Isenberg focuses on the obsessive quality of these narratives, and he notes how the narrators seem haunted by their memories of certain core experiences, including "recognition" scenes which recall the Freudian "primal scene" (19). As he interrogates the works, Isenberg looks for moments of tension, contradiction, or ambiguity in the narrator's discourse, and he utilizes these moments to open the text up, indicating that these texts may actually tell more than the narrator (and perhaps even the author) intends to say. This is the "telling silence" of the title: such silence is associated with "whatever is framed out, with the excess of what the inner story says to the reader over what the frame narrator knows" (143). Using psychoanalytic theory as a tool of inquiry, Isenberg argues that the student of these texts is dealing with "a textual unconscious, through whose workings we glimpse the unsayable" (143).

Isenberg draws upon these premises in his analysis of four works of nineteenth-century Russian literature. He begins with Turgenev's "First Love," which he regards as the most traditional of the works under consideration, and he points out some characteristic features of the genre. For example, the group of male friends introduced at the outset reflects what Isenberg calls a *narrutopia*—a potentially ideal community that is constituted through an exchange of stories. Isenberg's readings of frame narratives are shrewdly sensitive to the ways in which the outer frame anticipates, mirrors, or comments on the inner story. His real interest, however, lies with the inner narrators and their stories. He examines Vladimir Petrovich's story in "First Love" through the filter of the Freudian Oedipal complex, and he considers the implications of the narrator's obsessive concern with scenes in which Zinaida is seen in the company of other men, particularly Vladimir's father. From Isenberg's perspective, Vladimir Petrovich's written narrative about first love act represents a remarkable attempt to come to terms with the past. Although Vladimir Petrovich may feel himself to have been defeated by his father on the field of passion, the son ultimately "bests [his father] on the field of art" (49).

Turning next to Dostoevsky's "A Gentle Creature," and then to Tolstoy's "The Kreuzer Sonata," Isenberg analyzes the inner narratives to reveal how fervently the protagonists tried to fit the women in their lives into self-serving scripts, and how, in their tales, they desperately seek to stabilize the meaning of the climactic events they engineered. Isenberg's discussion of Dostoevsky's text considers the larger "frame" in which the story first appeared (*The Diary of a Writer*), and he explores the allegorical meanings which may be drawn from such consideration. The final major work which Isenberg treats is Chekhov's trilogy, "The Man in a Case," "Gooseberries," and "First Love," and Isenberg shows how Chekhov's approach to the frame narrative represents a direct challenge to earlier realist treatments of the genre, especially Turgenev's. Observing that the outer frame plays a more significant role in Chekhov's texts than in the earlier tales, Isenberg underscores the open-endedness of Chekhov's texts, his aversion to generalizations, and his scepticism of the individual "truths" articulated by the several narrators in the works.

In one sense, Isenberg's reading of Chekhov can be viewed as a model for reading Isenberg. Though the critic offers many suggestive observations on the works under consideration, he often shies away from providing definitive conclusions. For example, he states that Alekhin in "About Love" has "grasped the inadequacy of conventional ethics" in the context of love, but he goes on to wonder why Alekhin does not apply his insight to "his other source of unhappiness, his commitment to discharge his father's debts" (134). Isenberg's reader may be able to think of several answers to this question, but having been persuaded of Isenberg's sensitivity to the texts under consideration, the reader would welcome hearing Isenberg's own thoughts on such matters. The questions Isenberg raises in his study are provocative and engaging. His work not only offers a fresh perspective on familiar texts, it also challenges the reader to look anew at other representatives of this genre.

Julian W. Connolly, University of Virginia

Horst-Jürgen Gerigk. *Die Russen in Amerika: Dostojewskij, Tolstoj, Turgenjew und Tschechow in ihrer Bedeutung für die Literatur der USA*. Hürtgenwald: Guido Pressler Verlag, 1995. 513 pp. (cloth)

It may come as a surprise that this insightful look at American culture and the role that Russia's great writers have played is documented by a German observer. Horst-Jürgen Gerigk is the author of *Versuch über Dostoevskijs "Jüngling"* (Munich, 1965), *Der Mensch als Affe* (Hürtgenwald, 1991), *Unterwegs zur Interpretation* (Hürtgenwald, 1989), *Die Sache der Dichtung* (Hürtgenwald, 1991), articles on Dostoevsky, as well as comparative studies on American literature and film. As a comparativist and outside observer, he brings a fresh and informed understanding to how we Americans have seen and borrowed from Russians, from before the October Revolution through the dark days of the "Evil Empire."

Gerigk's potential audience stretches far beyond the narrow confines of Slavic literature. He walks a thin line between the general audience and specialists. Yet he has not forgotten his colleagues, and they will not be disappointed. *Die Russen in Amerika* is organized into a troika of threesomes. An introduction gives a brief historical overview of America's fascination with and image of Russia—from Arthur Miller and Faulkner to Dreiser and Nabokov. The second section of the introduction discusses the appearance and presence of nineteenth-century Russian classics in the literary consciousness of America. The third section concludes the substantive introduction with a discussion of comparative literary scholarship, and identifies Gerigk's method: "einen typologischen Vergleich in thematischer und formaler Hinsicht von Texten der russischen Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts mit Texten der amerikanischen Literatur des 20. Jahrhunderts" (95–96).

The three major chapters of Part One embody the theory in practice. Chapter 1 focuses on Dostoevsky and his fascination with murder. Chapter 2 examines Tolstoy's depiction of the military experience. Chapter 3 explores the "fragility" or "fleeting nature (Hinfälligkeit) of the beautiful" in Turgenev and then Chekhov.

Some of this has been said before. The tracks of Russian literature in American literature and film are often transparent and easily identifiable. The significance of Gerigk's contribution is his attempt to bring together all of these myriad reflections and to add his own twenty-year labor of love in the garden of American culture. The resulting fruits of that labor have made the waiting worthwhile. Gerigk's knowledge of the ties that bind the Russian texts to their American admirers, imitators, collaborators, is extraordinary, and his grasp of American literature and film is encyclopedic. The list of connections alone could fill several pages (and does in the extensive and valuable twenty-five page bibliography). Again and again Gerigk documents old or discovers new connections of American artists to their Russian mentors. Often these connections are explicit, found and captured in the words of Dreiser, Faulkner, Hemingway, Arthur Miller, Salinger, Woody Allen, and dozens more. Ultimately the texts (or films) are proof enough when re-examined through Gerigk's eyes to reveal the Dostoevskian, Tolstoian, Turgenevian or Chekhovian foundation (or at least an imprint). Since the work is aimed at the general reading public (and a non-American one at that), Gerigk often reminds the reader of the plot and thematic details of the particular works. For specialists of Russian or American literature, Gerigk's insights will evoke many provocative associations.

Gerigk sees Dostoevsky everywhere: "Raskolnikow in St. Louis?" in T. S. Eliots' *The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*, Svidrigailov in Faulkner's *Sanctuary*, or "Smerdjakow in Kansas" in Truman Capote's *In Cold Blood*, as well as in the impulse behind Dreiser's *An American Tragedy*. The sections on Tolstoy and war provide a new context in which Americans can perceive their own wars, from Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage* to Norman Mailer's *The Naked and the Dead*. In between Gerigk identifies Tolstoy's *Sevastopol Stories*, not *War and*

man consciousness. Gerigk traces the well-documented significance of Turgenev for Henry James, but also provides new insight into the profound influence of Turgenev on Hemingway

man consciousness. Gerigk traces the well-documented significance of Turgenev for Henry James, but also provides new insight into the profound influence of Turgenev on Hemingway, in particular the "eye of the hunter" and the "helpless narrator." Chekhov appears in the writings of Sherwood Anderson, Clifford Odets, and in the American version of *The Cherry Orchard*, i.e., Tennessee Williams' *A Streetcar Named Desire*. Who among us would not see the Chekhovian in Saroyan's *The Daring Young Man on the Flying Trapeze*, or "The Black Monk" in Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*? The beginnings of any number of monographs can be found here: Bellows' *Herzog* and "A Dreary Story," Joyce Carol Oates' own "The Lady with the Pet Dog," or simply Woody Allen and the Russian Classics. Gerigk's interpretations are bold, compelling, enlightened by a broad philosophical foundation, yet always informed by close textual readings and supported by background materials and other sources.

Part Two offers thoughts on the interaction of the Russian classics and their American counterparts. A brief look at Hemingway and Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*, and an in depth comparison of J. D. Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye* and *Raw Youth*, conclude with echoes of Thomas Wolfe, Kurt Vonnegurt and Ralph Ellison. The section on Tolstoy looks at Dreiser and Steinbeck, and the final section finds Turgenev in *The Virginian* and Chekhov in Philip Roth's *The Professor of Desire*. The comparisons are inevitability thought-provoking, and what was aimed primarily at a German-speaking audience acquires new meaning for students of Russian culture and of American culture—and for the way in which the one informed the other, and still continues to grace our screens and consciousness.

This is an extremely rewarding and demanding book, a gold mine waiting to surrender its treasures. It is also a challenge, for to truly appreciate the scholarship eventually you will have to read *The Grapes of Wrath* all over again to appreciate the role of *War and Peace* in its composition as Gerigk has. But *The Russians in America* is not only for scholars, though they will find much here; it is a work for all those interested in Russian-American cross-cultural connections. This book begs for translation into English and into Russian to make the world and its connections that Gerigk describes so well available to a much broader audience.

Thomas R. Beyer, Jr., Middlebury College

Leonard J. Stanton. *The Optina Pustyn Monastery in the Russian Literary Imagination: Iconic Vision in Works by Dostoevsky, Gogol, Tolstoy, and Others*. Middlebury Studies in Russian Language and Literature, Vol. 3. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1995. 307 pp., $55.95 (cloth).

Since its reopening in 1988, attention has once again been drawn to that center of revival of ascetic spirituality in nineteenth-century Russia: the Optina Pustyn Monastery of Kozel'sk (henceforth: OP). With hopes that OP will become once again "a Sabbath place where men and women will be brought to sense the sanctity of their own time" (259), Stanton takes us back to a time and place in which the spiritual life was sought "to a maximal degree of intensity and depth" (viii). Beginning with an inquiry into the possibility of religious language, the author studies the role of OP in Russian culture and examines the ways in which a particular vision was mediated to some of Russia's great writers. An inter-disciplinary work, this book will be of interest to specialists in the fields of intellectual history and literature and theology, while the generalist in Russian literature will find its fresh approach to some well-known nineteenth-century literary works insightful.

In Chapter One, "Space, Time, and Language in Inverse Perspective: Iconic Vision and its Path to Russia," the role of the OP elders as mediators between heaven and earth is linked to the early Christian concept of *perichoresis* ("a thorough inter-penetration of several sub-

stances . . . whereby neigher element loses its basic nature and no third and different substance is formed," ix), while their speech is understood to be "iconic" because, like the Incarnate Logos, it serves as an adequate means to the knowledge and experience of God. But the "iconic vision" which they impart is imperfect, often contradictory, and "most baffling precisely where it is most salient, just as the most holy objects in an icon are the ones represented in inverse perspective" (27).

Chapters 2 and 3, "A Quiet Hermitage: Aesthetics and Ecclesiastical Institutions" and "The Optina Intelligentsia: Institutions of Society and Literature," address the priestly role of OP in relation to the intelligentsia at a time when the national Church had failed to reform. Here Stanton examines the way in which OP met a need which the larger institution could not provide: with her early Christian, hesychastic (quiet, contemplative) spirituality she linked intellectuals concerned with national destiny to their past, and from there beyond time.

Chapter 4 presents the first "case study" of Russian writers who visited OP. "Icarus: Belinsky and Elder Makarii on Gogol's Spiritual Fall" demonstrates how Belinsky and the elder were essentially of one mind with respect to Gogol's flight, as evidenced in his *Selected Passages*: the former wished that Gogol would return to his former social concerns, while Makarii hoped that Gogol would not fly "too high" (124), but that his "spirit would find liberation from a world all too much with him" (140). Here the author laments the fact that a meeting between Makarii and Belinsky did not take place, and presents Gogol as a troubled soul who distorted iconic vision: his *Selected Passages* perverted "the mystic's 'inverse perspective' by dressing the Holy City of Jerusalem in the raiment of a Russian provincial capital" (142).

Chapter 5, "Zendergol'm's *Life of Elder Leonid* and Optina's Influence on Dostoevsky," traces the roots of Dostoevsky's iconic vision in *Brothers Karamazov* to the "apophthegmatic" device (or "sayings" of a holy man in a "face to face encounter," 23) in Zendergol'm's *Life*. With reference to *perichoresis* and Bakhtin's notion of "the penetrated word," Stanton examines the way in which an OP elder's discourse is both authoritative and dialogical: his speech enables his listener to find his own voice, but it is always, because of its personal nature, conditional. Thus, for instance, elder Zosima's counsel is to be accepted with its contradictions (e.g., he admonishes a woman who has lost a child to weep and not to weep, to rejoice but not be comforted), while at the same time as a perichoretic occasion.

In Chapter 6, "Prodigal Fathers, Merciful Sons, and Alyosha Karamozov's Sister," we turn to Dostoevsky's deformation of the Prodigal Son parable in his great novel. If, with Freud's story of the primal horde in mind, Michael Holquist sees that Alesha's transition to father is facilitated by his gaining of Zosima as a surrogate father (*Dostoevsky and the Novel* [Evanston, 1997]), Stanton finds the Alesha's centrality is established as he becomes a *brother*, and comes to "personally embody the truth of the outcast community" (177) through accepting Grushenka, and thereby gaining a sister. The iconic inversion rests on Alesha's role as a Christ figure, for as Jesus is seen a third son to a merciful father (in a "canonical" interpretation of the parable, 194), so Alesha becomes a merciful third son (after Mitya the prodigal and Ivan the righteous older brother) to a prodigal father, as well as a brother to humanity.

Chapter 7, "Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy and the Problem of Going Away," considers OP, which stood on the fringe of the institutional Church, as the only dimension of the Church with which Tolstoy might have wished to become reconciled. The "iconic vision" in *Father Sergius* is understood with respect to its hesychastic elements, e.g., Fr. Sergius' quest for "harmony with the natural world" (219) and the contemplative life.

Chapter 8, "The Optina Idea after Dostoevsky: Its Critical and Philosophical Reception," examines, first, the image of OP spirituality as it was shaped by Dostoevsky's elder Zosima. While Leont'ev rejected Dostoevsky's anti-institutional, "rosy" spirituality, Rozanov embraced Zosima's "pantheistic" vision. Stanton then addresses the principal concerns of the "Optina School" of thinkers who carried an OP spirit into regions beyond the monastery.