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Comprised of some fourteen articles by scholars from Russia, Europe, and North America, the entries in this volume consider different aspects of Tolstoy’s early creative efforts and how they were received both within Russia and abroad. The essays here were first presented at a conference held in Tbilisi in June 2002.


Though published in North America some time ago, this novel has only recently come out in Russia, where, together with other of the author’s works, it has gained a certain notoriety. Written in the form of a series of letters, the novel addresses a variety of topics from observations of everyday life to philosophical contemplations that are at times shocking and at others sarcastic, and quite often controversial. Not the least among the latter is Armalinskii’s reading of Tolstoy’s The Kreutzer Sonata. He is struck by Tolstoy’s sexual immaturity and considers the story to be a pile of nonsense and ignorance. Armalinskii is clearly of the view that, given the nature of man’s sexual desires, ‘pure’ relations between the sexes simply do not exist.


Tolstoy’s relationship with and support of conscientious objectors is shown to constitute an essential part of his Weltanschauung as this evolved from the 1870s on. It was the writer’s sanguine belief that the young men who objected to military service on grounds of conscience were standard bearers who would help to transform the world and establish peace among humankind. Two features stand out in Tolstoy’s relations with imprisoned conscientious objectors: his unflinching efforts to publicize each case as it became known to him and his intervention on their behalf with civilian and military authorities to ensure that these men were not punished repeatedly for the same offence; and second, his concern for the personal welfare and spiritual equilibrium of those incarcerated in what were often extremely trying circumstances. It is shown that Tolstoy was remarkably understanding in his relationship with potential conscientious objectors who could not withstand the pressure, and agreed to serve in the armed forces. Unlike his leading disciple, Vladimir Chertkov, who was more intractable, Tolstoy was flexible enough to tell these men that they had done the right thing, especially when their actions led to discord within their respective families, and refrained from expressing disapproval. Tolstoy also experienced a great deal of guilt at not being placed behind bars when the government jailed these young men, often for many years, because they had acted as he told them a Christian should.


This is a detailed investigation into various textual problems relating to Tolstoy’s early creative output. The author limits herself to the first five years of Tolstoy’s literary career, 1851-1855, and deals with such issues as, among others, the exact chronology of Tolstoy’s first writings, their submission to the censors and history of publication, autobiographical traces, and the
sources consulted by Tolstoy when composing these early works. Burnasheva’s approach is based on a detailed study of Tolstoy’s manuscripts as well as other relevant documents and she presents findings from newly discovered archival materials here for the first time.


Tolstoy’s description of nature in volume two, part four, chapters 9-12 of War and Peace extols the birth of Christ through its use of colour, sound, and movement. In these chapters nature doesn’t so much reflect the mental state of the characters as it provokes them and fashions their emotions. Tolstoy renders this influence in two different ways: the moonlight, stars, and pure brilliance of the snow evoke a sense of magic, richness, and intimations of an otherworldly paradise; while the opposites of light-dark, colour-non-colour, sound-silence sharply contrast the divine world of nature with the world of men. The character most affected by nature is Nikolai Rostov, who, under the spell of moonlight and the pristine winter landscape, sees something new in Sonia, which, in turn, leads to his decision to marry her.

• Carter, Steven. “Hemingway’s A Clean, Well-Lighted Place and Tolstoy’s The Death of Ivan Ilych.” The Explicator 61, no. 3 (Spring 2003): 162-164.

Describes and compares Hemingway’s story with Tolstoy’s. Neither of the two fictions is intended to unite the Gordian knot of doubt, which readers must confront on their own. Instead the elucidation of the pronoun “it” in both stories re-tie the knot, as it were, by foregrounding “something” and “nothing” not as opposites but as complementary entities.


Argues that Tolstoy’s perception of the devil as the “voice of the flesh” is of crucial importance in understanding his works written after the spiritual crisis he experienced in the late 1870s. Commonalities between The Devil and Father Sergius are examined as both stories tell of a demonic call to sexual licentiousness, and of a man’s horrified response to that call. Both stories begin with a portrait of a young man possessing tremendous prospects in life, and each goes on to show how the fate of their respective characters takes an unexpected turn. In the two stories, the central problem in the hero’s path is sexual desire and at crucial moments in each story the protagonist sees the woman who arouses his desire as the “devil.” By resorting to this stereotype of a woman as an agent of the devil, Tolstoy, Connolly suggests, looks back to an earlier era as the women in these stories do not escape being tarred with this traditional pejorative label. While Connolly is careful to point out that Tolstoy makes both Iriney and Father Sergius responsible for their conduct, he believes the use of demonic imagery in connection with women in these stories points to a palpable turbulence within the author himself.


When philosophers recommend an attitude to death, no less than when they recommend the correct attitude to sex, we presume such advice to be grounded in rational considerations about what is natural and proper. Two things must follow: first, that there will be room for perversity attitudes to death; second, that some objective facts about death can be found to justify such an evaluation. This essay explores a parallel between the duality of psychological and biological approaches to erotic desire, regarded as the paradigm of all desire, and a similar duality in the fear of death, regarded as the paradigm of all aversion. Each invokes an objective teleological fact about their respective objects, and a consequent norm of correctness in our attitudes towards them. The exploration of these two related ideas requires that we yield as generously as possible to the temptation to believe them. Tolstoy’s The Death of Ivan Ilych is read here as a mediation that makes the temptation vivid.


An informative account of the difficulties encountered in trying to establish Iasnaia Poliana as a world-class museum and cultural institution. The focus is on Vladimir Tolstoy, the great-great-grandson of the famous writer, who was appointed director of the estate in 1994 amid a storm of controversy. His efforts to eradicate Soviet-era backwardness and corruption amid the
changing political and cultural landscape of the new Russia forms the bulk of the article and makes for interesting reading. His dedication and optimism are clearly evident and appear undiminished, despite the wide variety of personal and professional hardships he has been forced to endure over the last ten years.


As the subtitle suggests, this collection of essays is divided into three sections that examine Tolstoy as an artist, reader, and thinker respectively. The entries in the first section deal with specific works, while those in the second centre on the library at Jasnaia Poliana with separate articles looking at Tolstoy as a reader of foreign literature, his familiarity with St. Augustine, and the French sources of War and Peace. The final section is devoted to broader philosophical and religious concerns in Tolstoy’s life and writings.


Topics relating to pedagogy include essays on Tolstoy’s views on the development of religious consciousness, the methodological underpinnings of his approach to education, and the philosophical-educational ideas of the writer in relation to the spiritual development of children’s personalities. Under area studies there are essays on such subjects as Tolstoy and Kazan, Tolstoy and the lessons of the war in the Caucasus, and the role occupied by Tolstoy in the culture of the Chechen people.


In Anna Karenina Tolstoy presents ways of seeing people and their lives that philosophy is poorer for neglecting. The opening section explores how Tolstoy utilizes intuitive impressions as the voice of conscience and the inadequacy of the moral codes of both Vronsky and Karenin to accommodate the needs and emotional complexity of others. Anna is the focus of the middle section. It looks at the tension created between Tolstoy’s inclination toward moral criticism of his heroine and the convincing portrayal of the strength of the pressures brought to bear on her. As she heads toward disaster, there is no single clear point where what before was only hard to resist becomes irresistible. “In that way,” Glover maintains, “Tolstoy faithfully reproduces the blurred moral boundaries of real life, rather than the artificially sharp ones of legal and moral theory” (168). The final section looks at Tolstoy’s view of seriousness. Anna’s love is seen to be as serious as Levin’s questioning and part of what they have in common is that both care about things that are not trivial.


Tolstoy’s heroines display the kind of development that closely corresponds to the Jungian model of individuation. While their male protagonists seek to take the world by storm or discover the meaning of life, Tolstoy’s female heroes characteristically strive to come to terms with the intractable givens of existence. Gregg explores this affinity by comparing Tolstoy’s early novella, Family Happiness, with the myth of Amor (Cupid) and Psyche as told by Apuleius. He finds correspondences between the development of Masha, Tolstoy’s heroine and narrator, and the mythical figure of Psyche. They are both beautiful young women forced to lead an unnaturally cloistered life; both find a male deliverer, both grow lonely and restless in their “beautiful prisons”—their discontent exacerbated by awakening sexual desire; both endure a period of difficulty and estrangement from their partners; and finally both achieve reconciliation and find happiness. In contrast to her mythological counterpart, the sexual awakening experienced by Masha, Gregg explains, is treated by Tolstoy as a backward and not a forward step toward self-realization. “Tolstoy the ‘Calvinist,’ having allowed his wayward heroine her fling, puts her, chastened and rueful, back into her doll’s house, gives her two baby boys to play with and throws away the key” (279). He concludes that the character of Masha is both exceptional and typical of female characters in Tolstoy’s later works. Exceptional in that the gamut of experiences through which the writer puts his later heroines is nowhere to be found in Masha’s story and
typical in that the sole natural sphere of activity for a woman was, in Tolstoy’s eyes, the home. This is where Masha, foreshadowing the fates of Natasha, Princess Mary, Kitty, and Dolly, finds herself—ensconced in her “doll’s house” at the end of the novella.


Tolstoy’s story, it is suggested, plays out the conflicting urges of its author’s psychology at the time of his spiritual crisis. Brekhunov is Tolstoy’s self-portrait of pride, independence, waywardness, and, ultimately, death. Conversely, the peasant Nikita represents his hoped-for future self of simplicity, certitude, and life everlasting.


Although Tolstoy famously lost his ancestral home at a game of “shits” in 1855, while serving as an officer in the Crimean War, he did not devote substantial attention to gambling in his writing. As such, the place he occupies in this book is relatively minor. Helfant briefly discusses two of Tolstoy’s early stories, Notes of a Billiard Marker (1855) and Two Hussars (1856), in which gambling serves as the central motif. Dolokhov’s fleeing of Nikolai Rostov of forty-three thousand roubles in War and Peace receives closer attention. Here Helfant sees in Rostov’s ruminations on his loss not only a youthful naiveté, but also Tolstoy’s attempt to represent a worldview that played a significant role in the nobility’s financial decline. “Nikolai seems incapable of both attributing his opponent’s winning streak to cheating and of realizing that Dolokhov is willing to ruin him”(121). In Anna Karenina Helfant looks at Vronsky’s code of conduct, which states that though debts to the tailor may not be paid, gambling debts must. This distillation of gender honour codes fails Vronsky during the course of the novel, as he is unable to deal with complications of his relationship with Anna within their confines. Vronsky assumes that his affair with Anna will lead to a duel with her husband and he finds himself at a loss when it does not. His bungled attempt to shoot himself represents a substitution for the missing duel.


In a general but highly interesting manner, correspondences in the lives and works of Tolstoy and Jean-Paul Sartre are drawn out. Though very different from one another, both these men symbolized in the eyes of the world not only their respective countries and time periods but virtually their respective centuries. Beginning with their childhoods and progressing through adulthood, Huston looks at how both aspired to use the immense power of their minds to become great men. Their love of books, attitudes towards women, and respective spiritual crises are compared, as are the relationships each had with their life partners, Sophie Tolstoy and Simone de Beauvoir. Noting that both writers were tempted by didacticism, and that Sartre alone allowed himself to be reduced to it, Huston argues that this was not the result of temperament, but of temporality: after the First World War, the traditional values of Western civilization were thrown into question and age-old certainties collapsed. This produced a new type of writer, one for whom “stories” seemed childish and irresponsible. Sartre sustained a detachment from the social side of life that Tolstoy, though he tried, never managed to maintain and this made him, almost against his will, a giant of world literature.


Kamm believes The Death of Ivan Ilych reveals how we can have some control over the process of dying and what death itself signifies. He considers several characteristics of Ivan’s death in order to investigate how they could have varied if he had lived his life differently. According to Kamm, death robbing Ivan of his life is less important than the process of dying robbing him of pleasant illusions about his life. That is why Ivan’s desire to know he has not wasted his life ultimately overpowers his desire to go on living. In this respect, Ivan needs death in order to be concerned with the real worth of his life. “Tolstoy,” Kamm argues, “is warning us that when someone must die, his primary concern will not be with death per se but with how he has lived his life”(215). He then proceeds to show how Ivan’s resistance to death and to the truth about his life causes him more suffering than the awareness of his approaching death and misspent life. Even though the actual end of Ivan’s life amounts to only a few good thoughts, it was worth the struggle for he was able to detach him-
The text of a speech given by the President of the Republic of Iran at the Moscow State University Institute of International Relations, during the course of his official visit to Russia in March 2001. Khatami speaks briefly about the relationship between freedom and justice, stressing the importance of the contributions made by Tolstoy and other Russian writers to our understanding of this relationship.


When Tolstoy began to publish War and Peace, he recognized that having an overall plan or structure in mind would make it impossible to represent contingency, his central theme, because the demands of a whole would guide events. As he explains in his draft prefaces and essay on War and Peace, Tolstoy did without a structure. In each serially published installment, he simply set up a series of potentials that could develop in many directions, and, writing from scene to scene, chose one of the rich possibilities available. As such, Morson explains, Tolstoy suggests that the creative process has the same presentness, contingency, and evenness as the events in the narrated world. Like his characters, Tolstoy has no idea what will happen to them next. The result is that the reader senses that whatever happened, something else might; and that the War and Peace we have is only one of the many possible books that could have emerged. This argument about Tolstoy serves as an illustration to a concept that Morson is calling “narrativeness.”


This book looks at the reign of Alexander II and the impact of his policies on the writers, thinkers, and revolutionaries of the period. In doing so, it closely examines the personal and public lives of such prominent individuals as Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Turgenev. Though he is mentioned throughout the book, Tolstoy is also the subject of five separate chapters, which discuss his military career in the Crimea, his life in the capital, his visit to Herzen, his marriage and the writing of War and Peace, and his reconciliation with Turgenev in 1878.


Ivan Fyodorovich Nazhavin (1874-1940) was a prolific, now largely forgotten, writer of the first wave of Russian émigrés. The author of more than thirty novels, he was deeply influenced by the ethical teachings of Tolstoy. In addition to Tolstoy’s Soul: The Burning Bush, which was first published in 1936, Nazhavin published two other works—My Confession and From the Life of L. N. Tolstoy—that were directly inspired by the elder writer. Tolstoy’s Soul follows a chronological narrative that focuses on the great writer’s search for Truth and the meaning of life. This edition marks the first time the novel has been published in Russia.


William James greatly admired Tolstoy’s fiction, and this is partly because the thought of the two authors has common roots in transcendental philosophy as it affected both American and Russian culture. This article explores the role of belief in the psychological theories of both authors and its grounding in transcendentalism. For James, Tolstoy represents part of his refutation of Schopenhauer, while, unbeknownst to James, Tolstoy underwent and partly overcame his own Schopenhauerian crisis. The two reacted to Schopenhauer somewhat differently, however, and the article concludes with a discussion of these differences.


The final volume of the academic edition of Tolstoy’s complete collected works appeared in 1958. This book offers a "behind-the-scenes" account of how the editors managed, in spite of considerable adversity, to publish all ninety volumes of this edition over a period of thirty
years. The book is laid out chronologically and it revisits the hardships encountered by the editorial staff as they persevered with their work through some of the darkest periods of Soviet history. The author makes extensive use of the diary kept by Nikolai Rodionov, one of the lead editors. The determination exhibited by Rodionov and others to publish all of Tolstoy despite opposition, official and otherwise, is vividly recounted. Attached as an appendix is a compilation of Tolstoy’s religious and social views as he expressed them after 1879. It is divided into two sections—“God and Man” and “Man and Society”—and each section offers and extensive number of citations that relate to these two themes.


A large, wide-ranging collection of essays devoted to both literary and non-literary research. With sections on the Tolstoy museum in Moscow, archival holdings, Tolstoy’s family, and an extended bibliography of materials published on Tolstoy in 2000, this yearbook offers an overview of contemporary Tolstoy scholarship in Russia. The sixth and by far the largest section contains more than a dozen essays on Tolstoy’s creative writings with the contributors almost equally divided between analysis of single works and broader thematic concerns.


This special Russian–German bilingual edition of the journal is devoted to Rilke’s relationship with Tolstoy and his visits to Jasnaja Poljana. The opening chapter looks briefly at the history of the estate and chapters two and three recount the two separate occasions when Rilke stayed there. Subsequent chapters compare the impressions of others who had the opportunity to visit Jasnaja Poljana with Rilke’s and the importance of Tolstoy and his estate in Rilke’s writings and letters. The text is complemented by numerous interesting photographs of Rilke in Russia, Tolstoy and his family, and life on the estate.


White disagrees with Isaiah Berlin’s interpretation of Tolstoy’s view of history. Berlin famously argued that Tolstoy was a fox who knew many things but vainly aspired in War and Peace to be a hedgehog who knew one big thing. White, on the other hand, regards Tolstoy as fox who wanted to be a fox, an empiricist who arrived at the big truth of metaphysical determinism, but who did not try to make intellectual contact with an inscrutable entity that Berlin says he felt but inevitably failed to identify. He maintains that Berlin’s philosophical antipathy to determinism as revealed in his lecture “Historical Inevitability,” published in 1954, a year after The Hedgehog and the Fox appeared, may have led him to suppose that Tolstoy paid only lip service to that doctrine and therefore to think that as a philosophical thinker Tolstoy was after very different metaphysical game. The essay elucidates the reasons why White believes Tolstoy never tried in War and Peace to acquire knowledge of what Berlin calls a “circumambient flow,” and why Tolstoy’s view of history led him to regard determinism as an acceptable metaphysics.