachronistic application of the so-called law of historical retrospection, an old-fashioned tactic of marrying effect to a cause, Boot builds his damning argument pressing mostly posthumous historical evidence against Tolstoy: the loss of the great Russia, the loss of the Judeo-Christian West, the loss of divinely inspired metaphysics and of divinely inspired art, and the impudent rise of terror and popular culture. Boot is also constantly recovering bits of evidence cherry-picked from accounts written or published in Tolstoy's lifetime that may be construed as unfriendly to Tolstoy, such as the 1893–94 memoir, *Vospominaniia o Grafe L. N. Tolstom* (Reminiscences about Count L. N. Tolstoy) (1893), by Tolstoy's brother-in-law, Stepan Behrs, a sibling of Tolstoy's wife Sophia Andreevna.

The book begins with a biblical warning instead of an epigraph, "For false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall shew signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect" (Mark 14:22). It ends with eight lessons to be learned from Tolstoy about the importance of good and the dangers of flimsy (Tolstoy's) metaphysics for organizing life, about fatal consequences to idle ears on which pernicious preaching like Tolstoy's is casting its spell (203–8). We learn such things as that "morality without eschatology is like a chair without legs" (209), that "relativism is lethal when applied to God's truth" (210), that "people who try to fashion their own faith will end up with none" (212), and that "scripture does not lend itself to simplistic interpretation" (213). These maxims fully capture the spirit of Boot's entire book, in which pathos competes with bathos.

> The echoes of an imploding world are still with us, and all the charges were set off by ideas. Many of them, not the biggest yet not the smallest, came from Leo Tolstoy. Even though

> some of us may have thoughts on the subject, we cannot know for sure whether he caused harm wittingly or unwittingly. In either case, we should pray for his soul, hoping that when he faced God he was treated with mercy—something he himself had always denied his opponents. (215)

With these very words, Boot's book ends.

Little as these quite different books seem to lend themselves to comparison, they offer some significant insights into the formats, goals, prerogatives, and limitations of criticism and its reception, and all these appear tied to disciplinary reaches of the human sciences and humanities as well as their debts to subjects and objects of inquiry and to the general public. Both books take on enormous subjects, modernity and its cultural and historical consequences. The very topics of their titles (God and man, religion and rationality) point strongly and explicitly at modern conceptual puzzles, at dilemmas and competitions tearing at the ontological and existential fabric of modern being.

Frank has made his name by arguing that the form of art—a topic first grasped in the modern sense by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing and continued in the age of modernism and avant-garde in the theories of Heinrich Wölfflin, Wilhelm Worringer, and André Malraux—is not a hollow abstraction, but a unique space housing experience in which every crisis can find resolution through reverent mastery, where ethical responsibility plays a huge role. In his discussions about the space of literature, Frank is neither on the side of the New Critics nor the Marxists (the former too noncommittal, the latter overcommitted to the socio-political), neither leftist nor conservative authors. He praises the conservative critical imagination of Lionel Trilling, who does not, the way liberals do, "measure the complexities of reality exclusively" by a "sociopolitical yardstick,"[5] and he criticizes Malraux for his totalitarian idealism, his inability to "dissolve the disparate qualities of historical cultures and their styles into the universal apprehension of the liberty of the creative act."[6] Rather, he presses man's "functional unity of the spirit" as he finds himself "confronting destiny with a world of values of his own creation" to become an ontological universal, an enlightened "quality of

5. Joseph Frank, "Lionel Trilling and the Conservative Imagination," in *The Widening Gyre: Crisis and Mastery in Modern Literature* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1963), 253–74, 254.

6. Joseph Frank, "Malraux's Metaphysics of Art" and "André Malraux: The Image of Man," in *Widening Gyre*, 63–103 and 105–29.

man."[7] At one point in these searches, and moving slowly away from existentialism, Frank discovers Mikhail Bakhtin's theories dealing with creative coexistence of author, hero, and reader on the thresholds of the apprehended ethical and aesthetic space. This discovery happens after Frank gravitates toward the riddles of Dostoevsky's Underground Man, his numerously acknowledged entryway into Dostoevsky's and then the Russian crisis-ridden world, suspended in the riotous carnival, ethically commanding, reaching for apotheosis but forever unfinalized.

Frank's choice of the ideal artist falls on Dostoevsky for a reason. It is Dostoevsky, who is raised on gothic and Romantic imagery and poetics and yet enmeshed in the sociopolitical life of his country and century, whose metaphysical dreaming carries him centuries back and forth and who attempts, in his art, to create the space where social and radical evil is transfigured, where the boring seriousness of theory and history (Bakhtin's term) is mediated by ideas spoken by men to each other and buffered by infinite kindness, hyperbolic suffering, responsibility of all for all, and by impulsiveness overcoming all restriction. Dostoevsky provides to Frank that perfect interpretive capsule within which he realizes his conclusions about spatial form, where he marries minute historicity based on documents with universality, where ideas of the age, man-made values, are discussed on the horizontal and vertical axes as phenomena to the absolute. And of course Dostoevsky's own amazing life—with its heavy personal losses, early literary success, political trial, mock execution, years in Siberia, and difficult revival as a journalist and writer during the decades of fast and fertile historical and social change in Russia and Europe during which his supreme genius matured and came into its fullest—proved irresistible to a still young scholar whose attention was gradually switching from spatial form to existentialism and its historical conditions. Frank's five-volume biography of Dostoevsky and the shorter essays and reviews issuing out of the biography are not only a triumph of expert scholarship, but also the best example of human and historical polyphony, yielding a "truth narrative," a story trustworthy, uplifting, and gripping. Frank explains the origin of his work on Dostoevsky in this way:

> I was very much interested in the new Existentialist literature making such a splash in the immediate postwar period. To

7. Joseph Frank, "Malraux's Metaphysics of Art," 97.

provide some historical background, I began with an analysis of Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground* as a precursor of the mood and the themes that one found in French Existentialism. I decided to study *Notes from Underground* more thoroughly, and to investigate the socio-cultural background that so obviously served as Dostoevsky's point of departure. I see Dostoevsky's work as a brilliant artistic synthesis of the major issues of his time, a personal utterance, to be sure, but one, more than most, oriented by concerns outside himself. It is not simply—as we too often tend to think in the West—the passionately febrile expression of an unbalanced but extraordinarily gifted temperament. Indeed, one way of defining Dostoevsky's genius is to locate it in his ability to fuse his private dilemmas with those raging in the society of which he was a part. My interest in Dostoevsky's personal life is therefore strictly limited, and anyone who seeks a conventional biography in the following pages will be sorely disappointed. I shall try to show that an exploration of his life on the plane of what Hegel would call "an objective spirit" of Dostoevsky's time, can lead to, if not a totally different, then a far better understanding of the significance of his achievement.[8]

As we have already seen, Boot practices an entirely opposite tactic, and his Tolstoy is not so much a product and embodiment of the ideas of his time as their perverted prevaricator. He savors every bit of even unchecked evidence to prove Tolstoy's malaise in mind, body, and spirit, which affected not only himself or his immediate family, his disciples and prisoners of his doctrinaire and tyrannical intellectual patrimony, but the fates of his country, century, and the history of civilization to follow. In that, Boot turns a polemic about history into a war campaign against one of its giant residents, while Frank studies cases of disagreements themselves as endemic symptoms of conflict, rich segments of an immense historical canvas worthy of study.

In the preface to volume 2 of the future five-volume saga on Dostoevsky, Frank tellingly distanced his method from another eminent multivolume biography, that of Tolstoy, by the already late Soviet scholar and former "formal method" critic Boris Eikhenbaum, who wrote a similarly Hegelian work that sought to flesh out Tolstoy as a man of his age.[9] Frank's disagreement with Eikhenbaum is especially eloquent given Eikhenbaum's unchallenged reputation as a supremely honest, balanced, learned, visionary, emotionally distant, and stellar literary historian, if they at all exist. Mentioning his doubts as to how he was supposed to approach Dostoevsky's years of regeneration following his strife in a Siberian *katorga* (hard labor camp) and in considering his courtships and amorous entanglements upon release, Frank says:

> Inevitably events such as his first serious love affair and his marriage, which occurred during the years portrayed in this volume, required a fuller biographical treatment than his private life had received in the first. For I did not want to be caught in the same absurd position as Boris Eikhenbaum, a critic I greatly admire and whose three-volume work on Tolstoy (unfortunately left incomplete at the time of his death) has served as an inspiration of my own. One of the founders of Russian Formalism, and like all members of this school a ferocious opponent of the confusion of art and life, he later undertook a massive historical study of Tolstoy—but only, as he cautiously explained, on the level of "literary mores" (that is, literary and social-cultural history of his time). Notwithstanding my immense respect for Eikhenbaum, and the refreshing stimulus provided by such jaunty iconoclasm, it seemed to me that one could yield a bit more to "real life" while still retaining the primary interest in "literary mores" that pushed him to so ascetic an extreme. Work on the present book persuaded me that I had drawn too sharp a distinction when I said that "my work is not a biography"; I would still maintain, however, that those who come to my pages seeking "conventional biography" are apt to be disappointed. The critical responses also helped me change my mind. . . . Indeed, I am now happy to make my own the observation of a distinguished commentator, who generously spoke of my promising "experiment in fusing biography, literary criticism and socio-cultural history." Such a fusion, as I now realize, is exactly what I have been trying to achieve.[10]

Midway through the writing and publishing of the five Dostoevsky volumes, Frank released *Through the Russian Prism:*

8. Joseph Frank, *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt, 1821–1849* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1976), xi–xiii.

9. Boris Eikhenbaum's Tolstoy biography has been released in English under the following titles: *The Young Tolstoy*, trans. and ed. Gary Kern (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1972); *Tolstoi in the Sixties*, trans. Duffield White (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1982); and *Tolstoi in the Seventies*, trans. Albert Kaspin (Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1982).

10. Joseph Frank, *Dostoevsky: The Years of Ordeal, 1850–1859* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1982), xii–xiii.

Essays on Literature and Culture (1990), which came out during the collapse of communism. A whole section in this book is composed of the finished or emerging pieces of the multi-volume Dostoevsky series. This approach of compact fusion of stories qua biographical and historical episodes serving as insertion pieces in a larger canvas worked out for Dostoevsky, which he explained in the preface to volume 2, provided Frank a general solution to writing other, much shorter, cameo-size, essay-long biographies of people and their ideas, including such masterpieces found in the 1990 volume as those on his contemporaries Bakhtin, Nabokov, Roman Jakobson, and Ralph Ellison. Neither these essays nor those on books and the people who wrote them, including discussions of Franco Venturi, Andrzej Walicki, and Henri Troyat, show their age twenty years later. What does show signs of aging are excerpts of the emerging Dostoevsky chapters later improved and made more familiar in Frank's Dostoevsky biography volumes, *Dostoevsky: The Miraculous Years, 1865–1871* (1996) and *Dostoevsky: The Mantle of the Prophet, 1871–1881* (2002), or essays dealing with other classics that are tied to "dilemmas" posed by transient realities of professional academe, including self-definition in relation to radical political movements or an attempt to forge disciplinary identity depending on where the winds of perestroika would direct the vane of Western scholarship.

Between Religion and Rationality has a structure replicating that of *Through the Russian Prism*, but it is a collection of essays written after communism, when criticism as Frank understands it is not to be defined by geopolitical dichotomies, which explains Frank's growing alienation from the Sovietological clichés of the Cold War era and his desire to speak with the general reader. Yet even here, Frank still relies heavily on the fundamental structures that were shaped by his work on Dostoevsky and to him define the Russian worldview: Slavophilism and Westernizers are still common categories. This factor imparts a tired quality to his book, although it is countered by Frank's discovery of new authors and new topics. In terms of focus, the book is a further remove from the academic genre than *Through the Russian Prism*, being now a collection of introductions excerpted from Barnes and Noble Classics and other mass-market editions like Everyman and of review essays gathered from the past two decades of Frank's ministry for Russian literature in the public arena. Frank opens up more readily to popular new genres of nonfiction, such as Figes's *Natasha's*

Dance, which he extols. He is apparently mesmerized by the novelization of scholarship in Coetzee and Tsypkin, or by the methods and fates of scholars and scholarship in dark times, surviving by the skin of their teeth, or not. He respectfully treats Pipes's steadfast conservatism of a nonbelonger, and Ginsburg's rediscoveries of self and others through the construction of "human document"; the honest adventurism of Kovner—this embezzler, fighter for Jewish rights in Imperial Russia, a correspondent of Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Vasily Rozanov, and a prolific author and journalist in his own right—thrills him, but Mirsky's tragically misguided Eurasianism, which ends in betrayal of liberty and denunciation of his new Soviet colleagues, bosses of proletarian literary criticism put on trial such as Leopold Averbakh, appreciably less so (260). Frank's reviews in *Between Religion and Rationality* are mainly unaltered reprints from such periodicals as the *New York Review of Books*, *New Republic*, *London Review of Books*, and *Partisan Review*. The only two exceptions are a chapter, "Dostoevsky and Anti-Semitism," which was a lecture given at Harvard in 2002, and a chapter on Nabokov's *Lectures on Literature* (1980), reprinted from the 1995 *Garland Companion to Nabokov*.[11] In its sweeping range, the book aptly covers new editions and revised translations of Dostoevsky's *Poor Folk* (1846), *House of the Dead* (1860), *The Idiot* (1868), and *The Demons* (1872). Although Frank's introductions would be familiar material to those who had read corresponding volumes from his Dostoevsky biography, these never read as trite déjà vus. Frank never clips and pastes his material, but always carefully rewrites it and adds substantive, albeit never overwhelming, footnotes to all three of his introductions to Dostoevsky's texts, explaining their degree of dependence on or difference from comparable chapter-long spans of discussion in the whole five-volume biography or citing his agreement and disagreement with the influential interpreters of Dostoevsky's texts such as Konstantin Mochulsky, Victor Terras, Robert Louis Jackson, or Robert Belknap.

Frank's reworked introductions gathered in *Between Religion and Rationality* will be of great benefit to anyone who teaches Dostoevsky's texts or history of Russian literature at any level of instruction. They can be used individually for each of Dostoevsky's works because in a matter of a dozen or so pages Frank

11. Vladimir Alexandrov, ed., *The Garland Companion to Vladimir Nabokov* (New York: Garland, 1995), 234–58.

manages to vividly and clearly cover everything from the important details in Dostoevsky's life and his creative situation, presented with close attention to the political and social realities of his day masterfully contextualized, to explanations of how diary and notebook sketches yield first plans, how these are reworked, and how Dostoevsky's conception of his characters and plots change. These sections will be segueing to fundamental elucidation of Dostoevsky's compositional decisions and the scope and detail of his narrative achievement. Frank follows up by commenting on Dostoevsky's state of satisfaction with the finished product and with supplying information about how each novel was received by Dostoevsky's contemporaries, how this reception has been changing since, and what each of Dostoevsky's novels means to us now. I should add that with equal success, all three chapters can be taught in sequence in the order they are placed in *Between Religion and Rationality*. Although lacking a chapter on *The Brothers Karamazov* (1880), the subtle transitions and signposts that Frank deploys at every turn in his chapters on the other great novels by Dostoevsky provide a brief biography of Dostoevsky the novelist, especially if we add to the list Frank's brilliant chapter on the background of *Crime and Punishment* (1866) published in *Through the Russian Prism*.[12]

Yet Gary Saul Morson, author of foundational studies on Bakhtin and extensions of Bakhtin-provoked theories, is not entirely wrong to endorse Frank's *Between Religion and Rationality* somewhat tepidly (although surprisingly his estimate is quoted on the book's back cover): "wonderful, illuminating," difficult to put down, with a delightful coda on Nabokov and full of thought-provoking interpretations but "written for general readers," although, he adds as a consolation, "any Russian specialist can also benefit from Frank's interpretations" for they "bear the stamp of his powerful and distinctive mind." The appeal of the book is real, but the prefaces, while they recycle his earlier work creatively, do not, unfortunately, engage with fascinating new studies on Dostoevsky's philosophy, art, and religion published since 2002, the year *The Mantle of the Prophet* was released. The preface to the 2006 Barnes and Noble edition of *War and Peace* (1869) is especially disappointing. Severely under-annotated, it relies largely on some sparsely noted older studies and stalls in viewing Tolstoy's work as a combination of

12. See Joseph Frank, "The Background of Crime and Punishment," in *Through the Russian Prism: Essays on Literature and Culture* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990), 122–36.

a novel and an epic (65), giving thus a short shrift to a veritable ocean of new, illuminating literature on Tolstoy's book whose appearance was triggered by the publication of Morson's *Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in "War and Peace"* (1987). In contrast, one can think of James P. Scanlan's *Dostoevsky the Thinker* (2002), Steven Cassedy's *Dostoevsky's Religion* (2005), Robin Feuer Miller's *Dostoevsky's Unfinished Journey* (2007), Rowan Williams's *Dostoevsky: Language, Faith, and Fiction* (2008), and Nancy Ruttenburg's *Dostoevsky's Democracy* (2008) to name but a few that would have similarly enriched Frank's Dostoevsky chapters.

Boot's book might not be intelligible to an audience of "general readers" on its first encounter with the topic but would not fail to command the jaded attention of a debonair or pundit. This long essay is written in the genre of a diatribe of twelve opinionated chapters in which the Judeo-Christian criterion is the one and only yardstick, although never passing on the chance of a good witticism is a close second. Accuracy of sustained research, however, is not. The following comments Boot makes on Tolstoy's ethics of nonviolence are typical for his book where pedestrian truths interspersed with some random quotations and historical name-dropping are served flamboyantly, mostly in a playful spirit, not occasionally without malicious sarcasm:

> Most of us drink and smoke for the innocent pleasure of it, which is devoid of any moral value, negative or positive. Doing either thing to excess is not good for our health, but we can remain at our normal moral level while enjoying a cigarette or a glass of wine. But for Tolstoy everything had to be morally charged, and he would ignore any evidence to the contrary. For example, there is no evidence that most evil deeds are done "in a state of drunkenness," not even in Russia. Nor are the most evil of men necessarily hedonistic drinkers and smokers. Hitler, for instance, was a vegetarian who neither drank nor smoked. His fellow mass murderer Lenin did not smoke and rarely drank. Mao was no binge drinker. Bin Laden probably does not plan his murders in the middle of a bender. On the other hand, Churchill smoked like a chimney and drank like a beached sailor, and yet one does not usually think of him as an evil man. (156)

A few paragraphs later, Boot moves on to debunk Tolstoy's dream of a stateless life through universal practice of nonviolent Christian pacifism, which Boot reduces to jokes about celery

juice and the all-too-primitive recipes for menial labor and communion with nature, all the while trying to make fun of "the towering heights" of Tolstoy's intellect:

> But let us suppose we have managed, non-violently to be sure, to get rid of the state with its coercive laws. . . . We now love each other ecstatically, equally and ideally, with nary a dirty thought among us. We eat nothing but carrot patties, drink nothing but celery juice, and—with ever-growing justification—see animals as our spiritual brethren (though we may still be allowed to wear leather shoes, for Tolstoy forgot to get around to castigating that outrage). . . . His own peasants could not suppress contemptuous smiles when watching their master push a plow, split logs, or carry buckets of water. One can understand them: they could not live his life of luxury, but at least they had their own life, their own space, to use modern jargon. It was this space that they saw Tolstoy invade so tastelessly, denying them even the exclusivity of their lowly station. (158–60)

All chapters in Boot's book bear ostentations epigraphs and are supplied with facetious notes. The book itself concludes with two appendices in which learnedness is ridiculed and sent off on a romp with less learned tomfoolery, followed by a good-humored index. As Boot puts it, speaking of the name index, only a number of the names are authentic, others are fictive and their descriptions quite entertaining. I never have read a book in which the "Bolshevik dictator" Vladimir Lenin could rub shoulders with Mikhail Kutuzov, the "1812 commander-in-Chief, seen by Tolstoy as expression of Russia's metaphysical essence" after whom Lenin comes next on the list, and both could rub shoulders with Grigory Rasputin, "mystic, major influence on Nicholas II and especially his wife. Murdered," or "Vronsky, Alexei. Character in *Anna Karenina.* Unwitting agent of Anna's demise" (220–23). In the section "Russians, real and fictional, mentioned in this book" (217), we encounter such entries as (skipping birthdates where these are provided): "Konstantin Aksakov, Slavophile philosopher, served a prison term for criticizing serfdom"; "Aksinia, Tolstoy's serf, mistress, mother of one of his illegitimate children"; "Berdiaev, Nikolai, philosopher, expelled from Russia in 1922"; and "Bezukhov, Pierre. Character in *War and Peace*" (217). Chekhov is characterized as "short-story writer and playwright, often critical of Tolstoy" (218); the poet Afanasy Fet makes it onto the list primarily to show that he was Tolstoy's friend before they

"broke up" (219); all tsars and tsarinas are there because they were murderers or were murdered; the great Russian philosophers of the twentieth century are mentioned only if expelled, jailed, declared mad, "died as paupers," criticized Tolstoy, or were shipped out of Lenin's Russia in 1922 (217–23); all of Tolstoy followers are said to be his "secretaries"; there is "Dostoevsky, Fyodor, novelist" (218) and "Helen, Princess, character in *War and Peace*" (219). Bowing his way out of cumbersome obligations of citation, data verification, or contextualization, Boot does away with most of the nuisance duties of academics. Bibliography is listed in predominantly garbled style.[13] The index of books of scholarship on the subjects of his book is a champion shortlist of thirty-eight items called "Others," which includes the likes of Dostoevsky, Saint Thomas Aquinas, Tertullian, R. G. Collingwood, Immanuel Kant, Mark Twain, James Fenimore Cooper, and Boot himself.

The focus of the book is not so much on Tolstoy the literary genius, which Boot seems to find uninteresting to discuss, but on Tolstoy in company with his two obsessions, God and man. Mere man and no God he is to Boot, a frail creature and thinker, an unexposed epileptic, spurious prophet, and progenitor of various historical plagues and disasters left in his wake: from the Russian revolution and the KGB, to Adolf Hitler and Stalin, to deformities in the human genome, to sex, lies, and rock 'n' roll—and the drugged grunge of diva-pop. None other than Amy Winehouse is named among the morbid counterculture offsprings of Tolstoyan consequence (132). Boot arrives at Winehouse by a circuitous route, while passing judgment on Tolstoy the misogynist. He reckons thoughtfully with the knowledge of an insider that "as the Tolstoys were growing older, his sex drive remained strong, while hers took a dive—at least with her husband. . . . One may suggest that Mrs. Tolstoy's flagging libido was not all due to menopause" (127). After a few more pages ruminating on her alleged affair with the composer Sergey Taneev and throwing in a few more quotes from Tolstoy's *Path of Life* (1910), his last calendar of wisdom, a

13. Even his reference to the famed Jubilee edition of Tolstoy in ninety volumes, his primary source, is misleading: It was published from 1928 to 1958, not 1956 to 1964 as Boot claims; only the index volume was released in 1964. The correct bibliographic reference for this edition is L. N. Tolstoy, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 90-ti tomakh. Akademicheskoe iubileinoe izdanie*, ed. V. G. Chertkov, 90 vol. (Moscow and Leningrad: Gosudartsvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1928–58).

collection of international heritage of wise thoughts borrowed from sages of all countries and ages, Boot begs to differ and cites other sages who did not preach chastity.

> Women for him [Tolstoy] were only good for one thing, or two, or three, depending on the mood. Elevated, spiritual love for a woman was beyond his ken: as his wife testifies, his women were bedmates, never soulmates. Also, he refuses to acknowledge that, as love of others comes from love of God, the two are related. . . . Tolstoy confuses the two planes of Christian morality, one of heaven, the other of this world. We should love all people equally because that is how God loves all of us. And we shall indeed love all people equally when we are united with God in heaven. That does not mean you cannot for the time being prefer your best friend to Osama bin Laden or your wife to Amy Winehouse. (132)

It is obvious that the book is calculated to shock; it insults traditions of adulating, starch-laced scholasticism, of scholarly intellectual property and propriety by featuring witty and flashy but ultimately superficial, chaotic displays of intellectual gerrymandering, replete with concoctions, insinuations, and specious details passed for evidence and borrowings from the treasure trove of best and worst clichés of the Tolstoy hate industry in order to sour the centenary of Tolstoy's death in November 2010. Boot joins Anthony Briggs's *Leo Tolstoy* (2010), a way more charitable and yet also an extremely unappetizing portrayal of Tolstoy's sexual, spiritual, and intellectual life.[14] He also joins the Russian government and the most obtuse adherents of the sanctum of church values, East and West, who refused to give a balanced and objective evaluation of Tolstoy in 2010.[15]

Boot presents Tolstoy as someone bad, mad, and dangerous to know in posterity: a sadist torturing animals, a homosexual kissing his peasants on the lips, a mentally unstable individual exorcising his demons in fictional scenes of unspeakable cruelty or didactic pamphlets of unspeakable turpitude. In trying to undermine Tolstoy's intellectual and moral credibility on the

14. See Anthony Briggs, *Brief Lives: Leo Tolstoy* (London: Hesperus, 2010).

15. It is still too early to sum up the results of Tolstoy's Jubilee in 2010. Readers for whom firsthand internet or print sources in Russian may be unavailable might want to follow excellent and objective reporting on the issue in *Tolstoy Studies Journal*. Some of the first echoes of 2010 were already covered in volume 22, which also contains Bob Blaisdell's review of *Brief Lives: Leo Tolstoy*, by Anthony Briggs (147–49), and coverage and analysis is forthcoming in subsequent yearly issues.

ground of his mental illness, Boot seems to be unaware of the fact that one of the sources he relies on is a highly biased study by A. Evlakhov commissioned by the People's Commissar of Education, Anatoly Lunacharsky. His other source is the previously mentioned memoir by Stepan Behrs, who, in isolated instances, is not inclined to treat Tolstoy's character charitably. But recent archival research has unearthed new information on the fate of the Freudian psychiatry that produced such studies as Evlakhov's in the Soviet Union as well as on the tragedy of the Tolstoy family. A discussion of the illness of Tolstoy's wife calls for a great deal of care and grace. At the least, Boot should have qualified his remarks about Evlakhov's study and Lunacharsky's preface to it by mentioning his predecessor on the subject, Daniel Rancour-Laferriere, who addresses the Tolstoy-Evlakhov imbroglio in his controversial study, *Tolstoy on the Couch: Misogyny, Masochism, and the Absent Mother* (1998).[16]

Lunacharsky's "Ward Number Six" file on Russian classics contained materials that could dampen the reputation of each of them in case of need and in echo of a new party call. To dampen Tolstoy's reputation in 1929–30 proved expedient in the years following the defection of Aleksandra Lvovna Tolstoy, the writer's youngest daughter, to Japan and then the United States. Ultimately, the campaign was cut short by Lunacharsky's "elder party brother" because the socialist realist plan was already on the horizon and Lunacharsky, who would die mysteriously in his fifties shortly thereafter, was not destined to be around to entomb Tolstoy in the foundation pit of Soviet literary culture.

Tolstoy's fate in the Soviet Union, of which this is only one corner, is now a topic of acute interest and continues to be researched and written about. In its concluding chapter, Bartlett's new biography of Tolstoy skillfully summarizes the results of what has been published to date.[17] I would add to her discussion the case of Konstantin Shokhor-Trotsky, not a relation to Leon Trotsky, but an idealistic member of the

16. The title of Evlakhov's study in English may be rendered as "Constitutional peculiarities of L. N. Tolstoy's psyche." The book was reissued in 1995, for the first time since its first publication in 1930. See A. Evlakhov, *Konstitutsional'nye osobennosti psikhiki L. N. Tolstogo*, intro. A. V. Lunacharsky (Moscow: Svarog, 1995).

17. See Rosamund Bartlett, *Tolstoy: A Russian Life* (London: Profile Books, 2010), which was reissued in the United States under the same title by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt in 2011.

Jewish-Russian intelligentsia who sacrificed his life to the study of Tolstoy. He died of acute heart disease developed as a consequence of harassment at the hands of the NKVD (People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs), threatened by an impending arrest because of the famine he was destined to witness in the Ukraine on his trips to the region to gather artifacts for the Tolstoy Museum collection. Scores of Tolstoy followers, students of his religious teaching, and Tolstoy scholars died in the purges without a word of blame on Tolstoy or Russian literature. In reading Boot's one-sided perspective, it is important to keep in mind that, for them, the blame did not rest on some abstract metaphysical notion of radical evil but on human cowardice, unscrupulousness, errant dreaming, and lack of ability to take care of the very basic ethical motivations of political, ideological, or social choice.

In the basketfuls of daily mail arriving at Yasnaya Polyana in Tolstoy's lifetime there were all categories of censure, entreaty, solicitations, critiques, threats, and homilies. He was mostly interested in critiques, full of attention and free of anything self-serving or narrow-minded. After Tolstoy's death, there appeared other accounts, from humble clerics, dethroned, humiliated, persecuted, from rank and file Soviet citizens, engineers, teachers, and farmers, who credited Tolstoy in privately kept journals and notes with helping them to survive.[18] From the European soil that he loved dearly but vacated in order to run leper colonies on the continent left out from the sphere of concern by Boot, the great humanist Albert Schweitzer wrote of Tolstoy as one of the solitary voices capable of saving civilization—an ethical brotherhood reverent about life.[19]

The two referees who signed off on Boot's volume sponsored it because, like him, they believe that the West is in jeopardy but still recoverable if, step by step, its false prophets and false practices can be exposed and extirpated. They are Paul Gottfried, a well-recognized political scientist who writes on the American and European right, conservatism, the death of

18. See, especially, an astounding account by V. A. Moroz, prisoner of conscience in the Soviet Union, which can be translated as "Tolstoy in my life behind bars" about the promise and meaningfulness of Tolstoy's teaching for personal spiritual survival and for that of humankind. V. A. Moroz, *Tolstoi v moei arestantskoi zhizni* (St. Petersburg: privately printed, 1996).

19. Albert Schweitzer, *The Philosophy of Civilization*, trans. C. T. Campion (Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 1987), 313.

Marxism, and life after liberalism, and Theodore Dalrymple, a well-known conservative humanitarian, author of pamphlets and popular books on responsible charity and poverty brought to account, and columnist for *City Journal of New York*, *The London Spectator*, and *The Daily Telegraph*. Dalrymple wrote a foreword to Boot's *How the West Was Lost* in which he praises its unflinching critique of humanity, which was losing the need to believe that there should be a "transcendent authority superior to itself."[20] However, should we examine it without bias, many principles of Tolstoy's Christian anarchism in rejection of legalized safety nets and exorbitant forms of government spending that encourage parasitism share a number of importantly conservative views with Boot, Dalrymple, and Gottfried. Like them, he is against drugs, promiscuous sex, contraception, pulp literature, yellow press, and a great many aspects of modernist art. At least on these grounds, he is the wrong target for their criticism.[21]

With excessive but firm diplomacy, Rosamund Bartlett, not only an acclaimed translator and biographer of Tolstoy and Chekhov but also a historian of art and music, writes in her most recent Tolstoy biography: "Tolstoy had his share of detractors. One of the most eloquent and witty is Alexander Boot, an admirer of Tolstoy the artist, but also the author of an effective hatchet job on Tolstoy the thinker. . . . To see Tolstoy principally in terms of artist versus thinker . . . is to overlook his important humanitarian message."[22]

I must confess that I do not see any special effectiveness in the technique of delivery or in the message of Boot's harsh, prohibitive, and ungenerous critiques. Whether more on the positive or the negative side of the spectrum, Tolstoy and his

20. Theodore Dalrymple, foreword to *How the West was Lost*, ix. Dalrymple continues, "Mr. Boot's explanation for the startling observation that our wealthy, healthy, and technologically sophisticated society has produced nothing in the arts that can remotely compare with Shakespeare, Velasquez or Bach is simple: pre-Enlightenment man's culture (in Europe) was entirely Judeo-Christian" (x).

21. Consider in this regard the relation between Tolstoy's *What Is Then to Be Done?* (1885) and Dalrymple's bestseller on poverty, *Life at the Bottom: The Worldview That Makes the Underclass* (2001).

22. Bartlett, *Tolstoy: A Russian Life*, 8. Frank's reading of Bartlett's *Chekhov: Scenes from a Life* (2004) in *Between Religion and Rationality* is so enthralled by the exhaustive but light narrative skill of this biography that it breathlessly retells its episodes and barely remembers to step aside and acknowledge the necessity to critique the work in this sparkling excursus into Chekhov's life, a tribute to his younger colleague's achievement.

problems have been receiving and continue to receive splendidly nuanced and penetrating readings; these start with the very first debates around his special dialectical-nihilist method by his very first reviewers, sustain their seriousness and the care of their attention through the years of the flowering of Russian religious thought and its unrepeatable philosophical pleiad of Nikolai Berdiaev, Lev Shestov, Nicholas Lossky, and Semyon Frank, and they continue to this day in the work of an international community of contemporary scholars who may differ, but take their topic responsibly and seriously.

As George Kennan once put it in one of his public lectures at the height of the Cold War, we cannot count on Tolstoy's passionate pacifism to explain to us whether we need more peace or more warheads, but we are dependent in our decision on how well or how poorly we understand his wise system of ethics. Other Tolstoy detractors, for example Mirsky, have done a better hatchet job. Peregrinating on the urging of his uneasy Eurasianism from the Bloomsbury salons and its culture of witty barbs into the stuffy hotel rooms of Stalin's Moscow where finding a bath proved a problem but denouncing others to save his life was easier, Mirsky and other eager takers of the task have wreaked far greater damage in their more sophisticated, better documented, pithily and wryly detonative arguments set off around jubilee times or in anticipation of possible destabilizations of the historical moment. Boot wittingly or unwittingly echoes Mirsky's "anti-Tolstoy" lectures of the 1920s, but he should not envy Mirsky or Paul Johnson, his model Tolstoy debunker, for whom the act of debunking and the degree of its épatage is in itself a serious marketing tool.[23] Boot has no gain other than finding a scapegoat for his tragic litany sung to the dying Judeo-Christian West (as he understands it) and requiring sacrifice. I would dare say that just as Shakespeare was for Tolstoy, so too is Tolstoy for Boot a lifetime preoccupation and a cause of wonder. How and why, indeed, has he managed to keep so many luminaries, geniuses, talents, and remarkable and unremarkable people under sway? Unlike another former dissident and émigré member of the Russian intelligentsia,

23. Boot regrets that Johnson had thought faster than he in inventing a theory of Tolstoy's God as the Count's younger brother. *God and Man*, 3, 229. See also Paul Johnson's notorious roasting of intellectuals in the eponymous paperback, *Intellectuals: From Marx and Tolstoy to Sartre and Chomsky* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1988). The chapter on Tolstoy, "Tolstoy: God's Elder Brother," is on pages 107–37.

Tertz, author of the irreverently loving and demystifying *Strolls with Pushkin*, who claimed that he would not live with Pushkin but could take a stroll with him now and then, for all his snide jokes, Boot cannot stroll with Tolstoy, he is stuck living with him.[24] This is because in his heart of hearts Boot is a truly passionate and honest seeker out of the ranks of the intelligentsia who is anchored by the same undying problems that are raised by Tolstoy and also because, as the Russian scholar N. Boldyrev writes in a commentary to a famous book by Janko Lavrin, another émigré from the Soviet Russia who made an illustrious career teaching literature in Europe, "Tolstoy's voice is hushed in contemporary Russia. It is audible to only a few. Why is Tolstoy's voice so quiet, barely audible? Is it not because the contemporary world understands religiosity exclusively as an aesthetic strain? For over a hundred years Tolstoy has been being accused of intellectual primitiveness. As if Tolstoy ever pretended to be an intellectual. As if getting foolish were not one of his foremost tasks . . . quite in the spirit of Blaise Pascal."[25] The trouble with critics is that sometimes they strive to be less foolish and more expert than their topics. It is Boot's great service that he decided to revive the tradition of Tertz's promenades in order to bring Tolstoy back as a form of living and live dialogue.

In the depths of these cultural recollections I am reminded of a wise detail that Frank did not allow to pass unnoticed in his chapter on Bakhtin, to the effect that the postwar generation of young Russian intellectuals preferred Dostoevsky to Tolstoy for no small reason, primarily because, in their mind, Tolstoy was "an allegory of Soviet power."[26] Without forcing a theory out of the foregoing, I would like to conclude with the following thoughts. Michel Foucault memorably observed that after the departure of the fabular scholars, we were tasked with telling "the most common of secrets."[27] We are at a point when the fabular clichés of postmodern scholarship, created in the

24. Abram Tertz [Andrei Siniavsky], *Strolls with Pushkin*, trans. Catharine Theimer Nepomnyashchy and Slava I. Yastremski (New Haven: Yale UP, 1993).

25. Janko Lavrin, *Lev Tolstoi sam o sebe* (Čelâbinsk, Russia: Ural LTD, 1999), 285. Translated anonymously into Russian from Janko Lavrin, *Lev Tolstoj mit Selbstzeugnissen und Bilddokumenten* (Hamburg: Rowolt, 1966).

26. Frank, *Through the Russian Prism*, 32.

27. Michel Foucault, *Power*, ed. James D. Faubion, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: New P, 2000), 173.

domain of education by the learned Mandarins of the West in imitation of Weberian priestly power, can no longer sustain our demands for truth. In sorting out the fates and legacies of the intellectuals, Edward Said remarked that it is not a professional rank, title, or academic post that distinguishes "professionals" from "amateurs," but the degree of intellectual seriousness, vested responsibility, and the talent to impart what they believe is objective knowledge and truth rather than keeping a certain narrow constituency happy.[28]

As Bruno Latour explains, "The asymmetry between nature and culture [is] an asymmetry between past and future. The past was the confusion of things and men; the future is what will no longer confuse them."[29] The form of humanistic space expands to include the past, the present, and the future in which classics are not disabused of their belonging in history or of our need of them in our lives; even if we reject them in our personal moments of quest, we are obliged to accept them as members of culture, civilization, in the shifting contours of "the West and in the Rest."[30] Despite the tired clichés delineating the space for their argument between the invented bugaboos of modernity—"religion" and "rationality," "God" and "man"—the two authors under review demonstrate in their works that they want to write for a wide community of readers concerned about the future of culture, and the high goals that they set for themselves are imbued with concern about the scope of literature and important intellectual legacies in their capacity to effect a positive impact on the world.

The New School for Social Research and Eugene Lang College
New York, New York

28. Edward D. Said, *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures* (New York: Vintage, 1994), 65–83.

29. Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993), 71.

30. See Pankaj Mishra, "Watch This Man," review of *Civilization: The West and the Rest*, by Niall Ferguson, *London Review of Books*, November 3, 2011, 10–12.

EDITORS

at Indiana University–Purdue University Fort Wayne

Rachel E. Hile, *Editor-in-Chief*
Cathleen M. Carosella, *Managing Editor*
Clark Butler, *Editor*
Ann Livschiz, *Editor*
Kendra Morris, *Publication Assistant*

BOOK REVIEWS

at The City College of New York
Felicia Bonaparte

at University of South Carolina
Debra Rae Cohen

BOARD OF ADVISORS

F. R. Ankersmit, University of Groningen (RUG); Robert S. Baker, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Harry Berger, Jr., University of California, Santa Cruz; Arthur C. Danto, Columbia University; Heather Dubrow, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Eugene Goodheart, Brandeis University; Lionel Gossman, Princeton University; Linda Hutcheon, University of Toronto; Hans Kellner, North Carolina State University; Sidney Monas, University of Texas; Tilottama Rajan, University of Western Ontario; Gary Shapiro, University of Richmond; Peter Stillman, Vassar College; Robert Weimann, Akademie der Künste; Hayden V. White, University of California, Santa Cruz.

A Journal of Literature, History, and the Philosophy of History

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY–PURDUE UNIVERSITY FORT WAYNE

Volume 42 Fall 2012 Number 1

Clio: A Journal of Literature, History, and the Philosophy of History is an international journal and the only English-language triennial that deals with three interrelated topics:

- literature as informed by historical understandings,
- historical writings considered as literature, and
- philosophy of history, speculative and analytic.

Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in *Sociological Abstracts, Abstracts of English Studies, Humanities Index, Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature,* and *ABC-Clio.* Electronic index and abstract databases are available from EBSCO publishing. The contents of *Clio* are reproduced in various EBSCO databases as well.

Manuscripts should follow *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th edition (with footnotes kept to a minimum). Electronic submissions only; acceptable file formats are Word (.doc or docx) or Rich Text Format (.rtf). Please send submissions to clio@ipfw.edu and include complete contact information and preferred email address.

To facilitate blind peer review, the author's name and affiliation should not appear on the manuscripts; instead, attach a cover sheet with appropriate information.

Clio is published three times per year. Annual subscriptions for individuals in the United States cost $40 and $15 each for back orders. For US libraries and institutions, subscriptions are $90 per year and back issues $30 each. International subscriptions rates are $55 for individuals and $105 for institutions, back issues are $22 and $40 respectively. All payments must be made in US dollars.

Please send subscription and back order requests to clio@ipfw.edu or Managing Editor, *Clio*, Indiana University–Purdue University Fort Wayne, 2101 East Coliseum Blvd., Fort Wayne, IN, 46805.

Under US copyright law, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

ISSN 0884-2043

© 2012 IPFW College of Arts and Sciences

CONTENTS

Articles

1 "The Continual Return of the Female Principle in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*"
Daniel E. Shannon

27 "Hegel, Edward Sanders, and Emancipatory History"
Jim Vernon

53 "History and Critique: A Response to Habermas's Misreading of Hegel"
Nicholas Mowad

Review Article

73 "Russian Classics on Trial: Reflections on Critics and Criticism" Review of *God and Man according to Tolstoy*, by Alexander Boot; and *Between Religion and Rationality: Essays in Russian Literature and Culture*, by Joseph Frank
Inessa Medzhibovskaya

Reviews

95 Federica Dallasta, *Eredità di carta: Biblioteche private e circolazione libraria nella Parma farnesiana (1545–1731)*
Romana Bassi

99 Ryan Prendergast, *Reading, Writing, and Errant Subjects in Inquisitorial Spain*
Helen Rawlings

103 Mark D. White, *Kantian Ethics and Economics: Autonomy, Dignity, and Character*
David Weissman

110 Tim Blanning, *The Romantic Revolution: A History*
Larry H. Peer