

listening, such as the state's listening to unreliable intellectuals, are not addressed. However, the book's core argument is persuasive and important. Safran has demonstrated how a methodologically novel approach to literary studies, augmented by concepts from sound and media studies, anthropology, and linguistics, can transform the familiar topic of Russian intellectuals' struggles to know the people. Her book also reveals how the story of Russian realism becomes productively comparable to developments in other arts and other countries when examined through the framework of the history of the senses.

VADIM SHNEYDER

University of California, Los Angeles

Heretical Orthodoxy: Lev Tolstói and the Russian Orthodox Church. By Pål Kolstø. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge University Press, 2022. vii, 306 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Tables. \$99.00, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2024.81

Pål Kolstø's *Heretical Orthodoxy* extends the Tolstoian spirituality depicted in Richard Gustafon's *Leo Tolstói: Resident and Stranger* by focusing on the reception history composed by Lev Tolstói's contemporaries and by demonstrating that Tolstói "entered" the role of three Orthodox pious archetypes (*starets*, *strannik*, and *iurodivyi*) associated with an estrangement characteristic of those without belonging (271). Characterizing the author's conversion as a "breakthrough," Kolstø posits that a greater appreciation for Tolstoianism will result in the reader's discovery of ideas "latent" in his pre-conversion literature, but the substance of the study remains commonalities between the canonical Orthodox tradition and Tolstói's writings, especially those dating from the composition of *Isповед'* (2). Kolstø depicts Tolstói as a misunderstood author struggling for truth in the midst of *Deus absconditus* while unreconciled to the faith of his childhood owing to an inability to accept intellectually the internal contradictions of a tradition simultaneously professing atonement and individual responsibility as well as the incomprehensibility of God alongside God's immanence (52, 59). The textual analysis of Tolstói's oeuvre, interwoven throughout the monograph, serves to affirm the attributes of the Orthodox God recognized by Tolstói: God's unity and God as being, while delineating his anthropocentric rather than theocentric Weltanschauung with his rejection of Christian precepts on Christ's divinity and the Trinity.

When defining his historical-genetic approach, Kolstø specifies that he intends to engage primarily Orthodox literature, and only that with which Tolstói "to a high degree of certainty" was familiar (12). From a summary of the reception of Tolstói among members of the Solov'ev society, Kolstø concludes that these contemporaries reached no consensus with Vladimir Ėrn (appreciating his artistic representation of Christians), Sergii Bulgakov (contending that the metaphysical dimension of Christianity eluded him), and Vasilii Zen'kovskii (valuing his mystical experiences). Many references to theologians publishing in Orthodox journals serve to reconstruct the dialogue (both in print and in person) between Tolstói and his contemporary theologians, including prominent members of the black clergy like Amvrosii of Optina Pustyn or members of the Holy Synod. As a result, although Tolstói esteemed the intuitive religious practice of the peasantry, the monograph traces Tolstói's interaction with the ecclesiastical hierarchy, partly as a consequence of the extensive presentation of his "self-excommunication" (226). Kolstø's analysis of the Moscow Patriarchate's published decision to deny Tolstói the traditional *otpevanie*,

pominovenie, and *panikhida* upon his death fills two chapters of the book, as he evaluates the family's reaction to the decision as well as the public's response. During these chapters, Kolstø frequently downplays the severity of these extraordinary measures undertaken by the Synod by attributing them not to retaliation for Tolstói's critique of Orthodoxy but to a failure of the Synod to communicate effectively, to official concern for his impact on impressionable believers, and to a campaign to return Tolstói to the fold. The many journal articles cited by Kolstø attest to the Orthodox Church's increased visibility resulting from its engagement with Tolstoyanism, but he ultimately concludes that although Tolstói drew upon his Orthodox heritage for key ideas like asceticism, all the same he sought to "reinterpret" rather than "rediscover" the "unadulterated doctrine" of Christ while maintaining that in Christianity lies were interwoven with truth (269).

In the final analysis, Kolstø convincingly argues that the fact that detractors applied the label of Antichrist to Tolstói further attests to the presence of Orthodox ideas in his teachings, since a sign of the Antichrist is his resemblance to Christ, through which he leads the faithful astray. While Kolstø overlooks some of the novelist's greatest contributions to fundamental—yet not uniquely—Christian concepts like Providence in *Voina i mir* or the development of individual conscience in *Anna Karenina*, his elucidation of Tolstói's appraisal of the two attributes Christ assigns to himself in the Gospel of John (14:6), through an identification with "the Truth and the Way," effectively demonstrates how this admirer of the *strannik* adopts this final role with little anticipation of its very public consequences (116). Despite the professor of patristics Vasilii Ekzemliarskii's defense of Tolstói's social message and Bulgakov's censure of leadership for displaying such "zeal" in correcting Tolstói while tolerating the "antics" of Grigorii Rasputin, Kolstø defends the Russian ecclesiastical leadership when concluding that the Russian readership, unfamiliar with Tolstói's most extreme views because of the censor prohibiting their publication, failed to comprehend the motivations behind the *Circular Letter* (155).

ELIZABETH BLAKE
Saint Louis University

Writing Fear: Russian Realism and the Gothic. By Katherine Bowers. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2022. xvi, 264 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$65.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2024.82

Should every description of a traumatic event, death, pain, or cruelty, especially directed at women, be viewed as gothic? *Writing Fear: Russian Realism and the Gothic*, an interesting interpretation of Russian realism, confronts us with this question.

Writing Fear follows the recent trend in scholarship that seeks to uncover gothic elements in realistic novels. Bowers argues that gothic fiction pervaded realism because "[r]ealist writers found the gothic's mobilization of fear within a narrative structure invaluable" (4). The term "gothic realism" is a borrowing from Mikhail Bakhtin. However, differently from Bakhtin, who explored the complex relations between realism and preceding literary forms, Bowers tends to identify realism and the Gothic by focusing on their fascination with fear. She claims that the gothic was "a key tool in the project of recreating life in prose." According to Bowers, the gothic as a genre "relies on the exaggeration of emotions such as fear, horror, and dread." Realist writers could not resist the Gothic temptation—"the affective capacity of fear"—to make their work more engaging for their audiences (4).