

diaries and letters, the aim of which was to “know thyself and improve.” The center of authority in their worldview shifted from the monarch and official church to the secret Rosicrucian hierarchy.

These two different types of “emotional community” (Barbara Rosenwein, *Emotional Community in the Early Middle Ages*, 2006), with one presided over by an autocrat, inevitably came to blows. Chapter 2 discusses the formation of a new “emotional community” as the Russian educated public turned to European sentimentalist literature as the main source for its emotional repertoire. Zorin analyzes Karamzin’s *Letters of the Russian Traveler* as a new kind of diary whose emotional center resides in the diarist himself. Inspired by Nikolai Karamzin, Michail Muraviev left a diary in the form of letters. Muraviev straddled two “emotional communities”—court bureaucracy and the readership of sentimentalist literature. His emotional experiences and responses depended on which hat he wore at the time.

As the last case, before turning to Turgenev, Zorin considers Aleksandr Radishchev’s *Diary of One Week* and literary antecedents for his suicide: his identification with the emotional states of Joseph Addison’s high tragedy protagonist in *Cato*, and a hero of Bernard-Joseph Saurin’s 1768 bourgeois drama *Béverlei*. Educated Russians were ready to learn to feel according to the European symbolic literary emotional matrixes. This can be observed best from personal diaries, in which “I” looks at “me.”

Chapters 3 through 6 tell the main story of the book: Turgenev’s emotional life as seen through his diary, from November 1799 to his death (suicide?) in 1803. Brought up by one emotional community, that represented by his father, Turgenev had become a leader of another—the admirers of German literature who formed themselves into a Friendly Literary Society. He had to negotiate the legacy of the one having internalized the essence of the other. As a key to Turgenev’s diary, built on literary models and written in search of rules suitable for preserving *Selbstheit* (as Turgenev put it), Zorin applies a sociocultural model that enables him to approach emotional processes of a single individual in a specific culture.

LINA BERNSTEIN
Franklin & Marshall Colleges

Siblings in Tolstoy and Dostoevsky: The Path to Universal Brotherhood. By Anna A. Berman. *Studies in Russian Literature and Theory*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015. xvi, 242 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. Paper, \$39.95. doi: 10.1017/slr.2017.212

Anna Berman’s rich and engaging study of the family novels of Tolstoy and Dostoevskii shifts the usual critical focus from erotic love or intergenerational conflict to siblinghood, tracing the trajectories of both writers as they seek to negotiate the question of love through the polyvalent concept of brotherhood. Building on Juliet Mitchell’s work, Berman refocuses our frame of reference from the vertical relations of the family to horizontal or lateral ones (6). In the case of Tolstoy, she sees his fiction as unfolding according to the three phases of love which he later universalized in *The Kingdom of God is within You* as “the personal, or animal,” “the social, or the pagan,” and “the universal, or the divine” (26). His early works explore love’s personal aspect, culminating in the ideal families of the end of *War and Peace*; *Anna Karenina* embodies the tensions of the second, social, stage; and *Resurrection* marks the all-encompassing concept of divine and universal brotherhood encapsulated in Tolstoy’s recollection of his brother’s dream of all mankind as Ant-brothers, a model which ultimately

excludes individual love. In contrast, Dostoevskii never depicts the ideal family. In his early works sibling bonds work within the ubiquitous model of triple love to suggest a powerful alternative to the masochistic suffering created by erotic love. In his later works they work in the vacuum provided by the broken or “accidental family,” serving as the building blocks for a model of universal brotherhood that does not exclude the personal.

By interspersing analysis of her two central subjects’ novels, Berman contrasts the parallel development of Tolstoi’s and Dostoevskii’s representations of siblinghood, showing how they came to such differing conclusions about the nature of universal brotherhood. Chapter 1 explores the foundations of Tolstoi’s view of siblinghood in the ideas of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and George Sand before examining the formative role played by sibling relations in his *Childhood* trilogy. A reading of *War and Peace* convincingly shows how siblinghood comes to serve as an alternative to the increasingly problematic notion of erotic love in that novel. Chapter 2 moves to Dostoevskii’s pre-1870s works, particularly *Crime and Punishment*, which reject western models of erotic love and the successes or failures of marriages in favor of plots “fueled by the shifting nexus of lateral relations the characters must navigate as they seek connection in a dark, isolating world” (77).

Chapter 3 examines Tolstoi’s expanded model of kinship in *Anna Karenina*, which Berman identifies as a novelistic world “structured and defined by lateral bonds,” where “literal siblings become the paradigmatic model for other lateral kinship relations” (85). She persuasively demonstrates how this kinship model maps onto the opposition between *svoi* and *chuzhoi* which Richard Gustafson has seen as lying at the heart of Tolstoi’s psychological make-up (93), and how its outer limits emerge at the novel’s ending, when both Levin and Tolstoi reject the notion of a brotherhood that is expansive enough to include those fighting in another country. Chapter 4 deals with Dostoevskii’s late novels, showing how the absent sibling bonds and broken families of *Demons* are finally regenerated through the restoration of universal brotherhood in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Berman’s examination of Smerdyakov as a test case of brotherhood, not just for the Karamazovs but also for the reader, reveals intriguing potential ruptures in Dostoevskii’s utopian vision. Chapter 5 examines *Resurrection* as the apex of Tolstoi’s unfolding vision of universal brotherhood and its clash with individual love.

The book’s great strength is its shift in focus to the sibling relationship and the new perspective it offers on familiar works: the lateral structures of *Anna Karenina*, for instance, or the fourth Karamazov brother. This perspective can also be the source of its weaknesses, in instances where the exclusive focus on siblinghood threatens to overwhelm readings of complex novels; in the case of *Crime and Punishment* the attention paid to Raskolnikov and Dunya’s relationship raises many unanswered questions about connections to the plot of Raskolnikov’s Idea. Berman’s analysis is mainly rooted in ethical and formal questions, and while the influence of historical and social forces in shaping the distinctive representations of the family is brought up in a comparative context, it is given short shrift. The reader is left wondering about the motivation behind the accidental family theme. I would have liked a more thorough and detailed reading of *The Adolescent*, which is mainly used here as a lens through which to examine *The Brothers Karamazov*. Berman’s book casts new light on the important genre of the family novel and will be of interest not only to scholars of the nineteenth century Russian novel but also to scholars of other novelistic traditions seeking an insight into the specifics of the Russian novelistic situation.

KATE HOLLAND
University of Toronto