

---

## Dolokhov as Romantic Parody: Ambiguity and Incongruity in Tolstoy's Pre-Byronic Hero

Donna Oliver

Beloit College

---

The tendency of nineteenth-century Russian writers to parody the themes of romantic literature and the behaviour of its heroes was a well-established practice by the time Tolstoy began to write his decidedly unromantic pieces. The dark heroes of Russian Byronism—Pushkin's Aleko, for example, or the reckless daredevils of Marlinsky—had proved to be sterile and irrelevant to the concerns of writers intent on depicting Russian reality and engaging the social questions facing contemporary Russia. As a result, the proliferation of romantic types in Russian literature was accompanied, as Diakova and Vacuro have observed, by self-conscious ridicule on the part of their creators: "Byronic heroes seemed to grow like mushrooms, and in due time became the object of parody and disdain" (157). The development of realism further promoted parodic portrayals of the type, as would-be Byronic heroes affecting literary behaviour began to appear in society,<sup>1</sup> and that social phenomenon was then transferred back to literature. Yuri Lotman explains this relationship between literary influences and societal behaviour in early nineteenth-century Russia:

The fact that the hero of romantic literature was a contemporary substantially helped the reader to approach the text as a program for his own behavior. The heroes of Byron, Marlinskii, Lermontov, and Pushkin in his romantic period generated an entire phalanx of imitators among young officers and officials, who aped the gestures, facial expressions, and manners of literary characters. If the realistic text imitates reality, in the case of roman-

ticism reality rushed to imitate literature. With realism, it is characteristic for a type of behavior to arise first in real life and then appear on the pages of the literary text. . . . In the romantic work, the new type of human behavior is conceived in the pages of the text and then transferred to life. ("Decembrists" 112)

The complex parodic layering that characterizes the most "mature" Russian Byronic works, including *Eugene Onegin* and *Hero of Our Time*, came about in large part as readers of romantic literature became the subject matter of realistic texts. According to Lotman, this reflection of social phenomena by realistic texts helps impose order and coherence on society by providing categories of behaviour: realistic texts "give a name to patterns of behaviour that are present as spontaneous and unconscious elements of a particular social fabric, and in so doing they bring these elements to the level of the social and conscious" ("Concerning Khlestakov" 186). Realistic literature plays a role then not only in reflecting social types, but also in defining and creating them. The social phenomenon described no longer exists merely in the text, but "now appears on an altogether new level, in the category of culturally recognized forms of behavior" (186). As a result, characters in realistic texts appear "twice encoded," functioning as both real persons and cultural types of their own choosing:

In depicting typified forms, a realistic work treats material which has already undergone a certain amount of cultural processing beyond the limits of an artistic text. The man who stands beyond the text has already selected a cultural role for himself; he has placed his own individual conduct in some category of social role. Introduced into the world of an artistic text, he emerges twice encoded. . . . The realistic text is, in theory, oriented to the situation of "a representation within a representation." (186-187)

The Byronism of Eugene Onegin, for example, originates in his self-conscious appropriation of behaviour from a romantic literary model, yet Pushkin places him into a realistic text; thus, he emerges "twice-encoded": he is both a disaffected Byronic cynic and an ordinary young Russian man-about-town. According to Lotman, "the orientation

to a double semiotic coding" is a "fundamental feature" of realistic texts (187).

Tolstoy's early works, with their apparent anti-romantic orientation and parodic portrayals of would-be romantic heroes, certainly confirm Lotman's observations. In *The Cossacks*, for example, he parodies the romantic notion of alienation and the idea that disaffected young Russian men could find a place for themselves in distant lands and among exotic peoples. But his hero Olenin is decidedly *not* a romantic character. When he questions his self-perceived inability to love in the novel's opening ("Am I really a moral freak?" [Неужели я нравственный урод?] [6: 9]), for example, Olenin merely echoes the words of another Caucasian exile, Pechorin, who uses similar words to describe himself and his inability to love to Princess Mary: "I became a moral cripple" ["Я сделался нравственным калекой"] (5: 273). The fantasies Olenin indulges in while travelling to the Caucasus—of mountains and ravines, of dangers and glory, of killing mountain tribesmen or becoming a tribesman himself—similarly betray his predilection for romantic literary themes. The handsome officer Rozenkrants, in "The Raid," dressed like a Tatar and attempting to speak to the Tatars attached to his regiment in a version of the Tatar language that apparently only he understands, serves as another portrait of a man who takes cues for his behaviour from the romantic heroes he has read about: "He was one of our young officers—daredevils, Dzhigits—who modelled themselves on Marlinsky and Lermontov. These men look at the Caucasus solely through the prism of the heroes of our time, of Mulla-Nur, and so on, and in all their actions they are guided not by their own inclinations, but by the example of these models" (*PSS* 3: 22). Rozenkrants's conviction that "feelings of hatred, vengeance, and contempt for the human race were the highest poetic feelings" (*PSS* 3: 22) is similarly generated not from his own beliefs, but instead in response to the Byronic mandate. As a result of their romantic role-playing, Olenin and Rozenkrants appear in the text "twice encoded": they are realistic social types who affect the romantic views and behaviour patterns found in the literature popular at the time.

Tolstoy's tendency to parody such types, as Carol Anschuetz has shown (405n), resulted in his classification by contemporary critics as anti-romantic. Boris Eikhenbaum, in his influential work on Tolstoy, further confirmed that perspective, by painting a picture of the artist's anti-romanticism in absolute terms, proclaiming him "the liquidator of Romantic poetics and the destroyer of established canons," who "[f]rom the very beginning ... was conscious of himself against a background of disintegrating romantic art" ("Crises" 52). Eikhenbaum clearly had such characters in mind when he asserted that the object of Tolstoy's engagement with romantic subject matter was parody, in particular in respect to the image of the Byronic hero, which, for Eikhenbaum, was synonymous with the notion of the romantic hero (Anschuetz 402n). As a result of this "battle with romantic clichés," Eikhenbaum maintains, "[t]he image of the Romantic daredevil in Marlinsky's and Lermontov's manner is lowered and parodied" in the works of Tolstoy (Eikhenbaum 1961: 52).

Readers of Tolstoy are accustomed to think that the writer accomplished his destruction of "Romantic poetics" in his early works, before his "departure into 'domesticity,'" as Eikhenbaum describes his behaviour after the harsh reviews of *The Cossacks* (*Sixties* 90). Yet the historical era and events depicted in *War and Peace* require an engagement on Tolstoy's part with at least some themes of romanticism—the Napoleonic image of the man of will, for example, or the potential for glory in battle, or the romantic appeal of reckless daring. Indeed, the "image of the Romantic daredevil" mentioned by Eikhenbaum makes an appearance in *War and Peace* in the figure of Dolokhov, the bold and reckless army officer whose penchant for intrigue brings grief into the lives of Pierre, Nikolai, Natasha, and others. From his first appearance in the novel, drinking a bottle of rum while balancing on a windowsill, to his last scene casually whipping his boot while herding the doomed French soldiers into their prison, Dolokhov captures the reader's attention with his daring and strength of will, his ruthlessness and cruelty.

Although Dolokhov's origins have been traced to certain historical figures,<sup>2</sup> it is clear that literary

antecedents also play an important part in his construction. In both his physical appearance and behaviour, Dolokhov shares many of the typical characteristics of the romantic Byronic hero: from his handsome face with its cold blue eyes, his "mocking smile" and "insolent" look, to his cruel and destructive nature, he serves as a worthy successor (or predecessor, in terms of narrative time) of Russian literature's Byronic heroes, from Eugene Onegin to Silvio to Pechorin.<sup>3</sup> Like those models, Dolokhov is driven by egoism and a passion for self-assertion; he is a destructive misfit in a society that has no place for him. It is no accident that Dolokhov was initially perceived as the hero of the novel by some of Tolstoy's early readers<sup>4</sup>: even in 1864, he remained a familiar type from Russia's literary past.

But Dolokhov is obviously not the hero of the novel, and this fact in itself becomes important. Like Pushkin and Lermontov, Tolstoy effectively undercuts the traditional appeal of such a character by exposing the senselessness of his destructive nature and adolescent behaviour and revealing the prosaic reality that frequently serves as an incongruous background or context for his actions. Dolokhov is a ferocious duelist who loses to a man who has never held a gun before; he is a dashing rake who cannot win the love of a simple, unsophisticated girl; he is a proud loner with a doting mother and hunchbacked sister. As a result, the impression Dolokhov produces is ambiguous: his striking acts of bravery and daring, of ruthlessness and insolence, are juxtaposed with equally striking yet incongruous moments of failure and sentimentality, of affectation and immaturity.

This ambiguity and incongruity in the depiction of Dolokhov serve as fodder for a parodic portrayal, but Tolstoy's placement of his Byronic hero anachronistically in the Napoleonic era complicates a straightforward reading of the character as such.<sup>5</sup> Unlike Eugene Onegin, Dolokhov cannot take his cues for behaviour from Byronic texts, because he predates those texts. Yet Tolstoy's depiction of Dolokhov relies heavily on the borrowed character traits of the Russian Byronic type. Thus, the "double semiotic coding" fundamental to characters in realistic texts occurs in Dolokhov in reverse:

he is a man of the Alexandrine era reflecting the behaviour and character traits of the men who populate the literature of the later romantic period. More important, however, in transplanting the Russian Byronic type into a "pre-Byronic" setting, Tolstoy suggests that the type *precedes* the appearance of Byronism and thus is not a reflection of Western romanticism, but instead a peculiarly Russian social phenomenon, an organic national type, originating in the social, political, and cultural reality of the time.<sup>6</sup> As a result, Tolstoy offers through Dolokhov a different source for the later behaviour of Eugene Onegin, Pechorin, and the other heroes of Russian romanticism—not Byronism, but Dolokhovism.<sup>7</sup> Following Lotman's proposition, Tolstoy's realistic text "give[s] a name" to this particular "pattern[] of behaviour" in the Alexandrine era.

Though Tolstoy asserts the Russian origins of Dolokhov as a type, he nonetheless ends up condemning on moral grounds (and following the lead of Pushkin and Lermontov) the cruelty and sterility that characterize that type and its literary descendants. Dolokhovism, like its successor, Russian Byronism, produces men who are self-absorbed, indulging in irresponsible self-assertion, leading lives of impulsive intensity, and seeking satisfaction through acts of reckless daring, carousing, and physical conflict. The literary representations of the Russian Byronic type are, consequently, formulaic and static, and their romantic appeal counts on a distancing between their actions and the reader's reality. Byronic parodies, however, function in realistic texts, where the complexity of life reveals inconsistencies and incongruities in the formula and forces readers to reevaluate the traditional appeal of such characters in the context of a more prosaic reality. Tolstoy counts on his readers to take a similar critical approach in their response to Dolokhov. Cloaked in the borrowed traits of Russian Byronism and relegated to the periphery of the action, Dolokhov is locked in a static role, engaging in behaviour that is both striking in its dramatic impact and sterile in its moral foundation.

Despite his potential for rich analysis, Dolokhov has received relatively little attention in the critical literature on *War and Peace*. In many

Soviet-era Russian critical studies he is depicted as a dynamic character, who ultimately gains the reader's (and Tolstoy's) sympathy by responding positively and decisively to the national imperative of 1812. His final scenes especially—asking forgiveness from Pierre before the battle of Borodino, making the daring visit incognito to the enemy camp, and leading the raid to free the Russian prisoners—are cited as evidence of his courage and patriotic zeal. Predictably, the faults he displays earlier in the novel are explained as products of a flawed class system and bourgeois society (Ermilov 47; Saburov 120). But in 1812, his strengths, until then wasted in vain, find a positive outlet, and his personal enmity for Pierre is washed away in the face of the heroic feat demanded by the motherland (Ermilov 47; Saburov 397). Dolokhov is thus transformed through his involvement in the defence of the motherland from a reckless, idle youth into a "national hero" [народный герой] (Saburov 84) and still later, during the raid, into a "national avenger for the nation" [народный мститель] (232).<sup>8</sup> Clearly, such interpretations simplify Dolokhov's role for ideological purposes and ignore the compelling evidence of his essentially static nature.<sup>9</sup>

Among Western critics of *War and Peace*, John Bayley has given the most attention to analyzing Dolokhov's role, yet he does so primarily in order to demonstrate how out of place he is among the tamer denizens of Tolstoy's world. Bayley calls him "an extreme character, who would be at home in Dostoevsky" (109), and concludes that he is ultimately "a failure" (117). Bayley suggests that Tolstoy had trouble with Dolokhov as a type, that he was uncomfortable with him because he did not understand him (111), which is why, in Bayley's view, so many of the scenes in which Dolokhov appears are unnatural and contrived. But Bayley's argument fails to take into consideration that Dolokhov's unnaturalness is in fact the point and that he is out of place not because he represents some kind of aesthetic failure, but rather because he functions as a parody of a formulaic type from a different literary tradition.

Tolstoy's ambiguous portrait of Dolokhov emerges in part as a result of his habitual narrative

device of repetition. Dmitri Merezhkovsky has noted that Tolstoy had a gift of "insight into the body" (57), which is manifested in his repeated references to certain physical gestures and traits of his characters. This repetition creates a visual image for the reader of the most striking and, therefore, in some way defining feature of a character. R. F. Christian has described such references as "an outward and visible sign which recurs critically and is the permanent property of that character" (148). He goes on to suggest that such repetition "is a combination of the assertion of a permanent, individualizing feature with the expression of a moral judgment" (149). Bayley has suggested that Tolstoy's emphasis on a peculiarity of a character's physical appearance "generally impl[ies] his hostility" (113). According to Natasha Sankovitch, "[t]hese details often become synecdoches for characters' entire moral, intellectual, or physical being" ("Readers" 52).

Tolstoy uses this same device to create a definite visual image of Dolokhov, but rather than identifying a peculiar physical trait that marks him as an individual, as he does with Lise's short, downy lip or Vronsky's compact teeth, he chooses instead a set of traits that not only belong to Dolokhov but also correspond to a particular character type, in this case, a Byronic one. In virtually every scene in which he appears, Dolokhov's eyes receive special mention: there are more than ten references to his "light blue eyes" [светлые, голубые глаза] and six other references to his "gaze" [взгляд]. The word "brazen" [наглый] is used five times to describe Dolokhov (often in conjunction with references to his eyes or look), "cruel or cruelty" [жестокий/жестокость] is used five times, "coldly, cold" [холодно/холодный] is used eight times, and he is described in terms of his smile, grin, or laugh [улыбка, улыбаться, засмеяться, смех, усмехнуться, усмешка] no fewer than twenty times. Dolokhov's physical image is romantic, both explicitly and implicitly: the "light, blue eyes" (which on one occasion are described as "glassy" or "glass-like" [стеклянный]) convey coldness and inscrutability, while his mouth, with its sides perpetually curving upward into a "mocking smile," conveys cruelty and malice. Although

this set of physical traits does indeed paint a vivid portrait of Dolokhov, it also resonates in the reader's imagination with other descriptions of a character type in existence long before Tolstoy began his epic novel: the Byronic hero.<sup>10</sup>

Tolstoy's use of repetition, however, is not simply a device for reminding the reader who is who throughout his novels. As Sankovitch has argued, the perspectives of other characters play a crucial role in the use of these "epithets," and their meaning relies on the context in which they are used (*Creating* 58). Thus, Lise's lip can make her face charming in the eyes of society and squirrel-like for Andrey when they argue. The "moral judgment" that Christian identifies in such incidents of repetition is less absolute in Sankovitch's view, because different characters have different responses to those "individualizing feature[s]" Tolstoy employs. Yet readers' responses to such features are equally significant, because their perspectives play a similarly critical part in the construction of Tolstoy's characters:

Tolstoy knew from his own experience as a reader that the images that take shape in the imagination during reading are colored by memories or associations called up by the words on the page.... To the extent that a reader's sense of the text as a whole is built upon a construct of these images colored by memory, the reader's individual experience, which includes knowledge of the conventions of reading and literary traditions, is crucial to an understanding and interpretation of the text.... ("Readers" 55)

Readers of *War and Peace*, familiar with "the conventions of reading and literary traditions," should recognize in Dolokhov traits of the Byronic type. At the same time, readers have already been conditioned by Russian literary tradition to distrust that type and to question the absolutes of his portrayal. Tolstoy relies on his readers to make this crucial connection between recognition and distrust in their apprehension of Dolokhov.

Sankovitch's observations on Tolstoy's use of repetition are especially helpful then in framing a discussion of Dolokhov, because the "irony of perspectives" (*Creating* 58) she describes often

occurs between the reader's perception of Dolokhov—tempered by this distrust—and the romantic perceptions of other characters, who often control the narration. These characters help through their perspectives to construct in Dolokhov a romantic hero of the Byronic type. The reader's task is to deromanticize Dolokhov, to apprehend him and his actions in a non-romantic, prosaic world. Tolstoy encourages the reader to consider Dolokhov more carefully by creating a pattern of incongruity, in which the romantic images constructed by the perspectives of the characters he encounters are undercut by an incongruous context or by other, "neutralizing" characters, whose function is to deflate the romantic fiction. This awareness of a fuller context and of the incongruity and ambiguity surrounding his depiction allows the reader to participate in the construction not of a Byronic hero, but rather of a parody of such heroes.

Dolokhov's initial portrait in *War and Peace*, which contains the whole complex of words and physical traits continually associated with him throughout the novel, invites the reader to apprehend him in a romantic light:

Dolokhov was a man of medium height, curly-headed and with light blue eyes. He was about twenty-five. Like all infantry officers, he did not have a moustache, and his mouth, the most striking feature of his face, was completely visible. The lines of this mouth were curved in a remarkably fine way. In the middle, the upper lip met the firm lower one forcefully in a sharp wedge, and something akin to two smiles, each with its own side formed constantly in the corners of his mouth. All of this together, and especially in combination with his hard, insolent, intelligent look, created such an impression that it was impossible not to notice this face. (*PSS* 9: 39)

Dolokhov is remarkable in the literal sense of the word, and he commands attention both from other characters and from readers. His stunt on the window-sill, of course, in and of itself attracts attention, but his manner and appearance—as this passage makes clear—are equally striking.

Tolstoy's early readers immediately paid attention to Dolokhov, and even Western responses to

the novel found the character intriguing: the review of *War and Peace* in an 1886 edition of *Literary World* mentions the memorable picture of “[t]he brutal bully Dolokhov balanced on the lofty window-sill drinking off a bottle of rum for a trivial wager...” (Wasiolek 72). Yet, as this reviewer makes clear, it is the senselessness of the action that heightens the excitement, that makes the scene (and character) memorable. For Tolstoy, however, senselessness, coupled with irresponsibility, produces ethically indefensible behaviour, and he counts on his readers, proficient in the lessons of Russian Byronism, to recognize the ambiguous nature of such acts of bravado. When a drunken Pierre decides to try his luck on the window-sill, Dolokhov, with his perpetual smile, says “Let him, let him” (942), in much the same way that Pechorin in “The Fatalist” encourages Vulich to risk his life by taking his bet. It is this same cruelty that prompts Dolokhov, assisted by Pierre and Anatole, to tie a policeman to a bear and throw him in the Moika Canal. His complete indifference toward the victim is indeed striking, but even more significant is the adolescent aggressiveness and irresponsibility that drive this tendency. Dolokhov’s need to control and dominate those around him is evident in this action, and it is explained later in the novel in a way that is similarly reminiscent of Pechorin and his parasitic nature: “[T]he very process of governing another’s will was a pleasure, a habit, and a necessity for Dolokhov” (PSS 10: 333-34).

Though Dolokhov’s behaviour here resonates with that of his literary model, it is also consistent, as Lotman points out, with the type of carousing that did occur in the Alexandrine era. According to Lotman, such carousing was viewed “as a variant of free thinking,” reflecting “a kind of everyday romanticism characterized by the tendency to act in an absolutely impetuous manner that swept away all restrictions on behavior” (“Decembrists” 125). He cites the “passion to be first” as “central to this kind of ‘revelry’” (126), and makes an explicit connection in his discussion of this behaviour with the actions of Dolokhov: “The value of the unconstrained act lies in *crossing a line* no one has yet crossed. Tolstoy captured this very perceptively in his description of the drinking bouts of Pierre and

Dolokhov” (127). But Tolstoy’s depiction of these bouts is not without moral judgment. It is no accident that his hero, Pierre, outgrows this kind of behaviour, while his parodic misfit, Dolokhov, remains locked in this role, unable or unwilling to abandon the “everyday romanticism” that gave free reign to impulses and promoted thoughtless self-assertion with disregard for the consequences of one’s actions.

As a soldier demoted in the ranks—a standard requirement for the alienated Russian romantic hero whose past plagues his present<sup>11</sup>—Dolokhov is again depicted as a remarkable figure who commands attention. He sticks out in the crowd at Braunau because of his blue coat and later his bent knee spoils the uniformity of the row.<sup>12</sup> When ordered by the regimental commander to straighten his leg, he does so slowly, looking at the general with his customary insolent gaze. His will and sheer strength of presence force the commander to curb his ire and even change his form of address from the familiar “thou” [ТЫ] to the polite “you” [ВЫ] (PSS 9: 140). In battle, Dolokhov kills without compunction or second thought, and impudently presents “trophies” from his victims to the regimental commander as proof of his bravery and daring. When brought before Kutuzov, Dolokhov looks at him just as insolently, “as if tearing down with his expression the veil of convention that placed such great distance between the head commander and the soldier” (PSS 9: 143). Yet Kutuzov’s response to Dolokhov’s vows to prove his devotion to the cause is equally significant: he turns away with a barely concealed smile, as if the bravado and excess of patriotic zeal that Dolokhov displays are tediously familiar to him.

Seven years later, on the eve of the battle of Borodino, Dolokhov employs similar clichés of heroism, asserting to Kutuzov that he is “ready to die” for the fatherland, that he would not “spare his skin,” if Kutuzov needed his services. Kutuzov, Tolstoy’s true “national hero” [народный герой], acts as a “neutralizing” force here, responding, as he had in the earlier scene, with barely concealed laughter, and replying with a noncommittal “yes, yes” [так, так] (PSS 11: 197-98).<sup>13</sup> Kutuzov’s similar response seven years later to

Dolokhov's protestations of patriotism not only reaffirms the ambiguous value of Dolokhov's heroic bravery, but also emphasizes the static nature of the type he represents.<sup>14</sup>

It is for this reason that Tolstoy keeps Dolokhov on the periphery of the action. He retains his romantic qualities, but those same qualities prevent him from acquiring real significance and participating fully in the world inhabited by Tolstoy's heroes. We are never shown Dolokhov's thoughts or feelings; we view him only from the outside, and thus he never fully engages our sympathy. A striking example of this forced estrangement from his character is found in a small scene, covering little more than a page, depicting the retreat from Austerlitz (*PSS* 9: 351-52). The only character we know in the scene is Dolokhov, and our attention thus focuses on him. With his customary power to command and reckless daring, Dolokhov convinces the retreating regiment to escape enemy bombing over the slippery ice-covered pond. His assurances that the ice will hold, coupled with the gruesome death of the regimental commander, who is knocked from his horse by a cannon ball, convince the desperate crowd to ignore the warning of the buckling ice and follow Dolokhov's example. When the ice breaks, forty men topple into the water and then proceed to drown each other in fear and desperation.

What motivates Dolokhov's behaviour in this scene? Bayley describes him here as "a demonic bell-wether leading the flock," and questions the point of the gesture: "Was it an act of bold initiative?" (175). All the reader knows, Bayley points out, is that the consequences for those who followed him "were as terrible as they were for the Frenchmen whom his final exploit rounded up" (175). Donna Orwin suggests that Dolokhov's actions here are more sinister: "There is that terrible moment at the mill pond ... when Dolokhov, in order to save his own skin and to clear a path of escape for himself across a dam, lures others ahead of him and already on the dam to their deaths out onto the thin ice of the pond" (236). In her essay on courage in Tolstoy, Orwin elaborates further on this scene and ties it to her larger thesis that true courage in Tolstoy lies in a just motivation:

What seems like an act of desperate courage on his part is a ploy, perhaps unself-conscious, to save himself at the expense of others. We cannot be sure of this, of course, because here as elsewhere we have no direct access to Dolokhov's inner life. This is appropriate, because Dolokhov, having never critically examined himself let alone acknowledged his own mortality, does not connect with others. (228)

Clearly, this small scene raises more questions than it answers: Was Dolokhov truly trying to help his compatriots? Was he seeking heroism by trying to save them? Or was he, as Orwin suggests, trying to save himself by getting rid of those in his way? This scene is shocking and the deaths that ensue are tragic; the reader naturally looks for some response from its initiator, but Dolokhov is gone. Tolstoy allows him to escape both physically and morally: as Orwin observes, the reader has no place inside Dolokhov's thoughts; his reflections on his role in this incident—whatever they may be—are not for us to share.

As a result of scenes like these, the reader's response to Dolokhov becomes more ambiguous as the novel progresses. The romantic images that initially are so striking emerge more clearly as the product of other characters' perspectives. At the banquet for Bagration, for example, it is Pierre who perceives Dolokhov in a romantic light: he sees the insolent, cruel eyes and the mouth with its perpetual smile directed at himself, and he responds accordingly, with fear and dread:

He recalled the expression that Dolokhov's face took on when he was visited by moments of cruelty.... "Yes, he's a duelist," thought Pierre, "to kill a man means nothing to him. It has to appear to him that everyone is afraid of him; he probably finds this pleasant. He probably thinks that I too am afraid of him. And, really, I am afraid of him." (*PSS* 10: 21)

Dolokhov is worthy of Pierre's fear, yet that fear fails to dominate the narrative for long. In her study of the duel as a solution for conflict in nineteenth-century Russia, Irina Reyfman argues that one of reasons why dueling achieved such

prominence in Russia is that it provided "a means of promoting equality" in an otherwise hierarchical society (11). In the case of Dolokhov, then, the capricious cruelty and ruthlessness of this particular Russian Byronic hero might in fact be a type of class-based resentment: Dolokhov employs the duel as a way for him to assert his right to stand as an equal next to Pierre, his former benefactor, by engaging in an act of "equalizing violence" (11). But it is also significant, as Gary Saul Morson points out, that Pierre becomes convinced of his wife's guilt only when he challenges Dolokhov to the duel (224). In other words, Dolokhov's primary role in this incident is to serve as a catalyst for Pierre to confront what he already knows. Though Pierre is caught in what Reyfman describes as the "spellbinding effect" of the duel (30), the fact that he spends the day before the duel preoccupied with the thought of Dolokhov's innocence and his wife's guilt serves to undercut further any notion that Dolokhov is in control of the situation: his attempt to use the duel as an assertion of his superiority over his former patron instead merely becomes a pretext within the narrative for Pierre to achieve greater self-awareness and hence grow morally.

Dolokhov's words of wisdom to Nikolai about the way one must approach a duel confirm his status as a seasoned duelist and smack of the ruthless romanticism of earlier Russian Byronic heroes. Both their tone and content are familiar to the reader:

"I'll tell you in two words the whole secret of dueling. If you go to a duel after writing a will and tender letters to your parents, and if you think that you might be killed, you're a fool and probably will fall; but if you go with a firm intention of killing him, as quickly and as certainly as possible, then everything will be all right." (PSS10: 23)

Yet everything does not turn out right for Dolokhov, who fails despite his "firm intention of killing" his opponent. Reyfman cites Pierre and Dolokhov as a rare example of "impeccable duelists" (4), noting the abundance of irregular duels in Russian literature—"the ones that in one way or another deviate from what is generally perceived as the norm of dueling behavior. The overwhelming

majority of famous fictional duelists violate the rules in significant—and often not quite noble—ways" (3). Though Pierre and Dolokhov might follow the rules "impeccably," the actual outcome results in apparent violations of the dueling norm, at least in respect to the reader's expectations, which call for the success of the romantic daredevil.

The duel begins with a description of the Dolokhov the reader has come to expect: "Dolokhov walked slowly, not raising the pistol, looking into his opponent's face with his glittering, light blue eyes. His mouth, as always, had on it the semblance of a smile" (PSS 10: 25). The vivid image of the wounded Dolokhov—on his knees, with his bloodied hand clutching his side and his pale face trembling, biting the snow, and taking his shot with glittering eyes—is a romantic one, yet the reader should recall the incongruous context that underlies this scene. Although Dolokhov is repeatedly referred to as a ferocious duelist (бpеpеp) Pierre has never held a gun before in his life. When Dolokhov gathers his remaining strength to take that final shot, Pierre is standing only ten paces away and, instead of heeding the advice of his seconds and covering his side, he stands facing forward, with his legs and feet apart, his broad chest submissively exposed to Dolokhov's experienced marksmanship. Thus Tolstoy is not content simply to have Dolokhov miss Pierre; he has him fail miserably, effectively rendering him a parody of the man he envisions himself to be.<sup>15</sup>

The scenes that follow establish a similar pattern of incongruity between Dolokhov's perceived image and a context that does not correspond. Nikolai, who is taken in by his new friend's romantic daring, is surprised when the wounded Dolokhov begs him with an "ecstatically tender expression" on his face and a catch in his voice to ride ahead and prepare his mother, "his adored angel," and then proceeds to break into tears. Although Rostov's response is limited to surprise, the reader cannot help but note the irony in this unexpected divergence from the romantic formula, especially in light of Tolstoy's typically flat delivery of this piece of news: "Rostov rode ahead to fulfill the mission and to his great surprise learned that



Dolokhov, this ruffian and rabid duelist, lived in Moscow with his elderly mother and hunchbacked sister and was the most tender son and brother" (PSS 10: 27). The ironic contradiction between the romantic image of Dolokhov as the ruthless outsider and the prosaic, if not sentimental, reality of his family circumstances creates for the reader in this passage a quite different impression of Tolstoy's repeated use of the words "ruffian" [буян] and "duelist" [бперѣр]. Tolstoy's realism removes the romantic cloak and discloses the reality that most certainly must lie beneath: that is, that even romantic heroes have mothers, and that even they play traditional life roles; they are not only ruffian and duelist, but also son and brother.<sup>16</sup>

The pattern of incongruity continues as Dolokhov, the dashing rake, unsuccessfully pursues the thoroughly domestic Sonia, who is prosaically in love with her cousin. The Pechorinesque confession Dolokhov makes to Nikolai during his convalescence, full of Byronic misogyny and alienation, sets the stage for a romantic conquest and regenerating love:

"People consider me evil. Let them. I don't care about anyone except those whom I love; but for those whom I love, I would give my life, and I will crush all the rest who stand in my way. I have an adored, priceless mother, two or three friends, you included, and to the rest I pay attention only insofar as they are useful or harmful. And most of them are harmful, especially women. . . . I have met loving, noble, high-minded men; but I have yet to meet a woman, countess or cook, it's all the same, who isn't venal. I have not yet met that divine purity and devotion, which I seek in a woman. If I were to find such a woman, I would give my life for her. . . . And believe me or not, if I still value life, then I value it only because I still hope to meet such a divine being who would regenerate, purify, and elevate me." (PSS 10: 42-43)

It is wholly appropriate for Nikolai, who has not yet learned the lessons of Russian Byronism, to be taken in by this romantic confession, but Tolstoy's reader should not be. The reader is familiar with such sentiments—the tragedy of the alienated and misunderstood soul, loyal only to those worthy of

him, and disdainful of all others—and should regard them with suspicion.<sup>17</sup> When those *literary* sentiments collide with the more ordinary sentiments of everyday life, Dolokhov again crosses over into parody. The expected romantic conquest does not take place, because in Tolstoy's world romantic heroes do not always succeed in their attempts to conquer the female heart. Tolstoy presents here an alternative reality to the romantic formula which demands that women are irresistibly attracted to the Byronic type, and his alternative is actually a much more plausible one: the pure and loyal girl of Dolokhov's dreams would in all likelihood not want the romantic scoundrel.<sup>18</sup> Like the bungled duel, Dolokhov's inability to win Sonia's love results in another failed cliché of the romantic hero.

At his farewell dinner, Dolokhov's romantic image reasserts itself, and he appears almost diabolical to his former protégé, Nikolai, who now becomes his victim. Nikolai's role in the construction of this perspective of Dolokhov is significant, but the reader nonetheless shares his incomprehension of Dolokhov's senseless cruelty. Like Pierre at the banquet, Nikolai recalls Dolokhov's ruthlessness and spite, and is duly frightened to see that the familiar cold smile, clear eyes, and merciless look are now turned on him: "Behind his smile Rostov saw that he was in the same kind of mood he was in during the dinner at the club and, in general, at those times when, seemingly bored with everyday life, Dolokhov felt the need to get out of it through some strange and largely cruel action" (PSS 10: 51). This response is of course typical of the Russian Byronic hero: in both Onegin and Pechorin, for example, boredom leads to destructiveness, and Dolokhov's behaviour in this scene—commanding attention, pursuing his goal coldly, ruthlessly and cruelly setting out to destroy Nikolai—certainly smacks of Byronism. Yet Tolstoy deliberately disengages the reader's perception of Dolokhov from Nikolai's when he steps in to reveal a more precise motive on Dolokhov's part: namely, to win from Nikolai the sum of forty-three thousand rubles, a number he has arrived at because it represents the combined total of Sonia's and his ages. In one prejudicial stroke, Tolstoy tempers Dolokhov's

terrible image by this quite romantic and at the same time quite silly "fateful number" [роковое число] (PSS 10: 55).

Nikolai's incomprehension of Dolokhov's motives and his failure to suspect him of cheating in this episode—despite his perception of him in a romantic light—stems from both his youth and his aristocratic handicap of believing unquestioningly that others abide by a code of honour in the same way that he does. Ian Helfant, in his book on gambling in nineteenth-century Russian literature and society, makes an excellent observation in this regard:

Nikolai's ruminations, which absolve both himself and Dolokhov of guilt, reflect not only his youthful naiveté but also Tolstoy's attempt to represent a worldview that played a significant role in the nobility's financial decline during the century. Nikolai seems incapable both of attributing his opponent's winning streak to cheating and of realizing that Dolokhov is willing to ruin him, despite Dolokhov's hints on both counts. (121)

Helfant, like Reyfman, takes a sociological approach in his study, and suggests that gamblers and *bretteurs* like Dolokhov were particularly adept at manipulating their "adversaries in a cold-blooded and cynical manner that reflects a connoisseur's knowledge of the social codes that underlay gambling and dueling behaviors." Nikolai's "obedience to convention" makes him especially vulnerable then to Dolokhov's schemes (84).

The effect of this incident on Nikolai, nonetheless, is a moral one: it is no accident that Tolstoy has Nikolai think about his home and family and how much they mean to him while he is staring at Dolokhov's broad, reddish hands deftly dealing the cards and sealing his fate: "At that moment his home life—jokes with Petya, talks with Sonia, duets with Natasha, piquet with his father, and even his comfortable bed in the house on Povarsky—presented itself to him with such force, clarity, and charm, as if it all was part of a happiness long gone, lost, and unvalued" (PSS 10: 53). Nikolai does not belong in Dolokhov's world, and his recollections of what Morson calls "the rituals of prosaic everyday family life" (128) confirm the

value Tolstoy places on the ability to reflect critically on one's actions. Nikolai emerges from this episode chastened, but wiser, and his ability to grow as a result of this experience stands in vivid contrast to the static, unchanging Dolokhov.

Dolokhov's potential for parody—revealed until now in such moments of incongruity and failed clichés—is fully realized in the opera scene and the subsequent attempt to abduct Natasha. Dolokhov reappears in the novel at opera with his curly hair combed up into an enormous shock, dressed in Persian costume, and attracting the attention of the whole concert hall. He is fawned over by the brilliant youth of Moscow, and drives the local ladies mad. Shinshin tells the Count Rostov that Dolokhov had been in the Caucasus, and had served as a minister to a ruling prince in Persia, where he had killed the brother of the Shah. Through these new adventures Dolokhov has fulfilled the obligatory Byronic requirements for a crime on the conscience and exotic adventures. Moreover, his Persian dress is wholly in keeping with the practice of the alienated, romantic young men of the time who sought a different identity in the cultures of exotic peoples.

But what we hear about Dolokhov in this scene is filtered through the lens of Shinshin, who, like Kutuzov, acts as a "neutralizing" character, relating Dolokhov's adventures with unconcealed irony and commenting rather wearily on his ubiquity in Moscow society. He tells us that it is not merely Dolokhov whose name is on the tip of everyone's tongue, but rather *Dolochoffle Persan*, an appellation which may convey more exoticism, but which in actuality places him clearly in the society in which he belongs. Tolstoy creates here a cultural hybrid, a Frenchified Russian masquerading as a Persian prince. There is no mistaking the irony that Dolokhov's role-playing in another culture can only be described in the language of the foreign culture that really dominated Russian society of that time. And finally, Dolokhov's showing off at the theatre, his deliberate attempts to attract attention, and his clear dominance over the young men in his crowd prove him to be anything but alienated. What is more important, however, is that his adventures and the whole new set of life experi-

ences and ethical challenges that accompanied them produced no *essential* change in Dolokhov, no growth beyond a new hair style and exotic wardrobe.

Dolokhov's failure to execute yet another typically romantic plot line—the abduction of a virginal, virtuous girl for dubious purposes—further deflates his romantic image. The plan for Anatole's elopement with Natasha is hatched in Dolokhov's study, covered in true romantic fashion from floor to ceiling with Persian carpets, bear skins, and weapons. Though it is Anatole who hopes to abduct Natasha, it is Dolokhov who plays the role of romantic intriguer in this episode: it is he who makes the arrangements and carries out the plan, and it is he who writes the love letter to Natasha, lending Anatole, who is stupid and unimaginative, his romantic nature. Dolokhov includes the standard trite expressions required by the genre ("My fate is decided—to be loved by you or to die. There is no other way out for me" [*PSS* 10: 343]), and follows up with the promise that their love will conquer all as they escape to the ends of the earth. Dolokhov repeats familiar phrases—in Tolstoy's time—from a worn-out genre, much in the same way another parody of the romantic hero, Pushkin's Hermann, borrows his romantic nature in his love-letters to Lizaveta from a German novel.<sup>19</sup> Later in the episode, however, Dolokhov's romanticism is replaced by a quite prosaic practicality: he advises Anatole to drop the whole affair, pointing out that it is stupid and dangerous, that it will have complex consequences. And it is the practical-minded Dolokhov who reminds Anatole, who can only think of his passion, to take a fur coat for Natasha and even demonstrates how he should wrap her in it. Both Feuer (60) and Zaidenshnur (84-85) note that Dolokhov, motivated by a desire for revenge against the Rostovs, originally played a much more pivotal role in the abduction in earlier drafts of the novel. It is significant that in the final draft, Tolstoy abandoned Dolokhov's more dramatic, actively evil role in favour of a more ambivalent, more practical, and hence less romantic one.

In his final scenes in the novel, Dolokhov is re-romanticized, as he becomes the hero of the

sixteen-year-old Petya Rostov, who has heard tales about "his extraordinary bravery and cruelty with the French" (*PSS* 12: 139). Dolokhov does indeed display reckless daring in his visit to the enemy camp, and his successful deception of the French deepens Petya's boyish infatuation: "You are such a hero! . . . How I love you!" (*PSS* 12: 144).<sup>20</sup> Dolokhov tolerates this adoration, indulgently accepting Petya's kiss. Then, in true romantic fashion, he laughs, turns his horse around, and disappears into the darkness, sealing the powerful impression he makes on his sixteen-year-old admirer. When that boy is killed in battle, after foolishly riding ahead with no thought of danger, in the manner of his new hero, Tolstoy reminds his reader with stunning force that romantic actions have real consequences.<sup>21</sup> He juxtaposes Dolokhov's crude and cold response to Petya's death "Done for" [Готов] which he repeats to Denisov "as if uttering this word gave him pleasure" (*PSS* 12: 150), with Denisov's howl of grief, and thereby condemns unambiguously the emotional detachment and sterility of his pre-Byronic type.

In his last scene, Dolokhov stands by the gate, flicking his boots with his whip, looking at the passing French prisoners with a cruel gleam in his eyes (*PSS* 12: 160). He utters the phrase he has learned from them ("*Filez, filez!*"), and silences them with his cold, ominous look. In some respects, this last view of Dolokhov is thoroughly Byronic—cruel, destructive, and ruthless. Yet Tolstoy does not undercut this final romantic picture, because he has ironically placed his character in a hideously real context. The unromantic tendency toward practicality which emerged in Dolokhov's planning of Natasha's abduction reappears in his final scene in the novel in a much more sinister light. Dolokhov reduces the problem of French prisoners of war to its simplest possible truth—taking them along results in the death of well over half, so why bother taking them? Execution is more practical, for both the Russians and the French. The man who states that he likes to "do things right" [аккуратно дело делат'] (*PSS* 12: 139) is ready, willing, and strong enough to take on the responsibility of solving this problem; Denisov, to his credit and with Tolstoy's tacit approval, cannot and will

not make that choice. For Tolstoy, the inability to take decisive action can at times be a virtue.

Tolstoy uses Dolokhov's typical response in this situation not simply to criticize the destructive nature of the type he has identified, but also, and more importantly, to explore the essential complexity of moral behaviour. Thoughtless self-assertion and senseless cruelty cripple the conscience and sterilize the spirit. Yet, as Saburov notes, Dolokhov's reasoning here is nonetheless compelling: the French soldiers will inevitably starve, and war by its very nature involves killing and dying (106). Dolokhov's moral bankruptcy, a clichéd characteristic of the type Tolstoy is parodying, stands out here as a terrifying and all-too-real consequence of the unnatural savagery of war. Saburov's argument, however, is constructed as a national one, and he asserts that Tolstoy did not disapprove of Dolokhov's behaviour in this scene (106). But a national argument does not hold here. As Christian aptly points out, "the most brutal massacre assumed to have taken place in the novel" is the responsibility not of the French, but of Dolokhov (100). Dolokhov's compulsion to kill in this scene is grounded not in patriotism, but rather in his *deliberately* brutal nature. In his notes for the novel, Tolstoy wrote the enigmatic phrase "Dolokhov's success is Napoleon's success" (Feuer 165). Tolstoy in this statement ironically accomplishes Dolokhov's alienation far more effectively than Dolokhov himself does, for all of his role-playing. Dolokhov's alienation is a moral one and stems from his absolute inward orientation, which brings him "success" in the areas that matter to him, just as a similar orientation brings "success" to Napoleon.<sup>22</sup>

Tolstoy drops Dolokhov here, granting him a romantic closing while locking him in a static existence. It is not important to learn what happens to Dolokhov, because in essence we already know: like his Byronic descendents, he remains arrested in adolescence, stunted by the sterility of the romantic formula, excluded from the natural course of growth and maturation. The ambiguity and incongruity that form the basis of Dolokhov's parodic depiction ultimately serve to reveal an unambiguous judgment by his creator. Though his anachro-

nistic placement of Dolokhov in a pre-Byronic setting suggests that the type is national in origin, Tolstoy concludes that Dolokhovism, the social phenomenon that he "names" in his realistic text, nonetheless produces the same kind of morally indefensible behaviour seen in its romantic successor, Byronism.

### Author's note

I would like to thank the two anonymous readers of a previous version of this article for their valuable suggestions. All translations from Russian into English are mine, unless otherwise noted.

### Notes

1. Bagby cites Turgenev's memoirs about the ubiquity of heroes of the Marlinsky type in the social spheres of his youth, "young men conversing in 'marlinisms'," poseurs who "appeared haughty and insolent, alternately pulling sorrowful and belligerent faces, and lived their short days and long nights, 'with storms in their souls and fire in their blood'" (1-2).

2. Both Zaidenshnur and Potapov identify A. S. Figner, hero of the 1812 war, as a main model for the character of Dolokhov. Potapov notes that Tolstoy read in Davydov's *Voennye zapiski* how Figner silenced the French prisoners with "*Filez! Filez!*" (47). Bogdanovich tells how Figner also had reportedly visited a French camp with a young lieutenant (cited in Christian 76). Zaidenshnur also cites Tolstoy's cousin Count Fedor Ivanovich Tolstoy ("the American") and R. I. Dorokhov, "a brave man and a carouser" [храблец и кутила] whom Tolstoy knew in the Caucasus (155), as historical models for Dolokhov. Saburov identifies Dolokhov as a "historically accurate" type, an example of the officers trained in the previous century under Suvorov (106). Kathryn B. Feuer also examines the origins and prototypes of Dolokhov, and her study reveals a consistent type: the "bored and cynical young man," "evil" and "mysterious" (60-61).

3. Others have remarked on Dolokhov's resemblance to Pechorin. See, for example, Saburov (106), Christian (114), Silbajoris (119). Saburov also hints at

parody: citing Dolokhov's failure in the duel and the thwarted abduction attempt, Saburov notes that "Tolstoy stands the Lermontovian hero on his knees" (339).

4. Noted in Morson 58.

5. Leontiev comments on some of the novel's anachronistic qualities. Leontiev questions how Andrei and Pierre, whose views have not been informed by all that happened in Russia in the post-Napoleonic period, can nonetheless think and speak as Tolstoy's contemporaries do: "Well, is it *plausible* that these people... should think almost in the same style, in which we think now, *we, as burdened as we can be* sometimes with all the speeches and thoughts of our predecessors, suffering all of their diseases, experiencing all of their passions...?" (120, emphasis in the original). Eikhenbaum points out a similar anachronism in Tolstoy's depiction of the Rostov family scenes in the novel, noting that they belong not to the period of 1805-1812, but rather to the 1850s and 1860s (*Sixties* 103, 195). (Leontiev, by the way, does not read Dolokhov as a parody, noting that he, along with Tsar Alexander I and Andrei Bolkonsky, is one of the only characters in the novel whom Tolstoy "for some reason" does not make fun of [21].)

6. The "Russianness" of Dolokhov's type resonates in other characters in nineteenth-century Russian literature. Gogol's Nozdrev, for example, a "carouser," "daredevil," and cardsharp, shares some of Dolokhov's traits, including his essentially stagnant nature: "Nozdrev was the same at thirty-five as he was at eighteen and twenty: a man who liked to have a good time" (V: 72-73). Dostoevsky was particularly aware of the relationship between the purely Russian type represented by Nozdrev and the borrowed image of the Byronic hero. Stepan Trofimovich in *The Possessed* describes Turgenev's Bazarov as "an unclear mixture of Nozdrev and Byron" (X: 171). Stavrogin's prototype, the Prince, is described in the notebooks for *The Possessed* as "[a] frivolous man, who does nothing but play the game of life, an elegant Nozdrev, who plays an awful lot of tricks on people, some of them noble and some dirty..." (159). Stavrogin's behaviour "off-stage" at the beginning of the novel, characterized by "wild unruliness" and "brutal conduct" (X: 36), similarly recalls both Nozdrev and the Byronic hero. Like Tolstoy in the case of Dolokhov, however, Dostoevsky suggests in his notebooks for *A Raw Youth* that his "Byronic" types are Russian in origin. He characterizes

Versilov, for example, as a "predatory type" (27), yet appropriates him as an organic, Russian phenomenon: "Simply an amoral man, a man who has failed to develop a moral principle. A purely Russian, universal type" (89).

7. Carol Anschuetz finds no evidence that Tolstoy even read Byron (424).

8. N. Dolinina's book, written for young readers, offers an interesting example of how some Soviet critics *re-romanticized* Dolokhov. She calls Dolokhov "the most incomprehensible, the most mysterious of all the heroes of *War and Peace*" (90), adding that "this lonely, angry man could have been different. He has his ideal: fine, devoted women like his mother and Sonya; strong, fearless men, who forget their petty enmity in the face of common danger like he himself before the battle of Borodino. He wants life to be fine [не-красна], but it doesn't correspond to his ideal; it is cruel and unjust. And therefore Dolokhov is also cruel and unjust" (95). Though she allows that one cannot justify Dolokhov's cruelty, she adds that thanks to those rare moments when we see his noble side—talking about his mother, loving Sonya, asking forgiveness of Pierre—we come to believe that there is hope for him to change. She also sees him as a future participant in the Decembrist revolt, refusing to give in under interrogation and remaining cold and alone in Siberian exile.

9. Contrary to these Soviet critics, who tended to depict Dolokhov as a positive hero, at least one contemporary of Tolstoy saw him differently. A. M. Skabichevsky placed Dolokhov in a group of characters "whom he [saw] as showing the final stages of complete moral degradation and who have no sympathy either for the lower classes or, what is more to the point, for their own class—people like the Kuragins, Anatole, Hélène and their father, and Dolokhov" (Knowles 56-7).

10. For formulaic descriptions of the Byronic hero, see Hauser 213-14; Mann 101; Thorslev 8.

11. In *A Hero of Our Time*, for example, Lermontov plays with this notion as part of his parodic layering in that novel: Pechorin complains that the ladies at the spa turn away in disdain when they see that he is wearing the epaulettes of a member of an ordinary field regiment, indicating that he has been demoted from the Guards. Werner also notes that Pechorin's

"history" has become the subject of gossip for the elder Princess and her society, while the younger Princess has begun, as a result of these tales, to view him as "the hero of a novel in the new style." Grushnitsky, whom Pechorin ridicules in his journal for striking romantic poses, makes repeated reference to his soldier's overcoat as a sign of his lowly status and allows Princess Mary to persist in her mistaken assumption that he has been demoted for some romantic misdeed in order to play up his romantic role.

12. Bayley has commented on Dolokhov's distinctive clothing in many of the scenes in which he appears (174).

13. Bayley notes how Dolokhov's "queer, discordant boastfulness" in this scene "arouses discomfort in those who hear him," noting that it "disconcerts Kutuzov" (175). Kutuzov, however, seems more disengaged than "disconcerted." Bayley correctly points out that Tolstoy does not admire boastful courage of the sort Dolokhov displays, because "courage itself is not a virtue to be singled out for admiration, but to be made use of discreetly, as occasion requires" (175). Potopov, in a similar vein, notes a difference between Dolokhov's bravery [храбрость] and Tushin's heroism [героизм] (278). Donna Orwin offers an alternate view, arguing that Tolstoy makes a distinction between the "romantic heroism" displayed by men like Dolokhov and the "true" courage of men like Tushin ("Courage" 222).

14. George Clay has also noted Dolokhov's static nature: "Dolokhov on parade near Braunau is the same person who downed the rum bottle nonstop on Anatole's third-floor window ledge..." (102); "Dolokhov is not going to do any growing—Dolokhov is Dolokhov, compulsively cruel, congenitally insensitive, condemned to travel one-way streets" (104).

15. Rimvydas Silbajoris calls the novel an "anti-epic" and "a parody," with Dolokhov functioning as a parody of classical heroes. According to Silbajoris, the duel scene is also parodic, because "the main action device in the classical accounts of war—the personal duel between the heroes—is trivialized in the novel to produce the bumbling Pierre, who holds a gun he doesn't know how to shoot and wounds just such a mad 'hero', Dolokhov, a fine parody of Achilles" (113).

16. Bayley, once again interpreting this episode against the backdrop of his larger argument that Dolokhov is

out of place in the novel, calls the scene in which Dolokhov tells Nikolai about his mother and sister "one of the very few moments in the book when Tolstoy seems to step outside his bounds and his creative stride falters" (109). Bayley argues that Dolokhov's tender devotion to his mother and sister smacks too much of romanticism, and hence is out of keeping with Tolstoyan realism: "He seems to be creating to order the sort of romantic Russian hero whom he elsewhere despises—the Byronic hero of Marlinsky's novels and of Lermontov—the hero whose sensibility is suddenly revealed through his armour of disdain" (110). What Bayley fails to consider, however, is that Tolstoy deliberately emphasizes the incongruity: even a static character like Dolokhov must function in life in more than just one role.

17. Bayley argues that Dolokhov's misogynistic confession to Nikolai "rings false" here because he "asserts a self-knowledge which he does not possess" (112). But what kind of self-knowledge do we see here? Dolokhov's speech is ridden with clichés and utterly lacking in any semblance of originality. In both this scene and in the scene in which Dolokhov speaks of his mother, Bayley fails to consider the possibility that Tolstoy deliberately strives for a discordant note, that the incongruity and false ring contribute to a parodic portrayal.

18. Bayley notes Dolokhov's ironic similarity to Sonya, in particular in respect to the idea of sterility: he too is "a sterile flower" (113).

19. When Dolokhov is courting Sonia, Natasha does not like him, calling him evil ("злой") and citing his unnaturalness and deliberation (*PSS* 10: 43), great sins for Tolstoy. Tolstoy heightens the irony of this later scene by having Natasha fall so completely for this totally contrived letter filled with clichés and deception.

20. Note how Dolokhov must have an excellent grasp of the French language in order to pull off this deception, yet in his opening scene of the novel he shouts out the conditions of the wager in halting French, with the narrator noting that his command of that language was "not too good" (940). Although Dolokhov's significantly improved French in the latter scene could be attributed to a mistake on Tolstoy's part in his "loose, baggy monster," it is also possible to read this improvement as a sign of Dolokhov's social advance-

ment, the only way in which he undergoes any meaningful change in the course of the novel.

21. Bayley has raised questions about Dolokhov's depiction in the raid scene, wondering if the "greenish tint" of his face might not indicate fear: "Was he a coward after all, as Don Juan was really afraid of women?" (175-6) While Bayley remains ambivalent on the question, noting that the detail "makes Dolokhov an even more enigmatic figure" (175), Orwin, following up on Bayley, is more categorical, positing that Dolokhov "holds back from fear during the partisan raid to rescue Russian prisoners" (*Art and Thought* 120). Building upon her observation that characters who "live within the parameters of [their] individual [lives] narrowly defined" meet with Tolstoy's disapproval, she argues that "Dolokhov is afraid because, unlike those who temporarily relinquish their individuality to kill and be killed, he remains preeminently himself and therefore afraid of death while making war" (120). Orwin's argument is interesting and her general assessment of Dolokhov's flaw is compelling, but the textual evidence offered us—the "greenish tint"—is insufficient to conclude that Dolokhov "holds back from fear" during the raid. Dolokhov's bravery and daring have been documented regularly and deliberately throughout the text. See, for example, the passage describing the battle of Schöngraben, when Timokhin's troops attack the French: "Dolokhov, running alongside Timokhin, in a frenzy killed a Frenchman and was the first to seize the surrendering officer by the collar" (PSS 9: 231). Dolokhov also stays in the front in this battle even after receiving a bayonet wound. See also the comments about Dolokhov made by the adjutant to Pierre at Borodino "That one's such a rogue, worming his way into everything! You know, he was demoted, and now he needs to bounce back. He's proposed some schemes and at night he's sneaked into the enemy line... but he's a brave one [*molodets*]" (PSS 11: 197) Dolokhov's visit with Petya to the enemy camp in disguise also indicates bravery. Orwin's recent essay on courage in Tolstoy questions the value of such incidents by examining the driving force behind Dolokhov's acts of bravado and daring. She places him among those characters "whose seemingly courageous behaviour is fueled by selfish and even evil intentions," and refers to him as "the most developed example in Tolstoy of egotistical courage" ("Courage" 227). According to Orwin, Dolokhov lacks "true courage," because courage can be a virtue only when "the feeling that moti-

vates the courageous man [is] 'higher' than fear of death" (226). Though he "represents the frightening combination of charisma, ferocity, and cruelty that Tolstoy observed in certain warlike men" (228), Dolokhov is motivated in his actions by self-preservation and not by that "higher" feeling that lies at the basis of "true courage." Orwin aptly notes that Dolokhov's "iron nerves" come from his failure to "get [ ] beyond the youthful sense of invincibility"; his bravery, in other words, stems in part from his immaturity, from his failure to grow up (228).

22. Lermontov's assessment of Napoleon's static nature applies to Dolokhov as well: "He was the same everywhere, cold, unchanging...." (noted in Lotman, "Decembrists" 104).

### Works cited

- Anschuetz, Carol. "The Young Tolstoy and Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality*." *The Russian Review*. 39(1980) 401-425.
- Bagby, Lewis. *Bestuzhev-Marlinsky and the Byronic Element in Russian Romantic Literature*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.
- Bayley, John. *Tolstoy and the Novel*. New York: The Viking Press, 1966.
- Christian, R. F. *Tolstoy's War and Peace: A Study*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Clay, George R. *Tolstoy's Phoenix: From Method to Meaning in "War in Peace"*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1998.
- Diakova, N., and V. Vacuro. "Byron and Russia." *Byron's Political and Cultural Influence in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Ed. Paul Graham Trueblood. London: Macmillan, 1981.
- Dolinina, N. *Po stranitsam 'Voiny i mira'*. Leningrad: "Detskaia literature", 1973.
- Dostoevskii, F. M. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 30-kh tomakh*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1972.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Notebooks for A Raw Youth*.

- Ed. Edward Wasiolek. Trans. Victor Terras. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Notebooks for The Possessed*. Ed. Edward Wasiolek. Trans. Victor Terras. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Eikhenbaum, Boris. "On Tolstoy's Crises." *Tolstoy: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Ralph E. Matlaw. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tolstoi in the Sixties*. Trans. Duffield White. Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1982.
- Ermilov, V. *Tolstoi-khudozhnik i roman "Voyna i mir"*. Moscow, 1961.
- Feuer, Kathryn B. *Tolstoy and the Genesis of War and Peace*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Gogol, N. V. *Sobranie sochinenii v shesti tomakh*. Moscow, 1953.
- Hauser, Arnold. *The Social History of Art*. Vol. 3. New York: Vintage Books, n.d.
- Helfant, Ian M. *The High Stakes of Identity: Gambling in the Life and Literature of Nineteenth-Century Russia*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2002.
- Knowles, A. V. "War over *War and Peace*: Prince Andrey Bolkonsky and Critical Literature of the 1860s and Early 1870s." *New Essays on Tolstoy*. Ed. Malcolm Jones. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Leont'ev, K. *Analiz, stil' i veianie. O romanakh gr. L. N. Tolstogo*. Providence, RI: Brown University Press, 1965.
- Lermontov, M. Iu. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1937.
- Lotman, Iurii M. "Concerning Khlestakov." *The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History*. Ed. Alexander D. Nakhimovsky and Alice Stone Nakhimovsky. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Decembrists in Daily Life (Everyday Behavior as a Historical-Psychological Category)." *The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History*. Ed. Alexander D. Nakhimovsky and Alice Stone Nakhimovsky. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Mann, Yu. V. *Poetika russkogo romantizma*. Moscow, 1976.
- Merezhkovsky, Dmitri. "Tolstoy, Seer of the Flesh." *Tolstoy: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Ralph E. Matlaw. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Morson, Gary Saul. *Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in "War and Peace"*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- Orwin, Donna Tussing. "Courage in Tolstoy." *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*. Ed. Donna Tussing Orwin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 222-236.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tolstoy's Art and Thought, 1847-1880*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Potapov, I. A. *Roman L. N. Tolstogo "Voyna i mir"*. Moscow, 1970.
- Reyfman, Irina. *Ritualized Violence Russian Style: The Duel in Russian Culture and Literature*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Saburov, A. "Voyna i mir" L. N. Tolstogo. *Problematika i poetika*. Moscow, 1959.
- Sankovitch, Natasha. *Creating and Recovering Experience: Repetition in Tolstoy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Readers' Experience of Repetition in Tolstoy." *Tolstoy Studies Journal* 3 (1990)49-61.
- Silbajoris, Rimvydas. *War and Peace: Tolstoy's Mirror of the World*. New York: Twayne, 1995.
- Thorslev, Jr., Peter L. *The Byronic Hero*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962.



Tolstoy, L. N. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1928-58. Cited in the text as *PSS*.

Zaidenshnur, E. Ye. "*Voina i mir*" L. N. Tolstogo. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Kniga", 1966.

Wasiolek, Edward, ed. *Critical Essays on Tolstoy*. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1986.