

Hodge also pays close attention to linguistic nuances embedded in Russian words with their broad semantic fields. In Turgenev's time, for instance, there were three words for nature (*natura*, *estestvo*, and *priroda*) and Hodge explains that his book analyzes Turgenev's use of the broadest of these—*priroda*—“chiefly by scrutinizing his conception and practice of hunting” (5). The word hunting itself (*okhota*), with its etymological connection to desire and hence to the feelings as well as practice of the hunter, expands the scope of his study (35–37). He relies in part on Oleg Egorov, the foremost modern scholar of Russian hunting, to make his case.

Chapter 1 discusses Turgenev's thought about nature, which comes out of his education in German romantic philosophy as practiced by Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling, Aleksandr Herzen, and others, and from practical knowledge gained over decades in the field. His writing as Hodge presents it is both “anthropotropic”—drawing everything, including nature, into the human sphere—and “ecotropic,” in which everything is defined in terms of nature. It is philosophical but not sentimental: nature in it is indifferent (19) towards individuals, and the artist, preserving equilibrium in his creation at the expense of happy endings, is like nature in this regard (26). As Hodge puts it in chapter two, which is on the relation of hunting and art, very frequently in Turgenev's prose, as in nature, the success of one character depends on the death of another (62). Chapter 3 focuses on *Notes of a Hunter* and especially the relation of hunting to power (*proizvol*). Chapter 4 then turns to two crucial reviews Turgenev published in 1852 and 1853 on the treatise by Slavophile and close friend Sergei Aksakov entitled *Notes of an Orenburg Hunter*. These include Turgenev's most profound direct statements on nature. Everything lives for itself alone, and yet all is harmony in nature (114–16). Both these principles and the struggle between them are present in Turgenev's prose, including its structure and plot. Especially striking in this respect is the analysis of the story “The Inn” (*Postoiayli dvor*), written at the same time as the second Aksakov review (113–16). Chapter 5, on “Journey to the Forest Belt,” *Rudin*, and *A Gentry Nest*, explains how nature is incorporated into the mature long form of the Turgenevian novel, which “comes to favor anthropotropic meanings embedded in putatively ecotropic observations” (131). Chapter 6 analyzes *First Love*, *On the Eve*, and *Fathers and Children*, which focus less on hunting, but still integrate lessons about nature gleaned from it. Hodge's reading of the mistaken concentration of scientists like Bazarov on matter as equivalent to *priroda* is one important example of this (171–72).

The book includes and discusses illustrations related to its subject. In appendices, Hodge provides a great service by translating the articles on Aksakov. The appendices also include a chronology of Turgenev's statements throughout life on the indifference of nature, and a translation of a late article entitled “The Hunter's Fifty Flaws and Fifty Flaws of a Gun Dog” (1876). It is an example of Turgenev's moral concerns about hunting late in his life (192–97).

DONNA TUSSING ORWIN
University of Toronto

Disenchanted Wanderer: The Apocalyptic Vision of Konstantin Leontiev. By Glenn Cronin. Ithaca: Northern Illinois University Press, an imprint of Cornell University Press, 2021. xiv, 276 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations. \$49.95, hard bound.
doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.288

Today, like every day, is a good time for a narrative of decline. For that reason, Glenn Cronin's discussion of Konstantin Leontiev makes a welcome contribution. Its value does

not lie in relating a particular compelling or insightful account of the world. Leontiev's narratives, however, offer an opportunity to consider a range of idiosyncratic anxieties about the future and how they project forward out of their time and into our own; they perhaps give us some indication of what fears might have power over us in the future.

The book is an odd sort of intellectual biography, carried out mostly through a comprehensive examination of Leontiev's works and correspondence. One oddity is the extent to which he is the sole source for his life. Documented events had little bearing on him, and his substantial interactions with others typically ended with him annoying and alienating them. So his life is a curiously monological one. Another oddity is that it did not seem to matter much what kind of work he was writing. Stories are "used to get across his ideas" (48) and their characters are "thinly disguised" (62) proxies of himself; if a story has two protagonists, this evidences a "divided self" (29). The theoretical writing and criticism are almost memoirs in disguise, and the correspondence can be dreamlike in its disconnection from its own time. Words are ultimately about ideas, and ideas are intra-psychic conflicts translated, awkwardly, into another idiom.

Some features of Leontiev's life are unsurprising. He had chronic health problems and financial difficulties, and a strained relationship with his mother, who owned a small, unprofitable estate. He studied medicine, enlisted in the army, worked as a family physician, abandoned medicine to pursue a literary career, joined the Russian Foreign Service when his literary career failed, started a literary career again, failed again, joined the Moscow Censorship Committee, and died in 1891. He managed to make enemies of possible and actual sources of support: Ivan Turgenev (14), Nikolai Strakhov (79), and Ivan Aksakov (124), among others. But the major event of his life is the "spiritual crisis of 1871" (135). Fearing death from cholera, Leontiev vowed that he would repent his whole past life, if only his sickness were relieved. It was, and he did. He burned manuscripts and devoted himself to "inner rebirth" (75) and a "violent conversion to *personal* orthodoxy" (75).

The ideas, then, fall naturally into a "before" and an "after." Before the crisis, the center was an "aesthetic morality" (20) and an "aesthetic worldview" (53). According to the former, beauty is more important than, and provides the motivational basis for ethics. In an aesthetic worldview, everything is judged on aesthetic grounds: politics, evil, society, religion. Leontiev hoped for a "synthesis" (55) whereby beauty and morality could be reconciled with cultural flourishing through adherence to "the Byzantine legacy" (8). But he found this possibility affectively unsatisfying; and indeed, understanding Orthodoxy in terms of its contribution to aesthetic pleasure is not a sustainable way of thinking about it.

After the crisis there were a mixture of ideas: "a severe and uncompromising version of Orthodox Christianity" (55), autocracy and the "restratification of society" (94), an organicist theory of the state, a pan-Slavic nationalism based on a "central unifying idea" (85) rather than race, and acquiring Czargrad and Kiev as the religious and political centers of an expanded state. What underlies all these ideas is not any refined philosophical commitments. Although Cronin mentions Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling, and Friedrich Nietzsche, among others, Leontiev was "not concerned with maintaining internal consistency in his arguments" (99) and was "at best an indifferent scholar" (89). The organizing themes of these ideas, rather, were that secular accomplishment is impossible, evil is ineradicable, only an anti-modern culture could temporarily stave off collapse, faith is rooted in "dread" (137) and "submission" (140), and the total rejection of worldly value is the only path to salvation.

The defining feature of his late thought, then, was the development of the narrative of decline into the apocalyptic vision of its culmination, while still maintaining an otherworldly hope. There are, it seems, points of view from which even an apocalyptic

vision is grounds for optimism, or at least an “optimistic pessimism” (145). One could embrace the vision for the spectacle of watching the world burn, or from anticipation of others getting burned, or out of hope for what comes afterward. Reading Cronin’s fine discussion, I am not sure Leontiev ever quite settled on what he was waiting for.

ROBERT GUAY

Binghamton University, SUNY

Language and Metaphors of the Russian Revolution: Sow the Wind, Reap the Storm. By Lonny Harrison. London: Lexington Books, 2021. xi, 257 pp. Notes.

Bibliography. Index. \$105.00, hard bound.

doi: 10.1017/slr.2022.289

Language and Metaphors of the Russian Revolution takes on the ambitious task of tracing images of storms, floods, sowing and reaping—“metaphor clusters” (13)—from the early nineteenth century on. These metaphor clusters are united by operating within a framework of struggle with nature and rebirth from that struggle. The book does not seek to be a compendium of metaphors but rather an overview of Russian cultural history for “general readership” (viii). In this capacity, the book will be useful to any class dedicated to cultural history or survey of Russian literature.

The book is split into two parts, the first on prerevolutionary culture and literature and the second on post-revolutionary. Part 1, “Sow the Wind,” consists of four chapters designed to give the reader both a history of the Russian intelligentsia before the 1917 revolution and the use of flood and storm metaphors in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Chapter 1 gives a broad overview of “metaphors of displacement, alienation, and lack of control” (20) that contain the promise of rebirth—the Biblical flood and ark, sowing and reaping, and the myth of the founding of Petersburg, dipping more deeply into examples from major figures of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries such as Aleksandr Pushkin, Aleksandr Herzen, and Vladimir Maiakovskii.

Chapter 2 in large part leaves the “metaphor clusters” aside to provide an overview of the formation and development of the intelligentsia, with sections on Aleksandr Radishchev, Nikolai Novikov, the Decembrists, the *raznochintsy*, Vissarion Belinskii, Petr Chaadaev, and the Civic Critics. This chapter provides an excellent overview of the intelligentsia that will prove illuminating to any reader interested in the Russian nineteenth century.

Chapter 3 examines images of the Russian people as an anarchic force through close readings of the storm imagery in Andrei Belyi (*Petersburg*), Aleksandr Blok (*The Twelve*), and Aleksei Remizov (*Whirlwind Russia*). This chapter concludes with the storm metaphors of Maksim Gor’kii, whom Larry Harrison views as a bridge connecting the intelligentsia, the people, and the Bolsheviks. In a final section Harrison discusses Gor’kii’s struggle to accept the Bolsheviks and his eventual return to Stalinist Soviet Union.

Chapter 4 opposes two visions of modernity: “bourgeois” and “cultural.” Bourgeois modernity centers on progress and the promises of technology, whereas cultural modernity is a “revolt against the past” (108) and mistrust of the peasants. Harrison argues that the Bolsheviks used the latter, as reflected in avant-garde art, to gain support of the workers and that this evolved into the spontaneity-consciousness paradigm of Socialist Realism.

Part 2, “Reap the Storm,” also consists of four chapters. Chapter 5 discusses the “weaponization” of language by the Bolsheviks. This chapter and the previous