

of their literary milieu, convincingly presents a special lens for studying women characters. Turning to lyric poetry, Iuliia E. Pavel'eva examines the literary rivalry of the sisters Mirra Lokhvitskaia and Nadezhda Teffi (82–98). While the latter found fame for her prose, Pavel'eva unmasks Teffi's outright theft of Lokhvitskaia's poetic themes and devices in violation of a family agreement to divide the literary turf. The third subsection broadly covers social activism with an overview of women's rights activists of the 1890's by Violetta Trofimova (114–27), a discussion of the “woman question” in 1903 reviews of the dancer Isadora Duncan (127–43), and concludes with Irina Sinova's discussion (144–57) of the differences in content and viewpoint of women's memoirs. Each memoir centers on finding personal fulfillment in a profession rather than love and so exemplifies the emergence of the “new woman.”

The second section, “From the first Russian revolution to October 1917,” repeats the previous structure but with greater emphasis on literary genres featuring explications of the feminine in the prose of Fedor Sologub, A.N. Tolstoi, and Aleksandr Kuprin. Kseniia I. Morozova's provocative essay “Between the Mother of God and Venus” deals with the negative image of a mother in A.K. Gol'debaeva's story “Mama left” (183–97). Essays on Anna Mar's “Woman on the Cross” and “Woman in Lilac” by Anna S. Andreeva (211–24) and Viktoriia G. Khruslova (225–33) examine Mar's tragic attempts to break free from patriarchal traditions to find a modern identity, resulting in suicide. Anna A. Orlova returns to the transitional figure of Innokentii Annenskii (234–45). Farida Kh. Israpova examines Nikolai Gumilev's gender imagery in “Alien Sky” (246–61). Ekaterina V. Kuznetsov portrays a different direction in self-transformation: Elizaveta Kuz'mina-Karavaeva's (later known as Mother Maria) adaptation of female role models as lyrical heroines who increasingly reflect her own religious activities (262–86). Of the three articles on drama, Zuseva-Ozkan's comparison of Teffi's play “The Woman Question” with N.N. Urvantsov's “The Fate of a Man” clearly affirms the centrality of the topic at the time.

The fourteen articles in the third section, “New Russia of the 1920–1930s” again focus on prose, poetry, drama, ego documents, and visual culture. Many extend beyond the stated time frame but all examine women's problems in the difficult transition to Soviet life from loss of private space to communal upbringing of children. Writers discussed include Ol'ga Forsh, Konstantin Vaginov, Andrei Platonov, Vladimir Maiakovskii, Larissa Reisner, and Elizaveta Polonskaia. A short final section on Russian émigré women includes individuals such as Nina Berberova and larger sociological issues, such as acceptance and adaptations to new roles and environments abroad. The volume ends with a bon-bon: Tatiana V. Ternopol's tracing of the evolution of Russian women characters in Agatha Christy's detective fiction. Each author's email address is included to facilitate much needed further discussion of these issues.

Alexander Burry. *Legacies of the Stone Guest: The Don Juan Legend in Russian Literature.*

Publications of the Wisconsin Center for Pushkin Studies. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2023. x, 239 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$99.95, hard bound.

Leslie O'Bell

University of Texas at Austin

Email: lobell@utexas.edu

doi: 10.1017/slr.2024.481

It is Alexander Burry's contention that Pushkin's “little tragedy,” *The Stone Guest*, shaped the afterlife of the Don Juan legend in Russian literature. However, his book pursues dual aims.

It addresses later works directly referencing Pushkin's play, but also follows Don Juanism in modern Russian literature, using Pushkin as a typological parallel, or sounding board, for the author's reflections. Burry skillfully contextualizes the material and incorporates many informative critical views, but the book is more an absorbing and suggestive guide to Russian Don Juanism than a continuous proof of Pushkin's enduring influence. Pushkin's model may not be essential to all the works discussed, but their interpretation often benefits from Burry's foregrounding of *The Stone Guest*.

Burry establishes the defining elements of Pushkin's Don Juan play, some first noted by Anna Akhmatova. The Commander is cast as the husband, not the father of Donna Anna, so Don Juan's duel with him becomes an act of sexual rivalry, and his final meeting with the Commander is staged not at supper but outside Donna Anna's bedchamber. Perhaps Pushkin has Don Juan accomplish the liberation of Donna Anna as well as her seduction, and he is matched by an emancipated new female character, Laura. This Don Juan is a rebellious artist figure, returning unbidden from exile, a poet adept at verbal seduction. He is presented as morally ambiguous, perhaps predatory, but maybe finally seeking true love. Instead of receiving divine punishment, the hero is plunged into psychological darkness, "tragically destroyed on the precipice of happiness" (64). Burry sees 1830, when the "little tragedies" were completed not long before the poet's marriage, as a turning point in Pushkin's life from his relatively libertine youth to maturity, enabling Pushkin to find potential in both sides of the drama. Burry emphasizes the autobiographical linkage of Pushkin's younger self with his projected nemesis, the Commander.

Burry then treats Russian Realist writers dealing with a romantic hero like Don Juan. They "find ingenious ways to reconceptualize Pushkin's linking of art and seduction, and his tantalizingly ambiguous portrait of a man who may or may not have reformed through genuine love" (70–71). There certainly is Don Juanism in works like *Anna Karenina* and "The Lady with the Dog," though it goes too far to say that they display "an underlying rewriting of *The Stone Guest*" (81). Burry reminds us how subtly retribution for transgression is worked out in Lev Tolstói's novel, and how subtly love transforms the adulterous pair in Anton Chekhov's story.

Burry next addresses the conscious Don Juan adaptations of the Silver Age poets Aleksandr Blok, Marina Tsvetaeva, Nikolai Gumilev and Anna Akhmatova. Blok, with his sense of promiscuity, degeneracy, and betrayal of the ideal Beautiful Lady, evokes retribution with apocalyptic overtones, enacting the defeat of Don Juan with faint hope that the ideal can be reborn. Tsvetaeva radically reworks the material: though her Don Juan, like Pushkin's, is a poet, he is out of place in cold Russia and "meet[s] his fate at the hands of Carmen" (129). Tsvetaeva imagines a transcendent fate for Don Juan in a spiritual love that she, as poet and equal, could offer him (130). Gumilev creates a playful parody, *Don Juan in Egypt*, where the irrepressible hero enjoys an active afterlife, as does the Commander. In *A Poem without a Hero*, Akhmatova evokes both "a real-life, Don Juan-like love triangle" (138), punished in the poem, and also the licentiousness of her Silver Age youth, punished in the advent of Stalinism and war.

Finally, Burry takes on post-Soviet treatments of Don Juan by Venedikt Erofeev, Vladimir Kazakov, and Liudmila Ulitskaia. Erofeev's *Walpurgis Night, or the Steps of the Commander* features a rebellious hero who will not be circumscribed, but only uses sexual seduction as a means to procure alcohol. This is a poisonous alcohol which destroys its imbibers, stressing the destructive and self-destructive charm of this apparently liberated Don Juan (156). Kazakov attempts to escape the confines of reality altogether by absurdist parodies of the legend in his *Don Juan* cycle. This Don Juan parades a poetic wit and eludes capture in a world of pure verbal play. Both Erofeev and Kazakov display active familiarity with Pushkin's play. For Burry, Ulitskaia, "though she explicitly refers neither to Donjuanism nor to Pushkin's *The Stone Guest*" (172), seems to continue his line of thinking in *Sonechka*, *The Funeral Party*, and *Sincerely Yours, Shurik*. Motifs like artistic passion, serial erotic adventures, and rebirth through love can be celebrated with no ensuing moral retribution, or, as reality requires, they can be critiqued.