NOTES

PREFACE

1. Andrei Bely [Boris Bugaev], Tragediia tvorchestva: Dostoevsky i Tolstoy, p. 36.
2. V. Zelinsky, ed., Russkaia kriticheskaia literatura o proizvedeniakh L. N. Tolstogo; O religii L'va Tolstogo.
3. N. G. Sheliapina et al., eds., Bibliografiia literatury o L. N. Tolstom.

CHAPTER ONE

2. This question has been thoroughly researched by Eric Havelock in his definitive study Preface to Plato.
5. According to a recent researcher, Rolf-Dieter Kluge, this was the point of transition from critical to socialist realism (Vom kritischen zum sozialistischen Realismus).
9. Belief here is to be understood as equivalent to incomplete understanding—a substitute for the missing knowledge of empirical reality.
10. René Wellek and Austin Warren also comment on this, saying that “man in the middle ages feared sudden death most, as it precluded preparation and repentance, while Montaigne begins to think that a quick death is best. He has lost the Christian view that death is the aim of life” (Theory of Literature, p. 105).


16. Attempts to explain the special meaning of this word for the Russians can be found in many places. For a representative attempt, see F. M. Dostoevsky, Diary of a Writer, where he condemns Tolstoy for trying to make Russians feel like Europeans, i.e., rootless people who have become detached from their tribe (for details see chap. 3 below).

17. Cf. the informative study by Michael Cherniavsky, Tsar and People.


19. The interested reader may wish to consult Valerii Briusov’s “Kliuchi tain” [Keys to the occult] and V. Ivanov’s “Simvolizm kak miroponimanie.”

20. The swamp is the devil’s abode in Russian folklore (cf. bolotnyi chort).

21. This issue is the subject of Iu. N. Tynianov’s major study Arkhaisty i novatory [Archaists and innovators].

22. B. Eikhenbaum, Molodoi Tolstoy.


CHAPTER TWO

1. N. A. Dobroliubov, Sobranie sochinenii [Collected works], 7:241.


3. N. A. Nekrasov, “Zametki o zhurnalakh za sentiabr’ 1855 g.,” Sovremennik 10 (October 1855); rpt. in Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 98:332.

4. N. A. Nekrasov, “Zametki o zhurnalakh. Sevastopol’ v avguste 1855 g.,” Sovremennik 3 (March 1856); rpt. in Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 9:372–73.

5. When Tolstoy’s “Two Hussars” was published in the Contemporary (May 1856), the weekly Son of the Fatherland branded it one of the worst and most sterile manifestations of the negative trend in Russian literature (Syn otechestva, 6 May 1856, pp. 15–18). But when Chernyshevsky spoke of it as one of the best stories to appear in 1856 (“Zametki o zhurnalakh,” Sovremennik 12 [December 1856]: 257; rpt. in Polnoe sobranie sochinenii), and
after he pointed to the picture of the young girl in the window in “Two Hussars” as “a charming and pure example of Tolstoy’s art” (“Detstvo i Otrochestvo. Voennye rasskazy grafa L. N. Tolstogo,” Sovremennik 12 [December 1856]: 53–64; rpt. in Polnoe sobranie sochinenii), Son of the Fatherland reversed itself and declared “Two Hussars” to be a beautiful story, “one of the best to come out during the past year” (Syn otechestva, 27 January 1857, p. 74) and “beautiful pictures” to be Tolstoy’s forte (10 February 1857, p. 139).

6. Soviet critics show continuing interest in Chernyshevsky’s reviews of Tolstoy, as Gleb Struve has shown (“Tolstoy in Soviet Criticism”).

7. “Detstvo i Otrochestvo.”


9. “Zamechatel’nyi khudozhnik i tonkii psikholog . . . Vдумчивост’ avtora v samye tonkie perezhivaniia rebenka” [“A remarkable artist and a fine psychologist . . . The author can identify and reproduce the finest shadings of a child’s emotions”] (B. A. Il’’mazov, “Sovremennik 1854 goda”); “Zamechate1’noe masterstvo analiza pochti neulovimykh chuvstv i perezhivaniia” [“A remarkable skill of analyzing almost imperceptible feelings and experiences”] (“Russkaia literatura”).

10. “Avtor dovodit chitatelia neoslabnoi proverkoi vst-rechaiaushchegosia emu do ubezhdeniiia, chto v odnom zheiste, v nez-nachitel’noi privychke, v neobdumannom slove cheloveka skryvaetsia in-o3ga dusha ego” [“By relentlessly checking over everything that occurs, the author brings the reader to the point of believing that a person’s soul hides sometimes in one gesture, an insignificant habit, a thoughtlessly uttered word”] (P. V. Annenkov, “O mysli v proizvedeniiaakh iziashchnoi slovesnosti”).


12. A. Tseitlin, Masterstvo Pushkina, p. 143.


16. T. A. Motyleva, “Po sledam polemiki.”

17. K. V. Driagin, “O dialektike i Tolstom.”

18. M. Vitenson, “K voprosu o sotsialisticheskom realizme.”


20. I. V. Strakhov, “Psikhologiia snovidenia” and “L. N. Tolstoy kak psikholog.”

22. “Esli eto— pervoe proizvedenie g. L. N., to nel'zia ne pozdravit' russkuiu literaturu s poiaavlением novogo zamechatel'nogo talanta!” ["If this is Mr. L. N.'s first work, then one cannot help but congratulate Russian literature on the appearance of a new and remarkable talent"] (S. S. Dudyshekin, “Kritika”).

23. “Peterburgskii vestnik.”

24. “Russkaia iziashchina literatura v 1852 g.,” p. 36.

25. “Otrochestvo.”

26. “Krainosti psikhicheskogo analiza” ["Excesses of psychological analysis"] (Apollon Grigor'ev, “Obozrenie nalicnykh literaturnykh deiatelei,” Moskvitianin 10 (October 1855): 187). Cf. also later pertinent assessments, such as “S imenem L. N. Tolstogo sviazyatsia predstavlenie o pisatele, kotoryi obliadaet darom chrezvychaino tonkogo analiza” ["Tolstoy's name is associated with the notion of a writer who has the gift of extraordinarily refined analysis"] (P. V. Annenkov, “Sovremennaia belletristika”); and “Vse tvorchestvo Tolstogo s nachala do kontsa pronizano takim 'chrezzmerno-tonkim analizom' po vyrazheniiu naivnogo Druzhinina” ["Tolstoy's entire output from beginning to end is shot through with such 'excessively refined analysis,' to use the expression of the naive Druzhinin"] (R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, “Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy,” Istoriia russkoi literatury XIX veka, 5:393).


28. “Net idei” ["There are no ideas"] (“Zhurnalista. Otrochestvo”).


30. “Net nikakoi mysli i tseli” ["Thought and orientation are totally absent"] (“Obzor literaturnykh izdaniii,” p. 138).


32. “Tolstoy s zamechatel'nym masterstvom vosproizvodit ne tol'ko vneshnuiu obstanovku byta poselian, no, chto gorazdo vazhnee, ikh vzgliad na veschchi. On umeet pereseliat'sia v dushu poselianina—ego muzhik chrezvychaino veren svoei nature—v rechakh ego muzhika net prikras, net ritoriki, poniatiia krest'ian peredaiutsia u grafa Tolstogo s takoiu zhe pravdivost'iu i rel'efnost'iu, kak kharaktery nashikh soldat” ["With remarkable skill Tolstoy reproduces not only the external conditions of the villagers' daily life but—what is much more important—their view of things. He knows how to dwell inside the villager's soul—his peasant is extraordinarily true to his own nature—his peasant's speech has neither adornments, nor rhetoric, Count Tolstoy reproduces the peasants' concepts with the same accuracy and plasticity that he used in reproducing the characters of our soldiers"] (“Rasskazy grafa L. N. Tolstogo,” p. 168).

34. Letter to I. S. Turgenev dated 7 January 1857; ibid., p. 332.

35. “S rashireniem sfery rasskaza rashhiriaetsia i vzgljad avtora. S novymi litsami vnosiat'sia i novye simpatii v ego poeziiu, eto vidit kazhdyi, pripominaia steny universitetskoi zhizni Irten'eva” [“As the scope of the story widens, so does the author's outlook. New characters introduce also new interests into his art, as anyone can see who remembers the scenes from Irten'ev's university life”] (“Rasskazy grafa L. N. Tolstogo,” p. 167).

36. I am translating “chistota nravstvennogo chuvstva” not verbatim as “purity of moral sentiment” but as “wholesomeness” because such a meaning is borne out by the various contextual connotations, all of which have “wholesomeness” as their common denominator.

37. “Detstvo i Otrochestvo. Voennye rasskazy,” p. 55. Subsequent page references in the text of this chapter identify passages of this article from which my translations are made.


39. René Wellek quotes Chernyshevsky as saying “‘with us, literature constitutes the whole intellectual life of the nation.’ In Russia then, writers and poets should feel their obligations a thousand times more strongly than in the West” (A History of Modern Criticism, 4:242).

40. Cf., e.g., the notorious sinister label a “great artist but a poor thinker.”

41. V. G. Belinsky’s famous vicious letter to half-mad Gogol on account of his inept Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends is a good example of this sort of “guidance.”

42. His disapproval is quite clear from his one article on Tolstoy’s pedagogical activities, written at Tolstoy’s own request, and for which Tolstoy supplied him with all the information he needed: N. G. Chernyshevsky, “Iasnaia Poliana. Shkola. Zhurnal pedagogicheskii, izdavaemyi gr. L. N. Tolstym. Moskva, 1862 g. Iasnaia Poliana. Knizhki dlia detei. Knizhka I i II. Sovremennoe obozrenie. Novye knigi” (Sovremennik 3 [March 1862]; 122-38). Tolstoy never forgave him for this and ignored Chernyshevsky for the rest of his life.

43. There exists a short reference by M. A. Antonovich to Anna Karenina in 1878, where he dismissed the novel as “a classic example of tendentiousness and quietism” (“Sovremennoe sostojanie literatury”).

44. [A. F. Golovachev], “Kazaki. Kavkazskaia povest' grafa L. N. Tolstogo.”

45. The Encyclopedia Britannica lists him as the “foremost representative of Russian Nihilism.” Cf. also Armand Coquart, Dmitri Pisarev et l'idéologie du nihilisme russe.

46. Strictly speaking he was not one himself but a nobleman, and “un jeune homme bien élevé” to boot. The information is pertinent as an example of Pisarev’s predilection for assuming lowly guises.

47. The three reviews are: “‘Tri smerti,’ rasskaz grafa L. N. Tolstogo,” Rassvet 12 (December 1859): 63–74; “Promakhi nezreloi mysli,” Russkoe slovo 12 (December 1864): 1–56; and “Staroe barstvo. ‘Voina i mir,’
sochinenie gr. L. N. Tolstogo," Otechestvennye zapiski 2 (February 1868); 263-91 (all are reprinted in Sochineniia D. I. Pisareva).

48. For a Marxist assessment of Pisarev, see V. Goldiner, "Pisarev."

49. Aesthetic assessments can be found in Pisarev's articles even after he began to deny any value in aesthetics. See Wellek, 4:258.


51. Numerous attacks on Pisarev in the Contemporary by M. A. Antonovich followed Pisarev's 1865 essay "The Destruction of Aesthetics." For details see Osval'd Likhtenshtadt's pamphlet Realisticheskie protivorechiia.

52. The Russian meaning of the word pathos differs from its English meaning as a personal or emotional element in art. For the Russians the word denotes such attitudes as passionate involvement, inspiration, and enthusiasm on the part of the addressee.


57. E. N. Medynsky, Istoriiia pedagogiki v sviazii s ekonomicheskim razvitiem obschestva, 3:285-86.


59. N. F. Poznansky, "Pedagogicheskoe nasledie D. I. Pisareva."


62. He borrowed the postulate from Chernyshevsky's thesis on The Aesthetic Relations of Art to Reality, which he discusses in his article "The Destruction of Aesthetics," Sochineniia, 4:119-21.

63. For example, he was hard on Pushkin, Goethe, and other great poets with a relatively weak social message, and lenient on Chernyshevsky's notoriously unartistic "novel of education" What Is To Be Done? for the significant social ideas expressed there. For details see "Realisty," "Pushkin i Belinsky," and other essays in Pisarev's Sochineniia.

64. He claimed, e.g., that Beethoven and Raphael were the peers of a great Parisian cook (Sochineniia, 4:119-21). Satirical references to this "outrageous" idea are found in I. S. Turgenev's Fathers and Sons and F. M. Dostoevsky's The Possessed.

65. To Pisarev knowledge of reality meant science. The man who fits Pisarev's label of "thinking realist" is a scientist. Pisarev's attitude accounts
for the exalted status he assigned to intelligence, in all its connotations, both as message and as ability to understand and store information, i.e., education.

66. This is why Pisarev's writings leave one with the impression that he has a poorly developed capacity for differentiating between thinking and being, art and reality. René Wellek makes this point in his essay on Pisarev in *A History of Modern Criticism*, vol. 4.

67. "Ia postoianno staralsia i staraius' do sikh por prevrati' iskusstvo v orudie realizma" ["I have continually tried, and am trying still to convert art into a tool of realism"] ("Posmotrim," p. 188).

68. Dobroliubov explained his method in "Zabitye liudi" and "Luch sveta v temnom tsarstve." See *Sochineniia*, various editions.

69. By his own admission it was a drastic change in views ("Promakhi," *Sochineniia*, 4:199). Soviet scholars, who are always keenly aware of such things, place the change somewhere between writing the first and second halves of his article "Skholastika XIX veka," i.e., between May and September 1861, when Pisarev, then twenty-one, "suddenly became radicalized," i.e., became inspired with his own message and wanted to beam his own "word" and have his own way—in a word, be a sage himself. For details see V. Pervenzev, "Esteticheskie vzgliady Pisareva."

70. Apparently inspired by Dobroliubov's very well known article "What Is 'Oblomovitis'?" (1859).

71. His intention, however, is open to doubt. There was no objective reason for him to delay the examination of any of the major characters of *War and Peace*, who were already well defined in the first three volumes of the book.

72. Thomas G. Masaryk, for example, as René Wellek points out, compares Pisarev with Nietzsche and even Max Stirner in his book *Rusko a Evropa*, 2:112–14.

73. Cf., e.g., Pisarev's article "Pushkin i Belinsky" (1865).


75. As Wellek put it, "Some of Pisarev's statements against art and esthetics were undoubtedly rhetorical flourishes, polemical extravagances designed to shock the reader (épater le bourgeois). But I think Pisarev is quite serious in his rejection of art: he must be grouped with a long list of thinkers that begins with Plato . . ." (4:256).

76. See his article "Idealizm Platona" (1861), in which he expounded the "practical applications" of Platonian thinking to current problems (*Sochineniia*, 1:257–80).

77. Cf. his detailed elucidations of the ideas of Büchner, Vogt, Moleschott, Comte, Darwin, Huxley, et al., whose statements he used to support his own ideas (*Sochineniia*, passim). Soviet scholars invariably refer to these as "vulgar," i.e., insensitive to the subtleties of dialectical materialism.

79. Denisov being overlooked, as it happened to at least one reviewer of this essay. René Wellek rates it as showing "a definite decline of Pisarev’s powers. ‘The Old Nobility’ of Pisarev’s title includes merely two [sic] characters of the novel . . . who are used to show up thecrudely scheming, ambitious, spoilt, and lazy old aristocracy" (4:264).

CHAPTER THREE
1. B. Al’mazov, “Sovremennik 1854 goda.”
4. N. F. Shcherbina, writing under the name Omega, “Pi’smo iz Moskvy.”
5. Evgenia Tur [Elizabeth, Countess Salias de Tournemir], “Kazaki. Kavkazskaia povest’ 1852 g. grafa L. N. Tolstogo.”
6. V. P. Meshchersky, Anna Karenina pod nozhom kritiki.
11. See Renato Poggioli, Rozanov.
12. V. V. Rozanov, N. N. Strakhov, p. 57.
13. Ibid., p. 184.
16. I do not know whether Merezhkovsky had access to the manuscript, which was finished by 1891.
17. This was a term coined and made popular by Apollon Grigor’ev. It was used by adherents of various organic trends in thought, especially the organic critics, in a variety of connotations. In this context it is probably best translated as “atmosphere.”
18. Evidently the nature of the theory has remained obscure to practically everybody outside the inner circle of its adherents. It was not recognized even by the brilliant twentieth-century philosopher Berdiaeve, who dismissed it offhand as Dostoevsky’s minor aberration. He apparently did not suspect that Dostoevsky’s entire weltanschauung, and not only his art, was rooted in the organic premise and the aesthetics derived from it (Nikolai Berdiaev, Mirosozertsanie Dostoevskogo).
19. The organic critics were neither the originators nor even the principal exponents of many of these premises. Apollon Grigor’ev’s (as well as
Belinsky's) organic aesthetics are derived in their entirety from the aesthetic philosophy of German objective idealism (Schelling, the Schlegel brothers, and Hegel), perhaps partly via Carlyle. German Organismensaethetik, in turn, rests very largely on Plotinus. For details, see Oskar Walzel, Grenzen von Poesie and Unpoesie, and M. H. Abrams, The Mirror and the Lamp. Strakhov admits that "Obshchije nachala kritiki Ap. Grigor'eva ochen prasty i obscheizvestny, ili, po kraineei mere, dolzhny byt' pochitaemy obscheizvestnymi. Eto te glubokie nachala, kotorye zaveshchany nam nemetskim idealizmom" ["The General premises of Apollon Grigor'ev's critical method are very simple and generally known, or, at least, should be considered generally known. They are those profound premises that were bequeathed to us by German idealism"] (N. N. Strakhov, Kriticheskie stat'i ob I. S. Turgeneve i L. N. Tolstom, pp. 242-43).

20. There have been several attempts to unravel the organic theory. It is explained by Dmytro Chyzhevs'kyi, Hegel in Russland, pt. 3, chap. 2; Ralph E. Matlaw, introduction to Apollon Grigoryev, My Literary and Moral Wanderings, pp. xxviii–xlil; Robert L. Jackson, Dostoevsky's Quest for Form; Linda Gerstein, Nikolai Strakhov, pp. 26–28, 88–90, and passim; V. V. Zenkovsky, A History of Russian Philosophy, 1:400–406; Ellen Chances, "Literary Criticism and the Ideology of Pochvennichestvo in Dostoevsky's Thick Journals Vremia and Epokha"; and Wayne Dowler, "Echoes of Pochvennichestvo in Solzhenitsyn's August 1914." Nowhere, however, are the central premises of the theory adequately accounted for; the majority of the works discuss only its peripheral aspects as an art theory or a social scheme. Dowler comments that "no comprehensive study of pochvennichestvo has been published in any language" (p. 111 n. 6).

21. Leonid Grossman wrote a long essay on Grigor'ev as a precursor of Bergsonian philosophy (Tri sovremennika: Dostoevsky, Tiutchev, Grigor'ev).

22. This point is astutely made by Vladimir Nabokov (who himself might qualify as an intellectual philistine in Grigor'ev's scale of values) in his very elegant study Nikolai Gogol, p. 71.


24. A. A. Grigor'ev, Literaturnaia kritika, p. 513. Subsequent translations from this work are identified by page number.

25. The etymology of the word pochva permits such an interpretation. It is analyzed as follows by A. G. Preobrazhensky: "Pochva, R. pochvy verkhnie sloi zemli, grunt, knizh., v nar. iazyke neizvestno (obykn. govoriat: zemlia, grunt); dial. olon.podoshva; pochvennyi, bez-. Po mneniiu Potebni (Et., 4, 82), preobrazovano iz p"d"shva. (sm. podoshva). Eto ob"iasnenie razdeliaet Pogodin (Sledy, 202, prim.): v semaziol. otoshenii interesno olon. pochva podoshva" ["Pochva, a word of Russian origin, denotes the upper layer of the earth, the ground. Bookish, in popular idiom unknown (the people
usually say *zemlia, grunt*); dialectal (Olonetsk district) *podoshva*; [adj.]: *pochvennyi, bez-*.

In Potebnia's opinion (Et., 4, 82), transformed from [old Russian] *p'd'shva* (see *podoshva*). This interpretation is shared by Pogodin (Sledy, 202, n.): semasiologically interesting is the Olonetsk regionalism for *pochva—podoshva*] (Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka, 2:118).

26. V. V. Rozanov, *N. N. Strakhov: Literaturnye izganniki*.

27. Scholarly references to Strakhov as a critic of Tolstoy are brief and unrevealing. For representative opinion see Wellek, 4:274–77; Gerstein, pp. 80–82; Vladimir Seduro, *Dostoyevski in Russian Literary Criticism 1846–1956*, p. 77; and A. S. Dolinin, *F. M. Dostoevsky i N. N. Strakhov, shestidesiatye gody*, pp. 249–52.


30. Strakhov comments here as follows: "Nevol'no vspominaiutsia stikhi Tiutcheva k 'Kraiu russkogo naroda' (kotoryi on nazyvaet 'krai rod­noi dolgoterpen'ia'), okanchivaiushchiesia . . .. :

Ne poimet i ne zametit
Gordyi vzor inoplemenny
Chto skvozit i taino svetit
V nagote tvoei smirennoi.

Udruchennyi noshei krestnoi
Vsiu tebia, zemlia rodnaiia,
V rabskom vide Tsar' Nebesnyi
Iskhodil blagoslovliaia"

['One cannot help but remember Tiutchev's verses 'To the Land of the Russian people' (which he calls 'our beloved native land of long-suffering forbearance') that end with: 'The foreigner's haughty eye / will neither
understand nor want to notice / what it is that secretly shines / through your humble rags. / Bearing the heavy burden of the cross / the King of Heaven, looking like a slave, / has walked back and forth across all of you, / blessing you, my beloved native land” (p. 378). Apparently Strakhov correctly read Tolstoy's intentions: stripped of sentimentality, the image appears in Resurrection as the shaggy old man (lokhmatyi starik) who is also referred to as “he who prays to a hole” (dyrnik), i.e., one whose religious orientation is aimed toward an “opening into eternity.”

31. Andrew and Peter were Christ's first two apostles. Unlike Liubov Axelrod-Orthodox, though (see L. N. Tolstoy, p. 75), Strakhov does not include Prince Andrei in this category. Pierre Bezukhov, on the other hand, is perceived by him as slated eventually to carry Russia's message to Europe and other Slavic countries (Kriticheskie, pp. 308-10).

32. This remark appeared in a later article, published in 1883 (Kriticheskie, p. 378).

33. Strakhov was aware through his correspondence with Tolstoy that Tolstoy was almost ready to give up Anna Karenina, which he had come to resent as “banal and trite,” and which he had to force himself to finish. For details see Perepiska L. N. Tolstogo s N. V. Strakhovym 1870-1894, edited, with an introduction, by B. L. Modzalevsky.

34. “Dushevaia shalosti’”—literally “craze” (dur) (Kriticheskie, p. 364). Strakhov here uses the word in its archaic connotation.

35. “Russkaia tekushchaia deistvitel'nost' byla v ponimanii Dostoevskogo vyrazheniem zhivogo 'nerva' istorii chelovechestva, v protivoves tern predshestvuiushchim rezultatam etoi istorii, kotorye uzhe uspeli slozhit'sia i opredelit'sia v proshlom” [“The current Russian reality was, in Dostoevsky's understanding, an expression of the 'raw nerve' of mankind's history, as opposed to those preceding results of this history, which already had a chance to solidify and acquire a definite form in the past”] (G. M. Fridlender, Realizm Dostoevskogo, p. 369).

36. Dostoevsky would implant the unusual, “stirring” (or “upsetting”—both words are standard organic terms) element of crime in the common “soil” of everyday reality of his works, in order to make crime appear typical, organic to human nature, rather than exceptional. For a most illuminating, thorough, and detailed discussion of this somewhat elusive point of Dostoevkiana, see E. Wasiolek, Dostoevsky: The Major Fiction.

37. Dostoevsky's contribution to literary criticism has not been extensively researched. For selected representative opinion on Dostoevsky as a critic, see Wellek. 4:270-74; G. M. Fridlender, “Dostoevsky-kritik,” R. L. Jackson, Dostoevsky's Quest for Form. A good deal of raw but detailed information is also available in Miller and Strakhov, eds., Materiały dla zhizneopisania F. M. Dostoevskogo.

38. Cf. Dostoevsky's announced statement of editorial policy for his journal Vremia, where he promised to deal with questions relative to the significance of art and its relation to life and reality (F. M. Dostoevsky, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 13:503).
39. This subject has been well researched by the Soviets. Cf., e.g., “Sovremennik v bor'be s zhurnalami Dostoevskogo,” 10:4; Fridlender, Realizm Dostoevskogo, p. 124; and other places where Dostoevsky's critical pronouncements are cited and discussed in detail. U. A. Gural'nik (Tvorchestvo Dostoevskogo, pp. 293-95) and Wellek (4:270-74) essentially agree that the polemics of the 1860s were decisive in forming Dostoevsky's views and organic theories.

40. M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, for example, comments on Dostoevsky's practice of switching suddenly from expository to feuilletonistic writing (Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem, 8:438).


42. E.g., the last pages of The Raw Youth.

43. According to R. L. Jackson (p. 134), Dostoevsky believed that every aspiring Russian writer should read all of Tolstoy's works.

44. K. Mochulsky, for example, believes that Dostoevsky improved upon Tolstoy's technique of inner monologue in the “Dream of a Ridiculous Man” and “The Meek One” (Dostoevsky: Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, p. 451). L. Grossman sees Dostoevsky's relentless inner dialogue (cf. also similar comments by M. M. Bakhtin, Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo) as another perfected variant of the same technique and as part of Dostoevsky's continuing search for new forms of expression (“Dostoevsky—khudozhhnik,” Tvorchestvo F. M. Dostoevskogo, p. 352).

45. Mochulsky, pp. 480 ff.


47. In a letter to I. S. Turgenev (1871), Dostoevsky writes, e.g.: "A znaete, ved' eto vse pomeshchich'ia literatura. One skazala vse, chto imela skazat' (velikolepno u L'va Tolstogo). No eto v vysshei stepeni pomeshchich'e slovo bylo poslednim. Novogo slova, zameniaiushchego pomeshchich'e eshche ne bylo, da i nekogda. Reshetnikovy nichego ne skazali. No vse-taki Reshetnikovy vyrazhajut mys' neobkhodimosti chego-to novogo v khudozhestvennom slove, uzhe ne pomeshchich'ego, khotia i vyrazhajut v bezobraznom vide" ["But you know, all this is literature of the gentry. It has said everything it had to say (magnificently in Leo Tolstoy's works). But that word, which was of the gentry in the highest degree, was the last one. A new word, to replace that of the gentry, has not yet appeared, and we don't have time for it. The Reshetnikovs haven't said a thing yet. Nevertheless, the Reshetnikovs do express the notion that a new approach is needed in verbal art, something that is no longer of the gentry, even though they express this notion in a hideous manner"] (F. M. Dostoevsky i I. S. Turgenev, p. vii).

49. One of the premises of the organic theory was that willful, intense effort, conscious creativity, caused emotional and mental strain. The resulting tension caused psychic imbalance.

50. Dostoevsky also employed other euphemisms, some of them with biting sarcasm, to express the same idea. The more frequent expressions are “après moi le délude,” “Ôte-toi de là, que je m’y mette;” indifference, savagery (kalmytskoe otnoshenie k delu), moral philistinism (lakeistvo), acting like a jack (knave) of hearts, and so forth.

51. “Ves’ russkii intelliggentnyi sloi, vse russkie, stoiashchie nad narodom . . .—vse v delom nikuda ne godiatsia. Ves’ etot sloi, kak tsel’nya plokhoi sloi. . . . Verkh nashei intelligentsii no to’l’ko ne mozhet on’t’edinit’ v sebe, otdeľ’no i iskliuchitel’no, pravo izobrazhat’ soboi gradzhanstvo vse strany, no, naprotiv, bez naroda i sil, pocherpaemykh iz nego bespreryvnno, utratil by migom i samuiu natsional’nuiu svoiu lichnost’” [“The entire Russian intellectual layer, all Russians who stand above the people as a whole are worthless. That entire layer, as a whole, is an extremely bad layer. The upper segment of our intelligentsia is not only disqualified as a unit, separately and exclusively, from representing the citizenry of the entire country but, on the contrary, without the common people and the strength, continuously derived from them, would in no time lose its national character altogether”] (rough drafts to the Diary of a Writer [July–August 1877, chap. 2]; Institut Russkoi literatury AN SSSR, manuscript folio 100, no. 294483, SSKh/b, 12, as quoted by Fridlender, Realizm Dostoevskogo, p. 47).

52. Euphemistically referred to by Dostoevsky as “land of holy wonders,” to suggest a cemetery of past spiritual glory, a traditional Slavophile designation for Western Europe. The line “strana sviatykh chudes” (land of holy wonders) was taken from a poem by the leading Slavophile thinker, poet, philospher, and theoretician, A. S. Khomiakov (1804–60), in which he prophesied the spiritual demise of Western Europe. For more details on this see L. Grossman, “Dostoevsky i Evropa,” Tri Sovremennika, pp. 63–114.

53. See, e.g., the subtitle “Landed squire who obtains faith in God from a peasant” (p. 322).

54. N. Berdiaev, Mirosozertsanie Dostoevskogo.
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2. V. [Bot]-kin, “Sovremennye povesti i sovremennye heroi (Pis’mo k redaktoru Golosa).”


5. P. V. Annenkov, “Istoricheskie i esteticheskie voprosy v romane gr. L. N. Tolstogo Voïna i mir.”
9. S. A. Andreevsky, “Iz myslei o L’ve Tolstom.”
10. Sine ira [Vsevolod S. Solov’ev], “Anna Karenina”; idem, “Sovremennaja literatura.”
11. Ia. P. Polonsky, “Po povodu poslednei povesti grafa L. N. Tolstogo—Kazaki (Pis’mo k redaktoru).”
12. A. A. Fet [Shenshin], “Chto sluchilos’ po smerti Anny Kareninoi,” written in 1877 but lost; available as the authorized copy of the first half dozen pages and published for the first time in Literaturnoe nasledstvo.
15. M. A. Aldanov [Landau], Tolstoy i Rolland.
16. In a letter to V. P. Botkin of 1 March 1857, Turgenev actually calls himself a tendentious writer (I. S. Turgenev, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem. Pis’ma, 3:91).
18. Cf., e.g., his introductions to the French translation of “The Two Hussars,” Le temps, 10 February 1875; War and Peace (open letter to E. About, editor of Le XIXe siècle, 20 January 1880); and A. Badin’s article “Un roman du comte Tolstoi avec préface de M. Ivan Tourguéneff.”
19. E.g., Turgenev’s odd paragraph about Tolstoy’s purported “ignorance” in “Po povodu ottsov i detei” (1869) in Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem. Sochineniia, 14:107–8, which earned him a blast from N. N. Strakhov (Kriticheskie stat’i ob I. S. Turgeneve i L. N. Tolstom, pp. 299–306).
20. Numerous testimonies are available on this point. First there is Turgenev’s own account of V. G. Belinsky’s opinion of him as a critic in “Vstrecha moia s Belinskim” (Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem. Sochineniia, 14:205–11); then there is V. Skvonikov’s reference to Turgenev’s critical qualifications as “truly professional” in his postscript, “Turgenev—kritik,” to Turgenev’s Sobranie sochinenii v desiaty tomyakh, 10:335. D. Blagoi praises highly Turgenev’s abilities as a literary critic in his “Iz prozhlogo russkoi literatury: Turgenev—redaktor Feta”; so does M. Kleman in “Pometki I. S. Turgeneva na perevode Fausta M. Vronchenko.” Turgenev’s critical acumen was admired by Gustave Flaubert, Guy de Maupassant, Henry James and others.
22. Cf. his remark to Tolstoy in a letter of 28 November 1856: “Ia pisatel’ perekhodnogo vremeni” [“I am a writer in a transitional period”] (Turgenev’s letters are translated from his Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem. Pis’ma). This opinion of himself coincides with that of Apollon Grigor’ev,
who saw Turgenev as a Mosaic figure, “rapturously casting his eye into the ‘promised land’ of future Russian literature, yet destined never to reach it himself” (“Yavleniia sovremennoi literatury propushchennye nashei kritike,” Literaturnaia kritika, p. 516).

23. “Tolstoy—edinstvennaia nadezhda nashei literature” [“Tolstoy is the only hope of our literature”] (letter to V. P. Botkin, 17 February 1857); “Tolstoy—edinstvennaia nadezhda nashei osirotevshoi literature” [“Tolstoy is the only hope of our orphaned literature”] (letter to A. A. Fet, 2 July 1871); “Nekogo chitat’ krome L. Tolstogo” [“There is no one worth reading except Tolstoy”] (letter to Fet, 14 January 1869); “Nedostatok talantov, osobenno talantov poeticheskikh. Posle L’va tolstogo nichego ne iavilos’. A ved’ ego pervaiia povest’ napechatana v 1852 godu. . . . Bessemianniki i poesiat’ nichego ne mogut” [“There is a dearth of talents, especially poetic talents. After Tolstoy nothing came. Yet his first story was printed in 1852. The sterile fellows cannot sow anything”] (letter to Polonsky, 2 January 1868).

24. Classical mythological references to the nature of Tolstoy’s talent abound in Turgenev’s letters. Cf., e.g. “Kogda eto molodee vino perebrodit’, vyidet napitok, dostoinyi bogov” [“When this young wine has fermented enough, out will come a drink worthy of gods”] (letter to Druzhinin, 17 December 1855). Chekhov was unpleasantly struck by the un-Russian mythological quality of Turgenev’s women and comments: “Vse zhenshchiny i devitsy Turgeneva nevynosimy svoei delannost’iu i, prostite, fal’sh’iu. Liza, Elena—eto ne russkie devitsy, a kakie-to Pifii veshchaiushchie” [“Turgenev’s women and girls are unbearable in their manneredness and, excuse me, falseness. Liza, Elena, these aren’t Russian girls—they are some kind of Delphic oracles who utter prophecies”] (letter to A. S. Suvorin, 24 February 1893). M. O. Gershenzon thinks that Turgenev was a pagan aesthete (Mechta i mysl’ I. S. Turgeneva, pp. 111—12 and passim).

25. “Mne by khotelos’ videt’ vas za stankom, s zasuchennymi rukavami i s rabochim fartukom” [“I would like to see you at the workbench, with rolled-up sleeves and a working apron”] (letter to Tolstoy, 29 January 1858).

26. “Velikii pisatel’ russkoi zemli” [“Great writer of the Russian land”]. Without capitalization and with the adjective transposed to a “poetic” postpositive position, the message was widely misconstrued as a mere fancy label. But its intelligence was specific: to remind Tolstoy of his duty to write about the Russian land. For many indirect corroborative details of this relatively obscure phase of the two writers’ stormy relationship, see Gershenzon, Mechta i mysl’.

27. This concept was apparently associated in Turgenev’s mind with Hamlet and the “superfluous man” (cf. his “Hamlet and Don Quixote”).

28. See Gershenzon, pp. 69–73.

29. This idea was repeated, somewhat out of context, in Turgenev’s reminiscences entitled “Po povodu Ottsov i detei” (Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem. Sochinenia, 14:107–8) and represents one of very few such com-
ments by Turgenev in print. Variants found in his complete works indicate that Turgenev struggled to express this idea as clearly, yet as noncommittally, as possible. He evidently considered it an important point (ibid., 16:354-55).

30. Compare how Turgenev treats the fourth volume of War and Peace as “sick”: “Dostavili mne 4-y tom Tolstogo” [“They delivered to me the fourth volume of Tolstoy”] (letter to Annenkov, 25 April 1868); and Anna Karenina as “revolting” or “bitter medicine”: “Mne davali chitat’ Annu Kareninu” [“They made me read Anna Karenina in doses”] (letter to Annenkov, 3 April 1876).

31. Le temps, 10 February 1875.

32. Open letter to E. About, editor of Le XIXe siècle, published 20 January 1880.

33. A. Badin, “Un roman du comte Tolstoï avec préface de M. Ivan Tourguéneff.”

34. L. N. Nazarova cites the authority of the writer P. D. Boborykin (1836-1921) that Turgenev “ne skryval ni pered kem . . . , chto on ne voskhishchaetsia ochen’ mnogim, chto est’ v Anne Kareninoi” [“Turgenev never concealed from anyone that he is less than delighted with very many things that can be found in Anna Karenina”] (“Turgenev-kritik,” p. 520).

35. See his letter to Gustave Flaubert, 24 January 1880.

36. In a letter to Countess S. A. Tolstoy (Tolstoy’s wife) of 22 November 1882, Turgenev admits to starting a letter to Tolstoy about his Confession but then changing his mind and abandoning it in fear of repercussions.

37. “Vy pishete chto Tolstoy izuchil grecheskii iazyk s pol’zoi . . . . Eta fraza lish’ nastol’ko menia bespokoit, naskol’ko ona pokazyvaet, chto emu vse eshche khochetsia mudrit’” [“You write that Tolstoy has studied the Greek language with profit. This phrase bothers me only inasmuch as it shows that he still wants to play the wise man”] (letter to Fet, 17 August 1871); “Raduius’ slukham o tom, chto on okanchivaet bol’shoi roman. Dai tol’ko Bog, chtoby tam filosofi ne bylo” [“I rejoice in rumors that have it that he is finishing a big novel. May God give, though, that there should be no philosophy”] (letter to Fet, 11 September 1873).

38. In a letter to L. J. Stechkina (7 May 1878), Turgenev advised the young authoress against reading Tolstoy’s works because it might prejudice her approach.
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3. A. M. Skabichevsky, “Razlad khudozhnika i myslitela.”

5. P. Nikitin [P. N. Tkachev], "Poiavlenie Anny Kareninoi i poedanie onoi saranchei."

6. The articles appeared in various journals (mostly *Otechestvennye zapiski* [Fatherland notes] and *Russkoe bogatstvo* [Russian wealth]—for a while the "official" narodnik publication) from 1875 on (Tolstoy was first mentioned by Mikhailovsky in an article in *Nedelia* in 1868). These articles are reprinted in various editions of Mikhailovsky's collected works. Most references here identify, by volume and page number, passages from N. K. Mikhailovsky, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, from which my translations are made. Excepted are "Desnitsa i shuitsa . . ." [The right and left hands . . . ]; passages from this work are translated from the more readily available Moscow 1957 edition of Mikhailovsky's *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i* and are identified by DS and page number. Articles that were not available to me in the ten-volume edition of Mikhailovsky's complete works I have translated from the two-volume edition of his *Poslednie sochineniia*; these passages are identified by PS and volume and page number.


11. Apparently what he had in mind was to imply a struggle between Tolstoy's Logos and Eros natures.


14. Lev Shestov [Shvartsman], *Dobro i zlo v uchenii Tolstogo i Nietzsche*.

15. For a comparison of their methods, see the recent study by Phillip A. Duncan, "Echoes of Zola's Experimental Novel in Russia."


18. Ibid., p. 256.


21. Grigor'ev referred to overrefinement of form without a corresponding sophistication of message as a kind of intellectual snobbery and called it moral philistinism. See pp. 78–93 above.


CHAPTER SIX
4. Andrei Bely [Boris Bugaev], “Lev Tolstoy.”
12. D. S. Merezhkovsky, *L. Tolstoy i Dostoevsky. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo* (Saint Petersburg, 1901); *Religiiia L. Tolstogo i Dostoevskogo* (Saint Petersburg, 1902). My translations here are from passages, identified by volume and page number, of vol. 7 of the Vol'f edition and vols. 11 and 12 of the Sytin edition of Merezhkovsky's *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*.
13. Announced previously in Merezhkovsky's programmatic essay *O prichinakh upadka i o novykh tehniakh russkoi literatury* [On causes of the decline and new currents in Russian literature] (Saint Petersburg, 1893; rpt. in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*). Merezhkovsky's thesis was that symbolism gave expression to a new religious feeling that was tied in with expectations of the second coming of Christ, who was referred to as “the symbol.” For details see H. Bedford, “Dmitry Merezhkovsky, the Third Testament and the Third Humanity.”
15. Scathing critiques of symbolism as a movement were published by, among others, N. K. Mikhailovsky, who also wrote sharply negative re-
views on Merezhkovsky's study of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky (see Mikhailovsky's collected works, 7:519–50; 10:1069–70). See also K. I. Chukovsky, "D. S. Merezhkovsky (Tainovidets veshchii)" [D. S. Merezhkovsky—the seer of the thing] and Andrei Bely [Boris Bugaev], Nachalo veka, pp. 168–69, 172.

16. In recent years the idea has been given some attention. It has been thoroughly explored by Marshall McLuhan, who developed in this context the concepts of "hot" (high saturation or definition) and "cool" (low definition) media (Understanding Media); see also Gerald E. Stearn, ed., McLuhan: Hot and Cool.
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2. V. V. Veresaev [Smidovich], Zhivaia zhizn'. O Dostoevskom i L've Tolstom.


5. M. Gorky [A. M. Peshkov], Vospominaniia o L've Tolstom.

6. Andreevich [Evgenii A. Solov'ev], L. N. Tolstoy.

7. Petr B. Struve, Stat'i o L've Tolstom.

8. N. N. Iordansky, "Lev Tolstoy i sovremennoe obshchestvo."

9. N. V. Shelgunov, "Filosofiia zastoia."

10. Lubov Axelrod (-Orthodox), Tolstoi Weltanschauung und ihre Entwicklung.

11. L. Axelrod-Orthodox, L. N. Tolstoy: Sbornik statei.

12. Lev Trotsky [Bronstein], "Tolstoy."


15. This passage is translated from G. V. Plekhanov, Literatura i estetika, 1:3–4. Subsequent citations are by volume and page only.

16. See, e.g., Gleb Struve, "Tolstoy in Soviet Criticism," p. 177. See also G. P. Semenova, "Problema ideinosti i khudozhhestvennosti v estetike G. V. Plekhanova"; E. N. Zaslonova, Plekhanov ob esteticheskoi ideale; M. Rozental', "Esteticheskie i literaturno-kriticheskie vzgliady G. V. Plekhanova," preface to G. V. Plekhanov, Iskusstvo i literatura; G. V. Plekhanov, Literatur-

17. The first was the rule of nonresistance to evil. The remaining four were, according to Plekhanov, "do not be angry, do not fornicate, do not swear, do not make war."


19. Lenin's pronouncements on literary matters have been collected in a number of books, most of them repeating the same material extracted piecemeal from his works and the works of those who knew him: S. D. Dreiden, ed., Lenin i iskusstvo, Literatura. Muzyka. Teatr. Kino; M. Lifshits, ed., Lenin o kulture i iskusstve; Lenin o literature; N. I. Krutikova, ed; Lenin o kulture i iskusstve; and N. I. Krutikova, ed., V. I. Lenin o literature i iskusstve.


22. Gleb Struve, "Tolstoy in Soviet Criticism."

23. "Artistic works founded on pure observation become 'documents,'" writes D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky, citing a term made current by Emile Zola, "by which it is possible to study an epoch" ("'Pushkinskoe' i 'Gogolevskoe': Khudozhestvennyi method Gogolia," Sobranie sochinenii, 1:48).

24. The first stage, as explained by the Marxists-Leninists, began with the abortive Decembrist revolt of 1825, which was staged by a small band of progressive, dedicated noblemen. The second stage (1865–1905) was carried by the raznochintsy, a much larger group and one much closer to the people, made up of men from all walks of life. The third and final stage was to be carried by the proletariat, the equivalent of all the Russians. Each stage would take the mythical forty years (cf. the biblical Exodus). Accordingly the revolution proper was to take place about 1945, not 1917. This explains Lenin's puzzling statement on 22 January 1917 that "we older men may not live to see the decisive battles of the approaching revolution." For details see Robert K. Massie, Nicholas and Alexandra, pp. 461 ff. The statement underscores the mythical base of Lenin's thinking.

25. See Aristotle's Poetics, beginning of chap. 9.

26. LEF (the name means "left front in art") was a Futurist-founded organization, as well as a journal founded by Futurists in 1923 in which they asserted their claim to dominate the art of the future and opposed the tendency, already manifest, toward a return to a conservative realism. For


28. Herman Ermolaev, review of *Vom kritischen zum sozialistischen Realismus*, p. 90.


