
Tolstoy Scholarship in Russia and Abroad

Recent Publications and Annotated Bibliography, 1999-2000

Paul Haddock

University of Toronto

- Burlakova, Tamara. *Mir pamiati: Tolstovskie mesta Tul'skogo kraia*. Tula: Izdatel'stvo Tul'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. L. N. Tolstogo, 1999.

This interesting little book accounts for Tolstoy's movements within his native province of Tula. The chapters are divided according to the districts of the province and each one describes Tolstoy's travels within a separate district. The book goes into considerable detail; often providing the duration of Tolstoy's visit, his hosts, and the business he conducted. In addition, a great deal of anecdotal information, literary and otherwise, is provided on the towns and villages of the province. Numerous quotations from the correspondence of the writer, his family, and acquaintances, together with endearing descriptions of the province's locales.

- Calvino, Italo. "Leo Tolstoy, Two Hussars," *Why Read the Classics?* Trans. Martin McLaughlin. New York: Pantheon Books, 1999. 155-158.

This is the first English translation of Calvino's preface to an Italian edition of *Two Hussars* published in 1973. His focus is on the narrative structure of Tolstoy's story. Calvino observes that the second half of *Two Hussars* is an inverted

image of the first: "instead of winter snow, sledges, and vodka, we have a mild spring with gardens in the moonlight; as opposed to the wild early years of the century with orgies in the caravanserai at the staging posts, we are in the mid-nineteenth century, settled epoch of knitting and peaceful ennui in the calm of family ... (156-157). Likewise, Calvino sees in the depiction of the younger Turbin a pale, ridiculous reflection of his father. However, behind the nostalgic, somewhat clichéd flashbacks of the story Calvino senses not a generic lament for times past, but the beginnings of a complex philosophy of history, and a weighing up of the costs of progress that Tolstoy would develop more fully ten years later in *War and Peace*.

- Caws, Peter. "Moral Certainty in Tolstoy." *Philosophy and Literature* 24.1 (April 2000): 49-66.

How the protagonists of Tolstoy's three major novels, *War and Peace*, *Anna Karenina*, and *Resurrection*, answer the question "What ought I to do?" is the subject of this article. Caws divides the moral dilemmas facing Tolstoy's characters into two main groups, social and sexual, and, relying on philosophy as much as literary criticism, he sums up Tolstoy's main moral insight as follows: "It cannot possibly be worse, and will probably be much better, to let nature and tradition take their course than to try to improve matters morally by calculation" (65). Although the author does not share Tolstoy's confidence in tradition as a conduit of truth and rejects even more the religious component of this tradition, he admits, "It is much harder than we are usually willing to admit to offer an equally plausible alternative to this view, let alone a practically more compelling one" (65). Tolstoy's characters, he concludes, find their moral certainty through life experience gained by interacting with other human beings and not through abstract theorizing.

- Clay, George R. "In Defense of Flat Characters: A Discussion of Their Value to Charles Dickens, Jane Austen, and Leo Tolstoy." *The International Fiction Review* 27.1 & 2 (2000): 20-26.

Clay takes exception to E. M. Forster's plea in his *Aspects of the Novel* to avoid "flat characters" or "types" that are constructed around a single idea or quality. While flat characters are necessarily of lesser importance than the "round" or main characters, they can, Clay points out, perform important functions within the overall structure of the novel. The ensuing discussion examines the nature of these functions in the works of Dickens, Austen, and Tolstoy. Dickens uses his flat characters to draw attention away from his slight plot with a fascinating sideshow in *David Copperfield*. Austen, for her part, uses "the Flats," as Clay refers to them, in *Pride and Prejudice* to propel the central action of the novel, getting her hero and heroine into, then out of, romantic difficulties. Tolstoy exploits his flat characters' flatness in *War and Peace* to track his round characters' development through a technique which Clay calls taking fixes. Borrowed from navigational terminology, a fix is a compass reading used to locate the position of a moving vessel. It requires three fixes to locate a present position and intermittently repeated readings to chart a course. To illustrate how this works in Tolstoy's novel Clay looks at Peronskaia, a minor flat character, who speaks derisively to the Rostovs about Prince Andrei at the Grand Ball: "I can't bear him. He's all the rage just now. He's too proud for anything. Takes after his father. And he's hand in glove with Speranski, writing some project or other. Just look at how he treats the ladies! There's one talking to him and he has turned away ... I'd give it to him if he treated me the way he does those ladies." We know there is some truth to Peronskaia's comments and no doubt Prince Andrew has just rudely turned away from a young lady while she was talking to him. Yet just moments later Prince Andrei is introduced to Natasha and offers her a low courteous bow that quite belies Peronskaia's

remarks about his rudeness. In meeting Natasha Rostova, Prince Andrei turns a crucial stage in his development, and the observations of this vain old curmudgeon, this flat character, "fix" the Prince in the eyes of the readers at the precise moment when he undergoes an important change of course.

- Doubrovkine, Roman. "Lev Tolstoi, Mallarme i Bolezn' Vremeni," *Revue des études Slaves* LXXI. 2 (1999): 333-358.
- "Leo Tolstoy, Mallarmé, and 'The Sickness of Our Time'." Trans. Thomas Cunningham. *Mallarmé in the Twentieth Century*. Ed. Robert Greer Cohn and Gerald Gillespie. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press, 1998. 235-263.

This interesting article examines the reception of the poetry of Stéphane Mallarmé in Russia and the reception of Tolstoy's treatise, *What is Art?*, in France and Europe. Doubrovkine reveals how Mallarmé's reputation in Russia rests to a large extent on Tolstoy's strictures against the poet in *What is Art?*. These strictures, in turn, rest not only on Tolstoy's strongly felt personal opinions, but also on the vagaries of publication that include typographical errors, editing mistakes, and generally sloppy reproduction of Mallarmé's poems. The author goes so far as to suggest that if Mallarmé is to be read again anew by Russian readers, the history of his reception must be foregrounded and unravelled. Much of the article consists of a detailed investigation into how these errors entered into the Russian reproductions of French Symbolist and Decadent poetry and how they contributed to Tolstoy's negative assessment of the adherents of these movements as a whole. Doubrovkine also looks at the French sources Tolstoy consulted when writing *What is Art?* and the publication history of this treatise in Europe. What emerges is a confusing, intriguing, and ultimately unfortunate concatenation of events that led to the unfair denigration of Mallarmé's reputation in Russia and the incorrect impression

of Tolstoy as an unsophisticated critic of French literature in Europe.

- Ehrenfeld, David. "War and Peace and Conservation Biology." *Conservation Biology* 14.1:105-112.

The author finds a relevant lesson for the field of conservation biology in *War and Peace*. In his epic novel, Tolstoy uses the failure of Napoleon's invasion of Russia to examine the idea that science (expertise) and reason simply cannot control the great events of the world, which are inherently too complex to be managed by these methods. The twentieth-century philosopher Isaiah Berlin largely agrees but takes a more moderate position: he explains why it is sometimes possible to apply reason to the vast problems that confront us and achieve the desired results. By analogy, in conservation biology it is possible to achieve conservation objectives, but the self-serving belief that an increase in our scientific knowledge by itself will always move us toward conservation must be laid to rest. To help identify conservation strategies that work, conservation biology must close critical feedback loops by emulating science and regularly monitoring the effectiveness of its research by understanding the place of its work in the life of the community.

- Emerson, Caryl. "Pushkin, Tolstoy, and the Possibility of an Ethics of History." *Resonant Themes: Literature, History, and the Arts in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe. Essays in Honor of Victor Brombert*. Ed. Stirling Haig. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999. 51-64.

Emerson puts forward a reconsideration of the attitudes toward history held by Russia's greatest poet, Alexander Pushkin, and her greatest novelist, Leo Tolstoy. Rather than analyzing the separate theories of history espoused by each writer, Emerson's focus is on "their ideas, or

better their intuitive grasp, of the ways history might be written up, that is, their thoughts on the very possibility of an ethical, accurate, responsible recording of an historical event" (54). A comparison of Pushkin's account of the destructive Cossack-led rebellion in the early 1770s, *History of Pugachev* (1834), with Tolstoy's epic on the Napoleonic campaigns and the 1812 invasion of Russia, *War and Peace* (1860s), is used to support Emerson's thesis that Pushkin "devised an approach to history that was ... more affirmative, more scrupulously objective, and less sentimental than Tolstoy's (54). Emerson takes issue with Tolstoy's treatment of history for its tendency to reduce historical events as unethical at the higher levels (kings, ministers, generals) and as unconscious at the lower levels (peasants, soldiers, ordinary people). What Tolstoy specifically avoids in his historical ruminations is the all-important middle layer where the subtle interactions of public personalities take place and yield up momentary insights into important movements of minds or bodies that might also serve as an inspiration for them. "Precision, humility and psychological acumen," Emerson points out, "are left for the private or fictional sphere, which Tolstoy fills with coincidence, happenstance and true love after the manner of all good novels" (56).

In contrast to Tolstoy, Pushkin had a more positive attitude toward the explanatory potential contained in chance, genius, and "great men." Pushkin's perspective when writing history is almost entirely external in as much as he brings many points of view to bear on the events he depicts and offers up in return. He does not psychologize the participants of an event but documents what has occurred in a detailed manner without passing judgement. This approach allowed Pushkin to reveal the multiple, simultaneous pressures acting on a historical event without feeling the compulsion, as the fiercely metonymic prose writer Tolstoy did, to explain everything cognitively, linearly, and logically. As a result, "Pushkin could honour the audience of his History by treating it not as a recalcitrant or gullible pupil being fed a lesson but by expecting

from it the patience, subtlety, and adult interpretative gifts required by the reader of a poem" (60). Emerson concludes by explaining that the different approaches to history taken by the two writers reflect an aesthetic choice based on the durability and trustworthiness of words. Tolstoy was suspicious of the ability of words to render reality honestly and assumed that they were constantly in thrall to something greedier and more immediate. Unless a writer's poetic energy was tied to an ethical end, his words always possessed the potential to pollute and seduce. Tolstoy's well-known crises, where he resolved to stop writing altogether, were symptomatic of his difficulties with language to depict "the event itself." Whereas Pushkin, for his part, believed fully in the power of language to create value and communicate realities with regard to historical events and, as a result, did not "experience a 'Tolstoyan' anxiety about words and their relationship to reality" (63).

- Gerigk, Horst-Jürgen. "Thomas Manns Anna Karenina. Überlegungen zu Humanität, Hermeneutik und Poetologie," *Thomas Mann Jahrbuch*. Band 12, 1999. Frankfurt am Main, 2000. 171-190.
- Gordon, Felicia. "Legitimation and Irony in Tolstoy and Fontane." *Scarlet Letters: Fictions of Adultery from Antiquity to the 1990s*. Ed. Nicholas White and Naomi Segal. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. 85-97.

Armed with quotations from Kant, Hegel, and feminist critics, this article, by examining the philosophic subtext of *Anna Karenina*, *The Kreutzer Sonata*, and *Effi Briest*, argues "one phenomenon novels of adultery may reflect is a transformation of the ancient legally sanctioned historic violence of husbands towards wives into an internally assumed violence of women towards themselves" (85). Gordon maintains *Anna Karenina*, while acknowledging the tragedies of the female condition, legitimates women's subjection

by convincingly dramatizing the horrors of social, spiritual, and mental exclusion. Furthermore, the novel as a whole validates female oppression not by approving it, but by suggesting that no other existence is available to women, save the even worse one of perpetual exile from the world of self-conscious Being. *The Kreutzer Sonata*, on the other hand, legitimates oppression by logically demonstrating the impossibility of ethical relations between the sexes. Of Fontane's *Effi Briest*, Gordon somewhat ambiguously observes, "[it] represents an accurate expression of Kantian gender categories operating in ... the context of the Hegelian State" (91). She concludes the article by stating "nineteenth-century novels of adultery can be read as Tolstoyan didactic warnings—'vengeance is mine, and I will repay'—as efforts to legitimate and to render 'natural' the sexual double standard upon which all other social inequalities depended or as ironic deconstructions of the murderous artificiality inherent in gender prescriptions" (95).

- Grenier, Svetlana. "Tolstoj's Wards: An Index of His Progression Towards Feminism and Polyphony?" *Russian Literature* XLVII (2000): 33-60.

This article draws our attention to two contradictions in Tolstoy scholarship: Tolstoy has been called a feminist and accused of misogyny; and he has been labelled "monolithically monologic" by Bakhtin and also described as polyphonic in a way different from Dostoevsky by Morson, Emerson, and others. Grenier maintains it is not a question of "either/or" but a matter of the evolution of Tolstoy's style that involves a correlation between dialogism and polyphony, on the one hand, and feminism, on the other. "Although he never becomes consistently dialogic or feminist," writes Grenier, "the more dialogic his work as a whole becomes, the more feminist it is" (33). To substantiate this claim the author analyzes Tolstoy's ward figures, Sonya in *War and Peace*, Varen'ka, and, to a lesser extent, Anna herself in *Anna Karenina*. She believes that Tolstoy's narratological treatment of these

characters testifies to the evolution in his overall worldview. It is argued that while Sonya is “finalized” and “progressively silenced” by the author in *War and Peace*, neither Anna nor Varen’ka (her double and Sonya’s reprise) are finalized to the same extent in the later novel. In *Anna Karenina* Grenier sees Tolstoy already moving closer to his post-conversion ideological position on class and gender issues and this entails a correlative change in his poetics that is characterized by “his [Tolstoy’s] movement away from monologism towards Pushkinian ‘objectivity’ and Dostoevskian dialogue and polyphony” (53).

- Hayward, Helen. *Never Marry a Girl with a Dead Father. Women’s Troubled Relationships in Realist Novels*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris Publishers, 1999.

Hayward argues that fiction is necessary to illuminate the struggle young women face for independence and identity. Some of the most suitable stories for her purposes are found in the pre-Freudian, realistic novels of such nineteenth-century authors as Balzac, Charlotte Brontë, Tolstoy, George Eliot, and Florence Nightingale. “The girl with the dead father” of the title is a metaphor used by the author to reveal one of the roots of existential paralysis: a girl whose father has died in her imagination—who is dead symbolically—may find it hard to perceive whoever comes after him as potent, while a girl whose father has died in reality may find it even harder because the father remains in her imagination bigger, better, and bolder than other men.

Chapter Four, “Childhood, Boyhood—and Womanhood in Tolstoy’s Early Novels,” uses Tolstoy’s *Childhood, Boyhood, Youth* and *Family Happiness* as the basis for a discussion on that most feminine of nineteenth-century ailments, hysteria. Hayward emphasizes that what passed for hysteria in women was likely to be called hypochondria or self-destructiveness in men. Tolstoy’s early autobiographical novels make it

clear, Hayward suggests, “he knew all about the hysterical feelings he later illuminated in his highly-strung heroines” (56). In his recreation of childhood, Tolstoy shows Nicholas Irtenyev overcoming his hysterical tendencies and gaining a firm enough sense of reality to distinguish the fancies of his imagination from his perceptions of the world. This is not true, however, of Masha in *Family Happiness* who fails to recognize that the root of her depression is not in her marriage but in herself and that it is connected to her desire for the love—both paternal and sexual—of her dead father.

- Hruska, Anne. “Loneliness and Social Class in Tolstoy’s Trilogy *Childhood, Boyhood, Youth*.” *Slavic and East European Journal* 44.1 (Spring 2000): 64-78.

The author addresses Tolstoy’s ambivalent attitude toward social class as expressed in *Childhood, Boyhood, Youth*. The majority of Western critics see Tolstoy not as the champion of peasantry but as a self-proclaimed upholder of the standards of aristocracy. However, the young Tolstoy’s attitude toward the aristocracy was significantly complex. Certainly Tolstoy’s allegiances belonged to the aristocracy rather than to the peasants or *raznochintsy*, but it was an allegiance marked by conflict. In his youth, Tolstoy fretted about his uncouth manners that marked him as an outsider in the circle to which he wanted to belong. During the 1850s he was still contemplating what being an aristocrat meant: whether it involved belonging to a loving community that cared for its serf dependants or whether it involved hurting and excluding others, and so spiritually harming oneself. As a result, Tolstoy’s trilogy not only idealizes the author’s aristocratic childhood, it also reflects his ambivalence and discomfort toward the social class to which he belonged.

- Johnson, Alexandra. *The Hidden Writer. Diaries and the Creative Life*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

The third chapter of this book, "The Married Muse" (52-85), recounts the important and ultimately tragic role diaries played in the troubled marriage of Leo and Sonya Tolstoy. A role the author summarizes in the following manner: "Years of confession in shared diaries, though, had poisoned the Tolstoys' marriage, leeching it of the trust necessary to heal the growing final rift" (83). Though the book is reliant solely on translated source and provides no new information, it retells the gradual breakdown of the relationship between the writer and his wife in dramatic fashion and frequently cites from their respective diaries.

- Kjetsaa, Geir. "Lev Tolstói i Nobelevskaia premiia." *A Centenary of Slavic Studies in Norway. The Olaf Broch Symposium*. Papers. Oslo, 12-14 September 1996. Eds. Jan Ivar Bjønflaten, Geir Kjetsaa, Terje Mathiassen. Oslo, 1998. 142-152.

Kjetsaa delves into the complicated history of why Tolstoy was not awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. The blame is equally dispersed among all the parties involved: Tolstoy himself is to blame for writing a pre-emptive rejection of the prize in 1902; the Swedish Academy of Sciences is at fault by taking offense at Tolstoy's rejection and by allowing its judgement to be affected by its conservative members who disapproved of Tolstoy's social anarchy; and finally politicians and journalists share in the blame for bringing external issues of nationalism and diplomacy to bear on the selection process.

- Leving, Yuri. "Nabokov's Mary" *The Explicator* 58.1 (Fall 1999): 39-42.

The author examines the influence of Tolstoy on Nabokov's first novel, *Mary* (1925). He sets this in the context of an incident in which Nabokov,

apparently falsely, denied having read Tolstoy's *Sevastopol Tales*.

- Mamedova, Giul'nara. "O nekotorykh geroiakh povesti L. N. Tolstogo Khazhdi-Murad k 170-letiiu L. N. Tolstogo," *Filologi arasdirmalar* (VIII kitab). Baku: Sirvannasr, 1998. 75-81.

This article calls into question the accuracy of certain attributes given to one of the characters in Tolstoy's final masterpiece, *Hadji-Murad*. Although Tolstoy always endeavoured to be as historically accurate as possible in his writing, it was the sources he consulted while composing this story that led to an unfair characterization of one of Shamil's wives, Zaidat. In particular, the reminiscences of Apollon Runovskii in his book *Zapiski o Shamile* (St. Petersburg, 1860) were coloured by his ignorance of Islam and the Muslim way of life. In *Hadji-Murad*, Tolstoy describes Zaidat as the unloved, elder wife of Shamil', with a sharp nose and a dark, unattractive face. However, Mamedova reveals each of these characteristics to be untrue by citing various archival sources. Far from being unloved, Zaidat was held in special esteem by her husband as she was a direct descendant of Mohammed. Shamil' married his first wife, Shaunet, when Zaidat was all of ten years old. Finally, as a direct descendant of Islam's most highly regarded prophet, Zaidat was a strict adherent of the Muslim faith and, as such, would not have shown her face to any man except the members of her immediate family. Consequently, any judgements on her beauty, or lack thereof, are highly suspect. Mamedova goes on to point out that Zaidat, by all accounts, was an extremely intelligent, strong-willed woman who wielded a great deal of influence both in her own family and in the larger Muslim community.

- Mayes, Hubert. "Resurrection: Tolstoy and Canada's Doukhobors." *The Beaver* 79.5 (October/November 1999): 39-44.

The author traces Tolstoy's involvement in the emigration of some 7,400 Russian Doukhobors to the Canadian West at the end of the last century. While those already familiar with the story will find no new information in the article, it is nevertheless noteworthy for its account of the present-day Doukhobors and for a number of rare photographs that accompany the text.

- Parel, Anthony. "Nonviolence: The Tolstoy – Gandhi Legacy" *Nonviolence for the Third Millennium*. Ed. G. Simon Harak, S.J. Macon, GA, 2000. 43-61.

Parel discusses Gandhi's relationship with Tolstoy in terms of an under appreciated dimension of his growth into non-violence. Tolstoy advocated non-violence, most forcefully in *The Kingdom of God is Within You* where he charged that the modern State was founded upon violence, and could never satisfy the Gospel call to non-violence. Morally, then, the State had to be done away with. Gandhi acknowledged Tolstoy's insights, but changed them in his struggle for Indian independence. His new understanding was a crucial step in presenting the relationship between non-violence and the modern State. The article first outlines Tolstoy's ideas on non-violence, then discusses how Gandhi accepted, modified, and further developed those ideas. Parel observes, "if Tolstoy put Gandhi on the path to discovery, it was Gandhi who showed how Tolstoy's ideas could be actually put into practice. Without Gandhi it is doubtful whether those ideas would have become part of a modern tradition of non-violent political action" (45).

- Rischin, Ruth. "'They're All Writing My Biography': Max Zweig's Tolstoi." *Max Zweig. Kritische Betrachtungen*. Ed. Eva Reichmann. Röhrig Universitätsverlag, 1995. 125-169.

The article deals with the Austrian dramatist Max Zweig's play, *Tolstois Gefangenschaft und Flucht* [Tolstoy's Captivity and Flight], which re-enacts the final days of the Russian writer's life. Rischin begins by highlighting the importance of Tolstoy to Zweig as a "great tragic figure, as well as a towering creative artist" (127). Zweig, it turns out, had an intimate knowledge of Tolstoy's writings and professed a spiritual kinship with him. In her detailed overview of the play, which was written shortly after the Second World War and has yet to be staged, Rischin shows how the text of the play follows, almost verbatim, Tolstoy's diary entries and letters of the days preceding his death. The final third of the article is devoted to a close examination of the architectonics of the play. Rischin maintains that Zweig overcame the challenge of inherited sources by incorporating into the structure of the drama the principle of auto psychology, which she believes to be characteristic of Tolstoy's own artistic procedures (164). Notable in this regard is Zweig's use of an allusion, unexplained in the play, to Tolstoy's late story, *The Posthumous Notes of the Elder Fëdor Kuzmich*, that ironically duplicates and foreshadows the multiple registers of captivity and flight encountered throughout the play. The use of this mise-en-abyme, Rischin believes, clarifies the design of the play and the psychology of its hero.

- Seeley, Frank. *Saviour or Superman? Old and New Essays on Tolstoy and Dostoevsky*. Nottingham, England: Astra Press, 1999.

Two previously unpublished essays on Tolstoy are to be found in this book. The first, "Tolstoy's Borodino: Fact and Fiction" (17-23), looks at how Tolstoy set out to "reinvent" the battle of Borodino in order to vindicate the diminished glory of the Russian army and to expose the bankruptcy of "modern" history and "modern" historians. To do so, Seeley shows how Tolstoy was forced to flatten the terrain, miscalculate the number of troops, and turn a blind eye to the artillery and half of the fortifications.

The second essay, "Natasha Rostova" (24-31),

examines how this beloved heroine relates to other people. Through a close reading of *War and Peace* Seeley shows the secret of her charm lies in her abandon—meaning her capacity to immerse herself in every moment, every experience—and concomitantly in the immediacy and intensity of her feelings. Immediacy of feeling for Natasha means that her feelings are not altered by considerations of time, place, or occasion. She is happy or angry,” Seeley points out, “with all her heart and with all her strength: this is the central fact about her, and it is to this she owes her fascination and power over both in novel and among its readers” (27).

- Shadskaia, A. V., et al. *Mir “Azbuki L’va Tolstogo. Kniga dlia uchitel’ia*. Tula: Izdatel’stvo Tul’skogo oblastnogo instituta razvitiia obrazovaniia, 1995.

This book is intended for teachers of younger students. It presents and examines the philosophical, pedagogical, and moral foundations on which Tolstoy based his grammar book for peasant children. Though it was written more than one hundred years ago, the authors of this book feel that the great writer’s textbook is still useful in the classroom today.

- Solev, Kosta. “Problema pola v religii shekerov i tvorcestve pozdnego L. N. Tolstogo.” *Rossiiia i SSHA: Formy literaturnogo dialoga. Sbornik statei po materialam mezhdunarodnykh konferentsii*. November 1998 (OSU), April 1999 (RGGU). Moscow, 2000. 116-121.

In his striving to escape both the burden of an idle life and the temptations of the flesh, Tolstoy was struck by the parallels between his beliefs and the adherents of the American religious sect, the Shakers. This article outlines these parallels and traces Tolstoy’s gradual move toward views that were similar to those held by the Shakers such as the abnegation of private property and celibacy. It is in this latter practice that the author sees the

basis for Tolstoy’s and the Shakers’ mutual understanding in as much as both parties expressed a desire to alter human sexuality. Tolstoy turned to the question of sexuality throughout his creative life, but his interest reached its peak during the final years of his life. In his later works Tolstoy advocated celibacy or a “spiritual marriage,” in which fraternal relations between the sexes would replace physical passion. The advocacy of celibacy by both Tolstoy and the Shakers was based on a number of shared assumptions: a desire to achieve moral perfection, to change human nature, to end the slavery of human consciousness to passion, and to live in harmony with one another.

- Svintsov, Vitalii. “Vera i neverie: Dostoevskii, Tolstoi, Chekhov i drugie.” *Voprosy literatury* 9-10 (September-October 1998): 176-207.

This article attacks head-on questions of faith and doubt in Russia’s three greatest prose writers of the nineteenth century. Though none of the conclusions reached is original, it is nonetheless a fascinating article written in an arresting conversational style. The author, as a former *homo sovieticus*, summarizes his attitude toward God in the words of Eugene Ionesco: “It seems to me that I believe, not quite believing that I believe” (177). In the writings of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Chekhov, Svintsov examines similar ambiguous statements concerning faith and unbelief. The article covers familiar territory: the most famous, oft-cited remarks by the writers themselves on this topic are duly noted; the names of Russian critics and religious thinkers such as Fedorov, Mikhailovsky, Shestov, Leont’ev, Merezhkovsky, Florensky, and Bulgakov are repeatedly dropped; and the most relevant sections of the writers’ oeuvre are brought to the reader’s attention. However, somewhere and somehow in the middle of this loosely structured discourse, insights are made and inferences drawn with such freshness and verve that it leaves the reader marvelling at the uniqueness of classical Russian literature and the complexity of those who produced it.

- Ungurianu, Dan. "Visions and Versions of History: Veterans of 1812 on Tolstoy's *War and Peace*." *Slavic and East European Journal* 44.1 (Spring 2000): 48-63.

Prince Petr Viazemsky's *Memoirs of the Year 1812* are examined as representative of veterans' objections to Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. It is not so much alleged inaccuracies to which Viazemsky

objected as the style of the novel. He felt Tolstoy's realism went against the grain of the epoch he was depicting and distorted its "general psychic tune." Also unpalatable to the romantic notions of the veterans was Tolstoy's scorn of the great men and heroes of history. Although Viazemsky perceptively discerned Tolstoy's blend of history and reality, he could not accept the new hybrid genre of the realistic novel because of its rejection of the romantic tradition in which he was raised.