

then it does little to explain these outcomes. Similarly, she falls short of engaging with the implications of male authorship. These issues, at times, hamper the analysis. In the case of Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* both kinds of engagement might have opened problematic and interesting perspectives. One familiar reading of Tolstoy is, of course, that *he* killed Anna precisely because she had made the wrong choice, returning to her lover rather than her husband and children. In this reading, there is little resistance to dichotomization. Rather, Anna, despite her psychological complexity, is the villain—pitiable, but ultimately deserving of her fate. By contrast, Ekaterina Maslova in Tolstoy's last novel, *Resurrection*, is the unambiguous victim of exploitation, for which the author rewards her. It would have been interesting to see how commodified love fits with the larger literature on gender and power and whether the concept serves to usefully unsettle the system of moral dichotomies imposed by authors such as Tolstoy to reward or punish his fictional female characters for their choices.

Lucey's study of prostitution as a cultural artefact is, however, particularly strong, as is her well-argued choice of texts and cultural artifacts, all of which she studies with unusual attention to detail. As happens frequently with cultural studies of gender politics, they raise as many questions as they answer and that is part of their utility. Commodified love as a topic for literary and historical analysis might open many doors for future work.

**Olga Petri, University of Cambridge**

Leigh, Allison. *Picturing Russia's Men: Masculinity and Modernity in 19th-Century Painting*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2020. 288 pp. \$108.00. ISBN 978-1-5013-4179-3.

What was masculinity in Russian art? One's heart sinks and rises at Allison Leigh's examination of the notions of masculinity and maleness in nineteenth-century Russian art. Her ambitious study of various sources and assemblage of themes draws on some of the approaches and methods of recent studies by Jongwoo Jeremy Kim, Anthea Gallen, Andrew Graciano, and, to a lesser extent, Nicole Hudgins, to probe how Russian academic painting has transformed, but largely preserved, traditional opinion on male body. Leigh threads together paintings from many different Russian artists and their social milieu to ask how the medium has shaped Russian understanding of masculinity and homosexuality in life and art—its idealization, disapproval, and effects on society. This is an emerging field in Russian art history, and the important debates related to it show that analyzing the male body, as well as social structures and relationships of Russia's encounter with the modern world, have the potential to spark new perspectives.

*Picturing Russia's Men* is organized into three parts, each of which is devoted to two artists. Briullov, Ivanov, Fedotov, Kramskoi, and Repin get their own chapter, as if to demonstrate that Russian art's reputation still rests on these great art instructors; other figures afforded ample space include Garshin (writer), Nicholas I (tsar), and Arakcheev (devotee of heel-clicking and military training). On the other hand, important figures for Leigh's argument like Belinsky (critic), Courbet (painter), Thorvaldsen (sculptor) get short shrift. The principle behind the selection of these artists seems simple: the troubled spirit's troubled question about how to live in troubled times; in fact, their entire art can be seen as emerging from an attempt to make sense of Russian life, and of the nineteenth-century's claim that national dignity equals personal virtue, and vice versa. The book's organizing principle is more definite: to understand the diversity of their artistic genius and sexual nature through complexity of portraiture. Leigh allows the reader to pay more attention to the artist himself, his face, body, and posture, and to the artists' attempts to be a performer with an instinct of theatricality, a guarded figure of power, an ordinary citizen, or an unsettling and disturbing personality of dark energy. Many of portraits and self-portraits Leigh offers—Briullov (1833 and 1848), Repin's Garshin (1884) and Mussorgsky (1881), Kramskoy's Dmitriev-Orenburgskii (1866)—are filled with inwardness, a quiet proclamation of selfhood; she draws our attention to tiny detail that hints at sensuality or suggests vulnerability, with much kept in reserve.

Leigh engages with the issue of the artist's poverty and its impact on artistic psyche: either glorifying his talent or testifying to his failure; choosing to live in bohemian squalor or turning into a gambler and drinker who avoids direct gazes and refuses offers from the arbiters of taste; accepting premature death or madness as God's will. Nineteenth-century Leigh confirms the notion that Russian art contains a drive to capture the essence of human existence as it confronts artist's inner self-consciousness. Like in the classic Russian novel, whose protagonists repeatedly take decisive steps to build a life for themselves as artists that collide with their desire to stay true to themselves, their own uniqueness. The issues of moral (and personal) censorship, the paralyzing anxieties and infinite hope are what rivets us to them.

Leigh's research into censorship, violations, and distaste for uniforms is timely. She centers Pavel Fedotov, who became a paragon of "different masculine identities" for his ravaged response to manliness and his own family's destitution (p. 82). On the other side of the spectrum is the affluent figure of Karl Briullov, who in 1822 quit Russia for Italy, but kept "childlike" ties to his father until abandoning filial duties for official ones. The gestation of this "fashionable gentlemen" accorded with Briullov's unfinished self-portrait for the Uffizi (1833), while reversing the father-son position when artist-son was called back by Tsar-father: an obedient but worldly servant returns to Russia on Christmas Day 1835 to accept the title of "Father in Art." Leigh's aptly juxtaposes these two life-changing episodes by quoting Aleksandr Benois's description of Briullov's "kingly behavior."

The long shadow of *domostroi*, combined with the bloodless doctrine of "official Nationality," meant isolation for some and stately approval for others, leaving majority in the fog of their own dreams. Leigh's fascination with Aleksandr Ivanov is in part explained by his nature as an alert dreamer. Her finely crafted chapter on Ivanov's *homosociality* and *homoeroticism* marks the usual choice of Russia's leading artists and intellectuals, where Ivanov's self-governing practice of painting feminine-looking male nudes in the stultifying atmosphere of the Academy's obsession with antiquities, is unique and detectable.

The vocabulary of nineteenth-century Russian academic art still retains this image of the hermetically sealed box hiding exquisite talent inside its interior mechanism. The establishment of Art Academy (next to myriad modern societies) was based upon gendered and class hierarchies, which only intensified as time passed. The modern Russian *self* was imagined as male, white, Orthodox, and *heteronormative*, and such assumptions impacted the structure of the Russian art world and art market. Leigh's study is a breath of fresh air showing that there was never one notion of masculinity (or femininity) even in Russia, but competing and dominant versions, intersecting with gendering projections, dependencies, and other categories used to define male identity.

**Inessa Kouteinikova, Independent scholar, Amsterdam**

Starikov, Konstantin, and Melissa L. Miller, eds. *The Russian Medical Humanities: Past, Present, and Future*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2021. xx1 + 214 pp. \$95.00. ISBN 978-1-4985-9215-4.

From Pushkin's "God Grant that I Not Lose My Mind" to Ulitskaya's *The Kukotsky Case*, the experiences of illness and medical care are core explorations for nearly every major Russian writer. Late-Imperial and Soviet Russia have rich medical histories distinguished by *zemstvo* medicine, Pavlov's and Bekhterev's work on conditioned reflexes, and Soviet vaccination, sanatoria, and universal free health care, among other innovations. Writers trained in medicine and the health sciences—Chekhov, Veresaev, Bulgakov, Ulitskaya, to name a few—rank among the most powerful and most human voices of world literature. It makes sense, then, that Russia would have a medical humanities, as *The Russian Medical Humanities* pronounces in its title. The editors of this groundbreaking volume flesh out what that means, practicing with the other authors of the book the broad array of methodologies and approaches of the medical humanities in the context of Russian literature and history.