INTRODUCTION

1 The Slavophiles have as a matter of course received the greatest attention, but a few studies of other conservative individuals are available. A comprehensive list appears in the bibliography. Two useful works, which attempt to draw together elements of the conservative tradition are E.C. Thaden, *Conservative Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Seattle 1964), and Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought* (Oxford 1975).

2 Two works of Soviet scholarship have been particularly important for the present study: B.F. Egorov, 'Apollon Grigor’ev – kritik,' *Uchenye zapiski Tartuskogo gos. universiteta*, xcvi (1960), 104–246 and B.G. Bazanov et al, *Neizdannyi Dostoevskii, Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, lxxxiii (Moscow 1971).

3 Richard Pipes has provided the most satisfactory working definition of Russian conservatism. Conservatism in Russia, he writes, is the ‘ideology which advocates for Russia an authoritarian government subject to restraints neither by formal law nor by an elected legislature but only of such limitations as it sees fit to impose on itself’; R. Pipes, ‘Russian Conservatism, in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century,’ *Slavic Review*, xxx no. 1 (March 1971), 121.

4 For a penetrating analysis of this aspect of the mentality of the Russian peasantry, see Daniel Field, *Rebels in the Name of the Tsar* (Boston 1976).

5 The great diversity of use of the term *intelligentsia* has prompted a few historians to abandon it altogether. See, for example, Daniel Brower, 'The Problem of the Russian Intelligentsia,' *Slavic Review*, xxvi no. 4 (December 1967), 638–47. Most historians prefer, however, to go on using the word
because the advantages of abandoning it and finding substitutes are often more apparent than real. In the case of the individuals discussed in this book, it is difficult to find an adequate substitute for 'intelligentsia conservatives.' The varieties of conservatism in nineteenth-century Russia were too great for 'conservative' to stand alone, but the addition of 'educated,' 'intellectual,' or 'philosophical' to 'conservative' is very far from satisfactory. None of these adjectives is as precise in meaning as intelligentsia and none conveys the oppositional character of the attitude of these particular conservatives towards the existing order as well as does intelligentsia. Most of the men discussed in this book were 'publicists' but by no means all conservative publicists of their day shared either the social characteristics or the specific views of the 'young editors' or the poshemniki. Nor were all 'conservative nationalists' opposed to the existing régime. It may, indeed, be argued that only the phrase 'intelligentsia conservatism' adequately describes both the social characteristics and the peculiar ideological amalgam of loyalty to tradition and opposition to the established order of the 'native soil' movement.

For an intelligent and balanced discussion of relations between the state and society in the first half of the nineteenth century, see N.V. Riasanovsky, A Parting of Ways. Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801–1855 (Oxford 1976).

7 Cited in ibid. 249–50
10 These behavioural patterns of the Russian intelligentsia conform to the model suggested by Karl Mannheim in his discussion of what he calls the 'socially unattached intelligentsia.' See Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge (New York 1936), 155–61.
11 In his study of the Russian nihilists, Brower points out the dangers of linking ideology to social origins; Daniel R. Brower, Training the Nihilists. Education and Radicalism in Tsarist Russia (Ithaca and London 1975), 117–18.

CHAPTER ONE: CONSERVATISM AND THE SEARCH FOR NATIONAL ORIGINALITY

1 The following brief account of the European conservative tradition rests on the work of a number of scholars. I have relied extensively on Klaus Epstein, The Genesis of German Conservatism (Princeton 1966); Russell Kirk, The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana (Chicago 1953); Noel O'Sullivan, Conservatism (London 1976); and John Weiss, Conservatism in Europe, 1700–1945. Traditionalism, Reaction and Counter-Revolution (London 1977).
2 O'Sullivan, Conservatism, 10–11
3 Ibid., 11
4 Edmund Burke, Reflections on the Revolution in France (Indianapolis and New York 1955), 70
5 Ibid., 99
7 Weiss, Conservatism, 18
8 O'Sullivan, Conservatism, 12
9 Weiss, Conservatism, 42
10 S.T. Coleridge, The Friend (London 1850), 268
11 Weiss, Conservatism, 53
12 The best introduction to the political thought of the German romantics is Reinhold Aris, History of Political Thought in Germany from 1789–1815 (London 1946).
15 Shcherbatov's O povrzhdenii nравов v Rossii was written in 1786–9 but published for the first time, by Herzen, only in 1858.
17 Ibid, 435
19 Hans Rogger has traced this development in his National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia (Cambridge, Mass, 1960).

21. Russian romantic and idealist thought in the first half of the nineteenth century is discussed in a number of sources. Most useful are D.I. Chizhevskii, *Gegel v Rossii* (Paris 1939); Alexandre Köyre, *Études sur l’histoire de la pensée philosophique en Russie* (Paris 1950) and *La Philosophie et le problème national en Russie au début du XIXe siècle* (Paris 1929); and I.I. Zamoish, *Romantizm dvadcatykh godov XIX stoletiia v russkoi literaturе* (Warsaw 1903) and *Romanticheskii idealizm v russkom obshchestve i literaturе 20–30x godov XIX stoletiia* (St Petersburg 1907).


CHAPTER TWO: THE YOUNG EDITORS OF MOSKVITIANIN

1. The careers of Pogodin and Chevyrev have been examined in Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1855* (Berkeley 1959).


3. The origins of the young editors’ circle are discussed in N. Barsukov, *Zhitn’ i trudy M.P. Pogodina, xi* (St Petersburg 1897) 64–72. See also S. Ven’gerov, ‘Molodaia redaktsiia Moskvitianina,’ *Vestnik Evropy*, 1 (1886), 581–612.

4. A.A. Grigor’ev was the son of a bureaucrat who had attained hereditary nobility on the *Table of Ranks*, E.N. Edel’son was the son of a gymnasium teacher in Riazan’, A.N. Ostrovskii was from a priestly family which had later entered the bureaucracy, A.F. Pismenskii came from the impoverished gentry, I.A. Polonskii was the son of a bureaucrat, and I.A. Mei was the son of a disabled army officer of German origin.

5. See, for example, Vengerov, ‘Molodaia,’ 590–5 and F. Nelidov, ‘A.N. Ostrovskii v kruzhke molodogo Moskvitianina,’ *Russkaia myst* III (St Petersburg 1901), 17–19.


9. A contemporary later noted that the young editors lived in an orgy of song; S.V. Maksimov, ‘A.N. Ostrovskii po moim vospominaniam,’ *Dramaticheskie sochineniia A.N. Ostrovskogo*, XI (St Petersburg n.d.), 12–16.


11. The influence of Herder on Grigor’ev and the native soil movement will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 3.

12. A.N. O[strovskii], ‘*Oshibka*, povest’ G–zhi Tur,’ *Moskovuzhnik* (April 1850), 88–9. Evgenii Tur was the pseudonym of Elisaveta Vasil’evna Salias-de-Turnenir (1815–1892), a minor novelist.


15. V.V. Zenkovsky refers to the young editors’ romantic proclivity for immediately felt experience as the ‘cult of immediacy’; V.V. Zenkovsky, *A History of Russian Philosophy* I (London 1953), 402.

16. E.N. Edel’son, ‘Zhurnalistikia, *Moskvitianin* (November 1854), 81–2. A month earlier Edel’son had deplored critics who greeted any work of art, no matter how devoid of talent, as a ‘welcome phenomenon’ so long as it was useful; Edel’son, ‘Zhurnalistikia, *Moskovuzhnik* (October 1854), 188. Grigor’ev’s views on art were outlined in his *Russkaia literatura v 1851 godu.*


18. A.A. Grigor’ev, *Sochenieniia Apollona Grigor’eva*, I, N. Strakhov ed (St Petersburg 1875), 120.


20. See, for example, N.L. Rubinstein, ‘ Apollon Grigor’ev,’ *Literatura i marksizm*, II (Moscow 1929), 104–6; and U.A. Gural’nik, ‘*Sovremennik* v bor’be s zhurnalami Dostoevskogo,’ *Izvestiia Akademii Nauk SSSR. Otdelenie literatu-ry i isyaka*, IX no. 4 (Moscow 1950), 268.


A. Walicki views the Slavophiles as the defenders of the pre-capitalist social structure as a whole and not simply of their own gentry class: ‘Slavophilism was the ideology of the hereditary Russian nobility who were reluctant to stand up on their own behalf as a privileged group defending its own selfish interests and therefore attempted to sublimate and universalize traditional values and to create an ideological platform that would unite all classes and social strata representing “ancient Russia’”; Andrzej Walicki, The Slavophile Controversy (Oxford 1975), 177–8. The traditional values which they sought to universalize remained, however, the patriarchal values of rural Russia.

Barsukov, Pogodina, xiv (1900), 200

CHAPTER THREE: GRIGOR’EV AND ORGANIC CRITICISM


2 The main exception is E.C. Thaden, who included a useful chapter on Grigor’ev in his Conservative Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Russia (Seattle 1964).

3 The best short biographical essay available in English is Krupitsch’s introduction to his edition of Grigor’ev’s selected essays cited above. Grigor’ev’s own autobiography is available in English: see Apollon Grigoryev, My Literary and Moral Wanderings, Ralph Matlaw trans (New York 1962).

4 Grigor’ev reminisced about his childhood years in his ‘Moi literaturanye i naravstvennye skitac’hestva. Avtobiografiiia.’ Sobranie sochineniia, i–xiv, V. Savodnik ed (Moscow 1915–19), 7ff.

5 A.A. Fet, the poet, lived as a boarder in the Grigor’ev home from 1839. He later provided invaluable information about Grigor’ev’s childhood and painted an intimate portrait of life in the family during Grigor’ev’s university years; A.A. Fet, ‘Rannie gody moei zhizni’ in A.A. Grigor’ev, Vospominaniia, R.V. Ivanov-Razumnik ed (Moscow-Leningrad 1930), 387–413.

6 For details about Grigor’ev’s circle, see ibid., 400–3 and Ia. P. Polonskii, ‘Moi studenscheskie vosprozvaniemia,’ Niva (December 1898), 642–87.


8 Fet made it clear that by ‘dogmatic structure’ Grigor’ev meant the humiliating restrictions placed on him by his mother; ‘Rannie gody moei zhizni,’ 394–7.

9 The play is reproduced in A.A. Grigor’ev Izbrannya proizvedeniia, Kostelanets ed, 183–268.

10 V.G. Belinskii, Izbrannya filosofskie sochineniia, i (Moscow 1948), 313


12 For Grigor’ev’s efforts to revive Moskvitinian, see I.S. Zil’bershtein, ‘Apollon Grigor’ev i popytka vozrodit’ Moskvitinian (nakanune sotrudnichestva v zhurnalе Vremia),’ Literaturnoe nasledstvo, txxxvi (Moscow 1973), 567–80.

13 Grigor’ev to A.I. Koshelev, Materialy, 150–2.

14 Grigor’ev to A.N. Maikov, ibid, 175

15 Grigor’ev to M.P. Pogodin, ibid, 227

16 Nicholas Berdyaev. Izlevi (Orono, Me, 1968), 151


19 A.N. Maikov to A.I. Maikova, Literaturnoe nasledstvo, txxxvi, 398

20 Belinskii, Izbrannya, i, 72 (Belinsky’s emphasis)

21 Ibid, i, 145–6 (Belinsky’s emphasis)

22 Ibid, ii, 443

23 Ibid, ii, 278

24 Belinsky discusses the relationship of the author to his environment and the theory of types in ibid, ii, 432–46.

25 Grigor’ev, ‘I.S. Turgenev,’ 324

26 A.A. Grigor’ev, ‘Posle “Grozny” Ostrovskogo,’ Sochineniia, i, N.N. Strakhov ed (St Petersburg 1876), 458

27 A.A. Grigor’ev, ‘O pravde i iskrennosti v iskusstve,’ ibid, 141–2

28 A.A. Grigor’ev, ‘Vzglad na russkuiu literaturu so smerti Pushkina,’ Literaturnaia kritika, 187

29 Grigor’ev, ‘O pravde,’ 142
30 A.A. Grigor’ev, ‘Kriticheskii vzhid na osnovy, znachenii i priemy sovremen-
noi kritiki iskusstva,’ *Literaturturnia krîtika*, 125
31 Grigor’ev, ‘Posle “Grozy”’, 451
32 Heinrich Stammer, *Dostoevsky’s Aesthetics and Schelling’s Philosophy
of Art,* *Comparative Literature, vii* (Fall 1955), 317
33 Grigor’ev, ‘I.S. Turgenev,’ 324
34 Ibid
35 Grigor’ev, ‘Vzhid na russkoiu literaturu,’ 166–7
36 Grigor’ev, ‘Kriticheskii vzhid,’ 127
37 Ibid, 129
38 For an excellent discussion of nineteenth-century European idealism, on
which my own summary relies, see Maurice Mandelbaum, *History, Man
39 Belinskii, *Izbrannye, i, 65 and 74
40 Ibid, 1, 495
41 G.W.F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (New York 1956), 78
42 F.W.J. von Schelling, *Of Human Freedom*, James Gutmann trans (Chicago
1936), 62
43 Ibid, 95
44 Ibid, 108
45 Grigor’ev, ‘Kriticheskii vzhid,’ 134
46 For a discussion of Setschkaroff’s findings, see Lauren Leighton, *Russian
Romanticism: Two Essays* (The Hague 1975), especially 44 and 104.
47 For the following interpretation of Herder’s thought, I have relied exten-
sively on the work of F.M. Barnard. See his introductory essay in J.G. Herder
Herder, 66
49 Grigor’ev discussed ‘historical feeling’ in his ‘Kriticheskii vzhid,’ 146–50.
Khomjakov, too, had identified two stages in the development of rationalism: 1) Enlightenment, and 2) Hegel.
50 J.G. Herder, ‘Yet Another Philosophy of History,’ Barnard ed. *J.G. Herder,
214
51 Odin iz mnogikh nenuzhnykh liudei [Grigor’ev], ‘O postepennom no by-
strom i povsemestnom rasprostranenii nevezhestva i bezgromotnosti v
russkoi slovesnosti,’ *Vremia* (March 1861), sect iv, 40–1
52 Herder, ‘Yet Another,’ 204
53 Grigor’ev, ‘Kriticheskii vzhid,’ 134
54 Ibid
55 Herder, ‘Yet Another,’ 194

193 Notes to pp 54–64

56 Grigor’ev, ‘Kriticheskii vzhid,’ 134
57 For a more detailed discussion of Herder’s understanding of the Volk, see
58 I.V. Kireevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 11 (Moscow 1911, reprint 1970), 149
59 Grigor’ev, ‘O komediakh Ostrovskogo i ikh znachenii v literature i na
stse,’ *Sochineniia Apollona Grigor’eva*, 1, Strakhov ed, 119; or ‘Posle “Grozy”’,
477–8
60 Belinski, *Izbrannye, i, 343
61 Barnard, *J.G. Herder*, 50
62 Grigor’ev, ‘Vzhid na russkoiu literaturu,’ 167 (emphasis added)
63 Herder, ‘Yet Another,’ 215
64 Grigor’ev, ‘Kriticheskii vzhid,’ 134. Robert Williams regarded the emphasis
placed on the soul (as opposed to the Hegelian spirit) as the distinguishing
characteristic of the native soil movement; R.C. Williams, *The Russian Soul:
A Study in European Thought and Non-European Nationalism,* *Journal of
65 A.A. Grigor’ev, ‘Vzhid na istoriu Rossii. Sochineniia S. Solov’eva,’ *Rus-
skoe slovo* (January 1859), 39–44
66 Grigor’ev to M.P. Pogodin, *Materialy*, 246
67 Grigor’ev to A.N. Mal’kov, ibid, 217
68 Grigor’ev outlined his views on the predatory and humble types in Rus-
sian literature in Grigor’ev, *Vzhid na russkoiu literaturu,’ 175–85.
69 Grigor’ev, ‘I.S. Turgenev i ego deiatel’nost’, 297. In this passage, Grigor’
ev completely identifies art and reality.
70 Ibid, 316
71 [Anon] A.A. Grigor’ev, ‘Nasha pristan,’ *Yakov*, no. 3 (1863), 41

CHAPTER FOUR: INTELLIGENTSIA CONSERVATISM
IN THE EMANCIPATION PERIOD

1 V.S. Nechaeva, *Zhurnal M.M. i F.M. Dostoevskikh Vremen*, 1861–1863
(Moscow 1972), 5
2 Cited in I.I. Zamotin, *Sorokanye i shestidesiatye gody* (Moscow-Petrograd 1915),
227
3 N.N. Strakhov, *Vospominaniiia o Fedore Mikhailovich Dostoevskom,* *Biogra-
gia, pis’ma i zametki iz zapisnii knizhki F.M. Dostoevskogo*, O. Miller and N.
Strakhov eds (St Petersburg 1883), 156–9 and 232
4 See N. Barsukov, *Zhiani trudy M.P. Pogodina*, vii (St Petersburg 1903),
307–38 for the program of *Parus* and extracts from the most important
articles that appeared in the only two issues that were published.
strakhov (1828–1896), the son of a priest, was born in Belgorod near Kharkov. He received his early education in a seminary. In 1844, he came to St Petersburg and registered at first in the juridical faculty as an auditor. In 1845, he transferred to the mathematical faculty. Owing to a family quarrel, he lost his stipend after a little more than a year and was forced once again to transfer, this time to the Chief Pedagogical Institute. This move obligated him to ten years' teaching service after graduation. After completing his studies, he was posted to Odessa but within a year was assigned to a gymnasium in St Petersburg. Here he remained for nine years. Along with his teaching, he pursued graduate work in biology, and in 1857 he received a master's degree. Apart from his interest in the natural sciences, he had acquired a wide knowledge of philosophy and European literature. His publishing career began in 1857 and occupied him fully until his death. For a detailed study of Strakhov's life and work, see Linda Gerstein, Nikolai Strakhov. Philosopher, Man of Letters, Social Critic (Cambridge, Mass., 1971).

30 N.N. Strakhov, 'Vospominaniia o A.A. Grigor'ev'e,' Epokha (September 1864), 3.
34 Strakhov, 'Vospominaniia o Dostoevskom,' 205.
35 Gerstein, Nikolai Strakhov, 53. Also see Nechaeva, Zhurnal "Vremia,' 17.
36 Strakhov, 'Vospominaniia o Grigor'ev'e,' 7. Strakhov pointed out also that the editors of Vremia printed Grigor'ev's articles as if they were editorials; ibid, 29.
37 A.A. Grigor'ev, 'Zhurnal'nyi mir i ego iavleniia, t, Iakor', no. 6 (1869), 102.

CHAPTER FIVE: NATIVE SOIL

1 In Fathers and Children, I.S. Turgenev epitomized the realist in the character of Bazarov. Less well known are some of his attempts to portray the urge to return to Russia. In the following passage from Rudin, Turgenev wrote: 'Rudin's misfortune consists in the fact that he does not know Russia, and that is truly a great misfortune. Russia can get along without any one of us, but none of us can get along without her. Woe to him who thinks he can,
woe twice over to him who actually does get along without her. Cosmopolitanism is nonsense; the cosmopolitan is a cipher, and worse than a cipher; outside nationality there is neither art, nor truth, nor life. Without a distinct physiognomy, there is no such thing even as an ideal face; only a vulgar face is possible without a distinct physiognomy;' I.S. Turgenev, *Sochinenia*, iv (Moscow 1860), 115–16.

2 From the manifesto of *Vremia* for 1860 in F.M. Dostoevskii, *Biografiia*, pis'ma i zapeti iz zapisoi knizhki F.M. Dostoevskogo, O. Miller and N. Strakhov eds (St Petersburg 1889), 177

3 F.M. Dostoevskii, 'Riad statei o russkoi literature. Poslednie literaturnye avtorenii. Gazeta Den', *Vremia* (November 1861), sect ii 71

4 N.K. [N.N. Strakhov], 'Literaturnye zakonodateli,' *Vremia* (November 1861), sect ii 117

5 See, for example, A.S. Khomiakov, 'O vozmoznosti russkoi khudozhestvennoi shkoly,' *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, i (Moscow 1861), 80.

6 Anon [F.M. Dostoevskii], 'N.A. Dobroliubov,' *Vremia* (March 1862), sect ii 46

7 N.K., 'Literaturnye zakonodateli,' 118

8 Anon [F.M. Dostoevskii], 'N.A. Dobroliubov,' 45

9 A.A. Grigor'ev, 'Belinskii i otritsatel'nyi vzgliad v literature,' *Vremia* (April 1861), sect ii 203

10 Anon [Dostoevskii], 'N.A. Dobroliubov,' 45 (Dostoevskii's emphasis)

11 F.M. Dostoevskii, 'Neizdannyi Dostoevskii,' *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, lxxiiiiv (Moscow 1971) 186 (Dostoevskii's emphasis)

12 Robert C. Williams, 'The Russian Soul: A Study in European Thought and Non-European Nationalism,' *Journal of the History of Ideas*, xxxi, no. 4 (1970) 584

13 N. Kositsa [N.N. Strakhov], 'Primer apatii,' *Vremia* (January–February 1862), sect ii 65

14 F.M. Dostoevskii, 'Riad statei o russkoi literature. Vvedenie,' *Vremia* (January 1861), sect ii 11

15 N.K., 'Nechto o polemike,' *Vremia* (August 1861), sect ii 147–8

16 Dostoevskii, 'Neizdannyi Dostoevskii,' 172 (Dostoevskii's emphasis)

17 Dostoevskii, 'Riad statei ... Vvedenie,' 111; and from the 'manifesto' for 1860 in Dostoevskii, *Biografiia*, pis'ma, 178

18 F.M. Dostoevskii, *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* (Toronto 1955), 89. It is interesting that Grigor'ev had used the analogy of the anthill to describe the social vision of Western socialists as early as December 1857 in a letter to Edel'son; A.A. Grigor'ev, *Materialy dlia biografii A. Grigor'eva*, VI. Kniazhenin ed (Petrograd 1917), 196.

19 A.S. Dolinin, among others, has drawn attention to certain similarities between *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* and Herzen's *Letters from Italy and France*. That Dostoevskii visited Herzen in London in 1862 has lent further credence to the view that Herzen influenced *Winter Notes*. See A.S. Dolinin, 'Dostoevskii i Gertsen,' in A.S. Dolinin ed *F.M. Dostoevskii. Stat'i i materialy*, i (Petersburg 1922), 308. There are undeniable parallels between the two works, but the ideas shared by the two writers, such as the decline of the West and its inability to escape from its dilemma through its own resources, were common currency at the time. E.H. Carr suggests that coincidence played a greater role than did imitation in the similarities; E.H. Carr, *Dostoevsky 1821–1881* (London 1962), 75. Herzen also at this time shared with Dostoevskii the notion that Russians were capable of the reconciliation of classes and the creation of social harmony. But this, too, was a view common to many of the 'unattached' intelligentsia of the day and not an exclusive characteristic of the conservatives.

20 Dostoevskii, 'Riad statei ... Vvedenie,' 15

21 For the Slavophile view of Russia and the West, see I.V. Kireevskii, 'O kharaktere prosveshchenii Evropy i ego otnosheni k prosveshchenii Rossii,' *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, i (Moscow 1911, reprinted 1970), 182–98; and A.S. Khomiakov, 'Po povodu stat' i V. Kireevskogo,' *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, i (Moscow 1861), 210–11.


23 A.S. Khomiakov, 'Zamechania na stat' i g. Soloveva: Sletser i anti-istorichesko napravlenie,' *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, i, 603. The entire passage is stressed in the original.


26 From the 'manifesto' of *Vremia* for 1860 in Dostoevskii, *Biografiia*, pis'ma, 179–80

27 A.A. Grigor'ev, 'Lermontov i ego napravlenie, i' *Vremia* (November 1862), sect ii 55; and Dostoevskii, 'Riad statei o russkoi literature. Vvedenie,' *Vremia* (January 1861), sect ii 18

28 Anon [F.M. Dostoevskii], 'Dva lageria teoretikov,' *Vremia* (January–February 1862), sect ii 154

29 From the 'manifesto' of *Vremia* for 1860 in Dostoevskii, *Biografiia*, pis'ma, 179
noted the impossibility of turning back as early as 1838. He remarked that it would be just as difficult to escape the century of European influence as it would be to shake off the thousand-year tradition that had preceded it; Kireevskii, 'V otkute A.S. Khomiakovu,' Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 1, 110.

Dostoevskii, 'Riad statei o russkoi literaturii. Gazette Den,' 68

Anon [A.A. Grigor'ev], 'Vzgliad na knigi i zhurnal'nye stat'i,' Vremia (April 1861), sect ii 175

Grigor'ev, 'Belinskii i otritsatel'nyi vzgliad v literature,' 186-7 and 214-15. Also see his 'Narodnost' i literatura,' 84-5.

Dostoevskii, 'Riad statei o russkoi literaturii. Gazette Den,' 67

Ibid, 68


From the 'manifesto' of Vremia for 1862 in Dostoevskii, Biografiia, pis'ma, 32.

From the 'manifesto' of Vremia for 1860 in Dostoevskii, Biografiia, pis'ma, 181.

Dostoevskii, 'Riad statei o russkoi literaturii. Vvedenie,' 10. The difference between Slavophilism and pochvennichestvo on this point was a matter of emphasis. The pochvenniki saw a positive value in the ideals of the West because they vastly expanded the potential of Russian nationality. The Slavophiles, in contrast, believed that Russia already possessed the best that had been formulated in the West. Frank Fadner has written that, in the eyes of the Slavophiles, 'The Russian people would accomplish [the realization of Western ideals] through the development of its own natural and native talents; the highest manifestations of the European spirit and the deepest beliefs of the Russian people were essentially the same. Thus the early Slavophiles looked inward'; Frank Fadner, Seventy Years of Pan-Slavism in Russia. Karamzin to Danilevskii, 1800-1870 (Georgetown 1963), 189-4. The early Slavophiles remained ambivalent on the relationship of European to Russian ideas, however. Khomiakov wrote, 'We also renounced ourselves and humiliated ourselves more, a hundred times more than Germany. I hope, I am certain that when we return home (and we shall return home - and soon), we shall bring with ourselves a clear understanding of the entire world, such as the Germans did not even dream of'; cited in N.V. Riasanovsky, A Parting of Ways. Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801-1855 (Oxford 1976), 190. Such views anticipated pochvennichestvo and encouraged Grigor'ev in his belief that his views were a natural continuation of the best of Slavophilism.
CHAPTER SIX: NATIVE SOIL AND SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CULTURE

1 P.V. Bykov, Situety dalekogo proshlogo (Moscow-Leningrad 1930), 51
2 F.M. Dostoevskii, 'Neizdannyi Dostoevskii,' Literaturnoe nasledstvo, lxxviii (Moscow 1971), 176
3 Ibid
4 From the 'manifesto' of Vremia for 1862 in F.M. Dostoevskii, Biografia, pis'ma i zametki iz zapisnoi knizhki F.M. Dostoevskogo, O. Miller and N. Strakhov (ed) (St Petersburg 1881), 32–3
5 On Dostoevsky and the fires, see N.G. Rozenblum, 'Peterburgskie pozhary 1862 g. i Dostoevskii,' Literaturnoe nasledstvo, lxxvi (Moscow 1973), 16–43.
6 F.M. Dostoevskii, Pis'ma, 1 (Moscow-Leningrad 1948), 312–13
7 M. Lemke, Epokha tsarskikh reform 1855–1864 gg. (St Petersburg 1904), 19a. For Aksakov's figures, see I.S. Aksakov, I.S. Aksakov v ego pis'makh, iv pt 2 (St Petersburg 1896), 86.
8 Anon., '19 fevralia 1861 goda,' Vremia (March 1861), sect ii 584
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