The volume's editorial program embraces well-documented developments in the transnational study of realism. These include the "economic turn" (represented here by two timely accounts of the problems of narrating capitalism in Dostoevskii and an essay tracing the evolving trope of the Russian forest as realist "resource"); the focus on material cultures of reading and writing (key to several illuminating essays, including Bella Grigoryan's on *Netochka Nezvanova* as a product of the 1840s commercial press and Gabriella Safran's on the paper factory in the background of Ivan Turgenev's *Zapiski okhotnika*); and the intertwining of literary and scientific "plots" (especially in Aleksei Vdovin's and Valeria Sobol's revelatory articles on Ivan Sechenov as a narrative force in Russian realism). However, the editors also note subtler theoretical resonances. They compare Kirill Zubkov's analysis of active models of reading in Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin's *Gubernskie ocherki* with Catherine Gallagher's new historicist studies of the rise of fictionality in eighteenth century English novels (28); similarly, Emma Lieber's essay on *Bratia Karamazovy* as anti-Oedipal novel and Ilya Kliger's on sociality and sovereignty in Goncharov's *Obyknovennaia istoriia* chime with Eve Sedgwick's concept of "reparative reading" (34). The point is not that these essays prominently invoke Gallagher or Sedgwick; rather, that they ask Shchedrin, Dostoevskii, and Goncharov to perform the same kind of theoretical work as Aphra Behn, Charlotte Lenox, or Henry James. One of the volume's strengths is that it draws concerted attention to how nineteenth-century Russian realist texts enrich the mainstream discourse of contemporary literary theory, and vice versa—another reason to hope for its eventual wider translation.

This brief summary cannot do justice to the volume's pleasures and discoveries: Kirill Ospovat's recasting of Makar Devushkin as a Spivakian "subaltern," Mikhail Dolbilov's meticulous reconstruction of Tolstoi's 1876 polemic with Pan-Slavism in *Anna Karenina*, Melissa Frazier's evocation of "dialogic science" in Tolstoi and Dostoevskii, and more. Perhaps most salutary are the reminders—in remarkable studies by Vadim Shkolnikov and Konstantine Klioutchkine—that our contemporary scholarship remains intertwined with the framework for reading Russian realism established in the 1840s–60s press: Belinskii's Hegelian conviction that literature's own internal logic will lead it beyond the bounds of art (97), and the "radical critics'" subsequent campaign to erase the problem of representation altogether, making print itself the arbiter of reality (378–79). The clearest source of exceptionality lies here: it is hard to think of another nineteenth-century literary tradition that so flagrantly asserted its own transcendence of aesthetic conventions and aesthetic bounds. This provocation is all the more reason to explore the correspondences between "literature" and "reality" from new theoretical standpoints, beginning to unearth the many surprises that Russian realism still has in store.

Chloë Kitzinger
Rutgers University

Mimetic Lives: Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Character in the Novel. By Chloë Kitzinger. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2021. xii, 256 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. $120.00, hard bound; $39.95, paper.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.282

Chloe Kitzinger's study is an ambitious project that in 160 pages discusses the major novels of Lev Tolstoi and Fedor Dostoevskii with their armies of characters, while

developing some theoretical issues pertaining to the mimesis in literature. These issues relate to technical aspects of mimesis, and to the predicament of the authors who strove to combine mimetic realism with the didactic goals of transforming their audience.

The style is dense, abstract, and sometimes hard to follow, as the focus of the study is less the narrative choices of authors or moral choices of characters, but rather theorizing on what the realistic presentation of characters implies, both in terms of possibilities and limitations: "we see not just the conditions that create the effect of lifelong persons, but also the conditions that contain it: a collision between the plenitude and the discontent of mimesis" (26). Undoubtedly, such probing authors as Tolstoi and Dostoevskii were bound to find discontent everywhere; for Kitzinger, it is primarily the discontent of "mimesis" that they explore by forever beating against its limits.

The opening of the study declares "the power of mimetic characters has its limits as a direct source of spiritual, social and political change" (5), while the conclusion suggests that, "the illusion of the character's life set boundary around the reader's encounter with him, which limits the novelist's power to turn this encounter toward lasting spiritual or social change" (156). We also learn that Tolstoi's frustration with mimetic limits forced him to quit writing novels: "Tolstoy's turn away from the novel after writing *Anna Karenina* bears witness to this limit: a realist so falling into vivid particularity that it resists its longed for dissolution in the real" (124). Surely both Tolstoi and Dostoevskii hoped to "move beyond the limits of realist character-systems themselves" (18); surely Tolstoi tried to tax "conventional character-system past its limits" (22); still, one feels that tracing what these authors have done within the limits of their verbal arts is more productive than theorizing on their unrealizable desires to move beyond them.

The practical side of the book is more rewarding than this theoretical "limitology." Kitzinger explores narrative techniques, which create a complicated network of meanings, produced by various modes of character presentation. As a point of departure she takes Alex Woloch's *The One vs. The Many: Minor Characters and the Space of the Protagonist in the Novel* (2003), which proposes to arrange the characters, according to their "degrees of protagonicity" along the axis of narrative center/periphery; the minor characters are suppressed and fragmented in contrast with more "complete" protagonists placed closer to "the vivifying center," as opposed to "formulaic margins" (9).

Kitzinger's insights into the arrangement of Tolstoi's major and minor characters are illuminating. While main protagonists exhibit "autonomous embodied existence in and for himself. . . independent of the narrative" (36), minor characters, in contrast, exhibit formulaic, mechanistic, ghostlike or fragmentary existence" (36). Their purpose is to "sustain fictional plot" (55). To push this comparison further, Kitzinger focuses on Dolokhov and Sonya, doomed to be "minor" by the rules that Tolstoi sets up for himself in the novel: "telling Pierre's story has to exclude telling Dolokhov's" (48). "Minor" characters become "minor" due to their moral flaws: "what links Napoleon and Dolokhov is their reliance on plotting—their belief in their own capacity to influence and direct others' actions, which for Tolstoi results in "minorness" (57).

For anyone trying to come to terms Tolstoi's hundreds of characters and his ever-changing perspective on what constitutes a true hero, such analysis is highly productive, as it accounts for all sorts of paradigms in Tolstoi, be it Prince Kasatsky's transformation into Father Sergius and a nameless wanderer in "Father Sergius," or the inverse proportion between moral goodness and narrative space allotted to the characters of "Three Deaths."

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.282 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I would add that Woloch's spatial metaphors (center, periphery) prove indispensable when analyzing Tolstoi's fiction, since his texts tend to be organized according to various spatial principles and utilize various angles and "shots." Tolstoi's narrative gaze zooms, pans, focuses, and provides close ups, while constantly playing with space, hierarchy, and proportions. Kitzinger highlights some of these moments: Natasha bursts into the room on her name day; Princess Marya Bolkonsky emerges on the scene as the figure in "the background" of her father's entourage; Andrew and Pierre discuss the meaning of life on a bridge. Natasha even thinks of her suitors spatially (Boris is narrow, Pierre wide). These explorations can surely be pushed further, since Tolstoi's spatial and artistic imagination utilizes the notions of center, periphery, flow, and trajectory, not only on the narrative but also physical level.

When it comes to Dostoevskii, one feels that neither the novels nor the intellectual preoccupations of their author benefits from theoretical schemes imposed upon them. Any theory of literature, and not just mimesis, finds Dostoevskii a harder nut to crack. His characters are notoriously unhinged, decentered, autonomous, self-aware, and do anything they can to violate theoretical schemes imposed upon them. Consequently, all sorts of theoreticians, from Gyorgy Lukács to Mikhail Bakhtin and Rene Girard, invented new theories to explain Dostoevskii and his unwieldy oeuvre. Not intimidated by the crowded field, Kitzinger introduces one more theoretical construct, the concept of "illegitimacy," the "master trope for representing both the loss and the spiritual potential of the absent foundation, "which opens a character to 'tempest and disorder' on the one hand and to Christ on the other" (81).

Dostoevskii's project of "transforming the novel for the spiritual demands of a disordered and chaotic post-reform Russia" (80) can be theorized in all sorts of way, as does his desire to bridge the gap between didactic and mimetic; but does the concept of "illegitimacy" create a better framework for exploring his novels, than, say, "alienation." The trope, however, remains important for Kitzinger, as she exerts a lot of effort to explain its applicability first to *The Adolescent* and then to *The Brothers Karamazov*, using it as a cornerstone for her interpretation of the novel.

The discussion of Dostoevskii's last novel does provide intriguing and illuminating insights into the dialogue between Tolstoi and Dostoevskii. It embraces the comparison of *The Adolescent*'s fluid characters to Tolstoi's more recognizable types, continuing to Dostoevskii's decision to utilize a strong family as the narrative vehicle for his last novel, resulting in the Karamazovs' dominance over the novel, and in the patterning of the three Karamazov brothers on the three Levin brothers: spiritual seeker, Konstantin, philosopher and writer, Koznyshev, and the passionate and rebellious Nikolai.

The desire to build upon the metaphor of "illegitimacy" forces Kitzinger, however, to construct her interpretation upon some radical difference between illegitimate Smerdiakov and his half-brothers. For Kitzinger, the epiphanies and transformations of the three brothers require their temporal lapse from their Karamazov nature, which they transcend by becoming at a certain moment "non-Karamazovs," experiencing therefore existential crises and consequent epiphanies. Smerdiakov is doomed because he cannot transcend his origins: he is an illegitimate Karamazov, a non-Karamazov. This construct hardly works in the case of Ivan, whose delirium does not represent any meaningful transformation, nor does it recognize the importance of Zosima as the alternative center of the novel, connected to the epiphanies of various characters not related to Karamazov.

Granted that some of its thought provoking readings are not always convincing, this nuanced and sophisticated study with its illuminating application of Woloch's

https://doi.org/10.1017/slr.2022.282 Published online by Cambridge University Press

model will be of great use to anyone interested in the European novel, while literary theorists would surely benefit from its analysis of mimesis and its scope.

Vladimir Golstein
Brown University

Love for Sale: Representing Prostitution in Imperial Russia. By Colleen Lucey. NIU Series in Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2021. xvi, 270 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. $49.95, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.283

In 1843, a system of state regulation of prostitution, fashioned after the French model, was introduced in imperial Russia. Prostitutes would be issued a "yellow ticket," allowing the medical police to track and contain their activities and to monitor them for venereal disease. The regulation of prostitution was intended to neutralize the danger posed by sexual commerce to societal stability. Things did not go according to plan. As Colleen Lucey details in her compelling new book, the prostitute became a key locus for many of imperial Russia's most profound anxieties. *Love for Sale* expertly traces the contours of these anxieties in Russian literary and visual culture, focusing on works produced between 1840 and 1905. Unease about urbanization, shifting gender dynamics, the presence of women as consumers in the public sphere, and the infusion of capitalist elements into the economy—the prostitute emblematized all of these concerns for imperial Russia's cultural producers. In the era's depictions of prostitution, nothing less than the fate of the Russian nation was at stake.

Each chapter of the book focuses on a different category of commercial sex. Chapter 1 foregrounds the urban, registered prostitute. Lucey credits Nikolai Gogol′'s story "Nevsky Prospect" with introducing "the theme of commercial sex" into Russian literature, adding that Gogol′ "did so by connecting the sold woman with the image" of the imperial capital (23). Gogol′'s story also articulates a question that would preoccupy subsequent Russian authors: Can the prostitute be "saved"? If so, how and by whom? In her discussion of how these questions undergird Fedor Dostoevskii's *The Underground Man*, Lucey adds a new dimension to well-covered territory by analyzing how the author "uses space as part of the symbolic language in the novel" (36). Obliquely highlighting the failure of the system of regulating prostitution, Dostoevskii reveals how women cannot escape being perceived as "commodity goods" even if they leave the confines of the brothel (36).

Chapter 2 continues the focus on the urban prostitute but explores how prose writers engaged with medical and sociological discourses, especially those normalizing prostitution as a "safety valve for social passions" (48). Lucey charts the struggle between vilifying and vindicating commercial sex workers that unfolds in the works of Vsevolod Krestovskii, Vsevolod Garshin, Lev Tolstoi, and Leonid Andreev. As with the discussion of Dostoevskii in the earlier chapter, she adds an original new dimension to the criticism of Tolstoi's *Resurrection* by detailing how it responds to the leading theories on sex work of the time. Chapter 3 turns from the urban prostitute to the elite one, or the demimondaine. With her "appropriation of the behaviors, pastimes, and clothing of the elite," the demimondaine "confused sexual and social boundaries," profoundly troubling the Russian intelligentsia in the process (78). The demimondaine emblematizes the threat posed by women's increasing emergence into the public domain as consumers. This chapter identifies an important