Orwin, D. T. (2010). *Anniversary essays on Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

© Cambridge University Press 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

<http://cambridge.org/us/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=9780521514910>

ANNIVERSARY ESSAYS ON TOLSTOY

EDITED BY
DONNA TUSSING ORWIN

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521514910

© Cambridge University Press 2010

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2010

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-0-521-51491-0 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or
accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to
in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

CHAPTER 4

Leo Tolstoy: pacifist, patriot, and molodets

Donna Tussing Orwin

What if there were a war and nobody came? Bumper stickers in college towns all over the United States in the 1960s broadcast this slogan, but today, fifty years later, no end to war is in sight. Count Lev (Leo) Nikolaevich Tolstoy, advocate of conscientious war resistance and author of the greatest war fiction in modern times, hated war but understood its role in human life. He fought in two conflicts, the long-running battle against mountain tribes in the Caucasus, and the Crimean War. Born into a family of warrior aristocrats, with his oldest brother Nikolai already in the army, his decision to take up arms came naturally, and so, presumably, did his celebration of Russian martial spirit at the siege of Sevastopol. Yet the seeds of his later pacifism are evident in his earliest war stories. A draft of his first one, "The Raid" (1853), defines war as "murder,"¹ while the patriotic "Sevastopol in December" (1855) calls it "blood, suffering, and death." War seemed evil to him for religious reasons,² and in the final chapter of "Sevastopol in May" (1855) he asks how "all those [Christians] who profess the same great law of love and self-sacrifice" could fight one other. In his old age, by then a world-famous pacifist, Tolstoy returned in *Hadji Murat* (published posthumously, 1911) to the Caucasian wars of his youth to depict them as an imperialist adventure by Russia. Yet this anti-war masterpiece contains his most sympathetic portrait of a warrior.

This chapter explores the psychological and cultural reasons why Tolstoy's soldiers go to war. Having read and heard a great deal about war, having observed it as an eye-witness and participated in various forms of it over five years, Tolstoy collected a mass of impressions that did not boil down to any one easily digestible teaching. Different aspects of his understanding, in isolation, lead to different (potentially conflicting) conclusions, and this is why he seems like a patriot in some readings and a pacifist in others.³ We will use the particulars of Tolstoy's life so far as we can reconstruct them from his own writings and other sources to follow him to his general conclusions.⁴

MOLODECHESTVO

When Tolstoy first joined the army, he worried mostly about his own performance. Two entries in his diary, the first as he leaves with his detachment for the winter campaign, and the second as he is returning from it after his first serious combat, document a loss of confidence in himself as a warrior.

February 5, 1852 (Nikolaevka – riding in the detachment.) I'm indifferent to a life in which I've experienced too little happiness to love it; therefore, I don't fear death. I am not afraid of torments either, but I am afraid that I won't be able to bear torments and death well. I'm not completely calm; and I'm aware of this because I shift from one spiritual state and view about many things to another. It's strange that my childish view of war – *molodechestvo* – is the most comfortable for me. In many ways I am returning to my childish view of things. (PSS 46: 90–91)

February 28, 1852 (In the detachment, near Teplichek.) The expectations of my imagination have never been justified in reality. I wanted fate to put me in difficult situations for which spiritual strength and virtue were necessary. My imagination loved to present these situations to me, and inner feeling told me that I would have sufficient strength and virtue for them. My vanity and confidence in my strength of soul, encountering no obstacles, grew. Circumstances in which I might have put my confidence to the test, but in which I did not do so, I excused because they presented too few difficulties, and I would not be using all the strengths of my soul.

I was proud, but my pride did not found itself on deeds, but on the firm hope that I was capable of everything. Because of that, my outward pride lacked certainty, firmness, and constancy, [and] I would swing from extreme haughtiness to excessive modesty.

My state during danger opened my eyes. I had loved to imagine myself completely cold-blooded and calm in danger. But in the operations of the 17th and 18th, I wasn't. I didn't have the excuse that I usually use, that the danger was not as great as I imagined it to be. This was my one chance to show all my strength of soul. And I was weak and therefore I'm not satisfied with myself.

I have only now understood that confidence based on future deeds is deceptive, and I can count on myself only in those matters where I already have experience. That this confidence actually destroys strength, and that I must not consider a single circumstance too negligible to apply all my strength to it. (PSS 46: 91–92)

On February 5, the novice artillery NCO expected to prove himself in battle. On February 18, during a second day of engagement with enemy forces, he almost died when a cannonball struck the gun carriage he was operating. The fact that this happened on his name day heightened its significance for him, and it became the basis of his fictional accounts of the experience of the untested soldier.⁵ In the second diary entry, written the day before the end of the campaign, Tolstoy was not satisfied with his

performance. Henceforth he would miss no opportunity to try his resolve, because only experience steels the soul for battle.

It is tempting to slide with Tolstoy in these two war diary entries from fantasies of glory to experience. That said, however, some fantasies have deeper roots than others in Tolstoyan reality. The Russian imitating a Caucasian *dzhigit* (warrior) always looks silly, while the young officer, with his youthful enthusiasm for war, is always positive.⁶ His youthful high spirits may kill him – as they do Alanin (“The Raid”), Volodya Kozel’tsov (“Sevastopol in August”), and Petya Rostov (*War and Peace*) – but careerists like Berg and Boris Drubetskoi in *War and Peace*, wholly lacking these spirits, are always despicable. On the one hand, Tolstoy wanted to put an end to dangerous, false romantic illusions about war;⁷ on the other, he treasured the spontaneity and confidence inherent in what he called, in the entry of February 5, *molodechestvo*.

To understand Tolstoy’s soldier, one must explore the meaning of this word. A *molodets* is a youth fine in body and spirit. The word *molodechestvo* with its abstract suffix ‘stvo’ indicates the essence of such a youth, so it should be, and fundamentally is, positive.⁸ Although the concept is applied quite frequently in a broader context, in folk poetry it is associated with war: the heroes of Russian epic folk poetry are called *molodtsy*, usually with the epithet “fine” (*dobrye*) attached.⁹ A frequent synonym for the word is *udalets*, another difficult word to translate that refers to courage and skill, often, though not always, in battle. The closest English equivalents to *molodechestvo* might be “pluck” or “boldness,” but, as we shall see, these concepts resonate differently in the Russian context.

In a late diary entry Tolstoy disparages the *molodechestvo* of his youth as a kind of corrupting convention.

January 24, 1909. While I was out walking I was thinking about two things: childish wisdom, and my upbringing, how, as in my childhood I was taught to direct all my energy to *molodechestvo* in hunting and war, so it is possible to inspire children to direct all their energy to a battle with themselves, to an enlargement of love. (*PSS* 57: 18)

The story *Father Sergius* (published posthumously, 1911) dramatizes this desirable transformation from soldier to saint.¹⁰ After discovering that his fiancée has been the mistress of his beloved Tsar, the officer hero resigns his commission, joins the church, and concludes his quest to vanquish pride as an anonymous vagabond working for a rich peasant in Siberia. In the diary passage of February 28, 1852, however, Tolstoy says nothing about rejecting *molodechestvo* as not moral. On the contrary, it seems that he judges himself

not strong and virtuous enough to be a *molodets* in combat. The word *sila*, "strength," as a synonym for courage, appears six times in the passage from February 28; in the first two it is paired with *dobrodetel'*, "virtue," and the other four appearances imply the pairing as well. The suggestion is that an uncorrupted youth goes to war for moral reasons.¹¹ In Tolstoy's war fiction, real martial courage in both officers and men is usually portrayed as positive; the problem is that most of what passes for courage is false, and Tolstoy provides copious evidence of this.

The youthful Tolstoy considered the military an honorable profession, and even later in his life he occasionally alluded to the virtuous motives of officers in earlier times. In 1896, in an unfinished anti-war document, Tolstoy contrasted them to the debased corps of the present day.

In the past, a military man of the 1830s, 40s, 50s, and even the 60s, constituting an inseparable and indispensable part of society then, not only was not something disagreeable, but as it was then among us and most probably everywhere, he was, especially among the guards, the flower of the educated class of the time. Our Decembrists in the 1820s were such men. Military men at that time not only did not doubt the justice of their calling, but were proud of it, often choosing it out of a feeling of selflessness. (*PSS* 39: 219)¹²

The young Tolstoy came out of the tradition described in this passage and made it his own. As a Rousseauian, he believed in a natural goodness that was constantly being undermined by passions artificially inflated by civilization. Joining the war effort in the Caucasus, he was hoping to exchange bad habits for a career of public service, but he soon became acquainted with army vices and practiced them with gusto himself.¹³ In Bucharest, however, where he was stationed for a few months before being transferred to the Crimea, he met a group of idealistic young officers with whom he tried, unsuccessfully, to found a newspaper for soldiers.¹⁴ Like Tolstoy and his friends, the young officers in his fiction recklessly rushing into battle combine the personal desire to test themselves with the virtuous intentions that he insisted were necessary for true courage.

Yet even if it seems as though Tolstoy embraces *molodechestvo* as an ideal in the diary entries for 1852, it cannot simply be equated with virtue in his fiction, which would be much less profound if this were so. It is not the Russian equivalent of knightliness (*rytsarstvo*). As we shall see, he understood and illustrated all the implications, good and bad, of *molodechestvo* in his war fiction, though he emphasized some more than others. In *The Cossacks* (1863), Lukashka is called "Snatcher" (*urvan*) for the *molodechestvo* that he displayed as a boy in rescuing a drowning child (*PSS* 6: 21). Vaska Denisov in *War and*

Peace shows himself to be a true “*molodets*” when he is dancing the mazurka or on horseback (PSS 10: 50), and Russian soldiers are admiringly called “*molodtsy*” (the plural form) many times there. Hadji Murat remembers “the expression of pride and *molodechestvo*” with which his son Iosif has promised his father to care for his mother and grandmother (PSS 35: 106). But *molodechestvo* can be foolhardy, as with Alanin or Petya Rostov. It can be mere convention: in *Anna Karenina*, Vronsky is disgusted at having to entertain a foreign prince with a bear hunt as a “display of Russian *molodechestvo*” (PSS 18: 374). The cult of *molodechestvo* can lead to depravity, so that in *The Kreutzer Sonata* the protagonist’s friends urge him to have casual sex both for his health, and also as a form of “*molodechestvo*” (PSS 27: 18).

As a mask for mere vanity or narcissism, *molodechestvo* is negative in the language and most definitely in Tolstoy’s fiction, but even when authentic it can be problematic. The *dzhigit* and the Cossack are true *molodtsy* in it, yet, as Olenin discovers in *The Cossacks*, *molodets* Lukashka is not sufficiently moral; in particular, he is not ashamed of killing men in war. Tolstoy had learned from earlier writers that Caucasian braves allow themselves the freedom to pursue all their passions, including hatred and vengeance, which they satisfy in war. The *molodechestvo* ascribed to the eponymous hero of A. Bestuzhev-Marlinsky’s *Ammalat Bek* (a childhood favorite of Tolstoy) is presented by the author as attractive but tragically flawed, while M. Lermontov “unequivocally identified” with the eponymous hero of his poem *Ismail-Bei*.¹⁵ Tolstoy loved this poem. In July 1854, just after he had left the Caucasus, its opening lines helped him “understand and love” the place “in which so strangely and poetically two completely opposing things – war and freedom – are joined.”¹⁶

And the tribes of those gorges are savage;
 Their god is freedom, their law – war.
 They grow up amidst clandestine raids,
 Cruel deeds, and extraordinary ones;
 In the cradle there the songs of mothers
 Frighren children with Russian names;
 There to destroy an enemy is no crime;
 Friendship is certain there, but more certain is revenge;
 There good is returned for good, and blood for blood,
 And hatred is as boundless as love.

In Lermontov’s writings, Tolstoy found an anarchic individualism, or freedom, implicit in *molodechestvo* that makes it seductive and also, in its extreme forms, taboo within Russian culture except in particular situations which we will enumerate below.¹⁷

Tolstoy had other sources in Russian culture, direct and indirect, for the concept of *molodechestvo*. In the 1830s, A. Pushkin used folk poetry collected in the eighteenth century by M. Chulkov to conjure Emelyan Pugachev and his men into existence in *The Captain's Daughter* (1836) as courageous, reckless, and lawless *molodtsy*. (I refer to the use of related words in epigraphs to chapters and in folk songs interpolated into the text.) The Cossacks in N. Gogol's *Taras Bulba* (1842), though rarely called *molodtsy* in the text, are models of *molodechestvo*, and so, in real life, and frequently named as such, were the Russian soldiers of Tolstoy's time. F. Bulgarin's memoirs, published in the late 1840s, applied the term specifically to officers in the 1820s.

The character, spirit, and tone of the military youth and even the older cavalry officers epitomized *molodechestvo* or daring (*udal'stvo*). *Spend as though there's no tomorrow* and *Life's not worth a damn, don't bother your head about it*: these sayings of ancient Russian daring were our motto and our guide. In both war and peace we sought dangers so as to distinguish ourselves by our fearlessness and daring. Feasting, duelling with swords, raising hell where we shouldn't, that's what our military life consisted of in peacetime.¹⁸

Bulgarin's *molodtsy* are loyal to one another, but think nothing of humiliating civilians and seducing their wives. In constant trouble with the police, they may also overstep military authority and are demoted or even imprisoned for this. Later in the memoirs Bulgarin discusses Tolstoy's relative, Fyodor Ivanovich Tolstoy, "The American" (1782–1846), who "took [*molodechestvo*] to its farthest extreme."¹⁹ Tolstoy did not read Bulgarin's memoirs so far as we know, but he remembered Fyodor Tolstoy from his childhood, and in his own unfinished memoirs (1903–6), in language encapsulating Bulgarin's definition of *molodechestvo*, referred to him as "an extraordinary, transgressive, and attractive person."²⁰ As is well known, Fyodor Tolstoy was a prototype for Dolokhov in *War and Peace*. *Molodechestvo* appears in the novel for the first time at Dolokhov's wild party, where the host earns the title *molodets* for a daring stunt. In war, Dolokhov is a cold-blooded killer, though a useful one.

Bulgarin's discussion of *molodechestvo* begins with an epigraph from a poem by hussar poet Denis Vasilievich Davydov (1784–1839), and contains a quotation from another one of Davydov's poems:

I do love a bloody battle;
I'm born to serve the Tsar!
Sabre, vodka, Hussar steed,
You're partners in my golden life!
I do love a bloody battle;
I'm born to serve the Tsar!

As Bulgarin explains in a note to this epigraph, Davydov "copied the cavalry life of his time from life"; that is, what Davydov called "gusarshchina" is Bulgarin's *molodechestvo*.²¹ Tolstoy knew Davydov's writing very well. His "Two Hussars" (1856), comparing the youths of a father and son, has an epigraph from a poem by the hussar poet. Count Turbin, the older hussar from the early nineteenth century, resembles both Fyodor "The American" Tolstoy and the hussar as immortalized in Davydov's poetry. Whereas Davydov himself rarely uses the word *molodechestvo* or related forms, Tolstoy applies them to the count. A braggart in the story who wants to link his name with Turbin calls him a *molodets* and a "real hussar": in sum, the older Turbin is as charming and "transgressive" as his prototype, and Bulgarin's *molodets*.²² In *War and Peace*, Tolstoy invoked the entire hussar world out of Davydov's poems, memoirs, and essays, and placed Denisov at its head to acknowledge his debt.²³

"Sevastopol in August" is an "idyll" of *molodechestvo* in which the Kozeltsov brothers together represent the front-line Russian officer as Tolstoy encountered him in the Crimean War.²⁴ Volodya, the younger brother, sets out for Sevastopol with ideals nurtured in his military academy, and in chapter 9, just like Tolstoy on February 5, 1852, he imagines himself as a *molodets* in battle. His journey down into the heart of the embattled city coincides with a catastrophic fall in spirits, but prayer revives him. His older brother Mikhail, who chooses to return to the front even before a wound has healed, raises hell with his mates in the bunker in the spirit of *molodechestvo*. Both brothers die idyllicly, that is, bravely. To satisfy his sense of pride and love of competition, Mikhail must either "excel or ... expire."²⁵ The best place to do this is at war, which, if Mikhail represents a natural type, would seem to be an inevitable part of human life.

WAR

A seasoned *molodets* understands the reality of war. Just as he brought a concept of *molodechestvo* with him to the Caucasus, in later reminiscences Tolstoy claimed that he already knew what war was when he arrived there. His teachers were his brother Nikolai and Stendhal in *The Charterhouse of Parma*.

"Stendhal," Tolstoy told Paul Boyer, "taught me to understand war. In *The Charterhouse of Parma*, you should reread the story about the Battle of Waterloo. Who before him had described war that way, that is, the way it really is? Remember Fabrizio, riding over the battlefield and understanding "nothing." And how the

hussars lightly tossed him over the back end of his horse, his magnificent general's horse? Then my brother, who served in the Caucasus earlier than me, confirmed the truthfulness of Stendhal's descriptions. Nikolai loved war very much, but he was not one of those who believed in the bridge at Arcole. These are all embellishments, he told me, and in war there are no embellishments. Soon after that it was easy for me in the Crimea to see all this with my own eyes. But, I repeat, everything that I know about war I learned first from Stendhal.²⁶

In 1900, recalling his first combat in 1852, Tolstoy mentions the morning fog, the noise of battle, his near death, and then unexpected enemy fire during the retreat at which "I felt fright such as I had never before experienced."²⁷ His emphasis on chaos as the most frightening element in war owes something to Stendhal.²⁸ Fabrizio's comical loss of his horse (to a general on his own side), which so tickled Tolstoy, stands for the lesson learned by all his untried soldiers about the loss of control in battle. Tolstoy also borrowed Stendhal's technique of making battle strange by representing it from the perspective of single individuals. It may illustrate either the impossibility of one individual's grasping the whole picture in battle (as when an officer tries to explain the Russian position to Pierre at Borodino), or the bewilderment of an individual under fire (Pierre's loss of his "home" with the artillery battery). The warnings of Nikolai Tolstoy against the "embellishments" of war are related to Stendhal's lessons. Showy feats of glory such as Napoleon's supposed taking of the bridge at Arcole presuppose a degree of control impossible in war. Experienced soldiers like Nikolai Tolstoy know what war is, and courage for them, as in the case of Captain Khlopov in "The Raid," consists in keeping their cool.²⁹ Hence in 1900, Tolstoy praised his brother for his "astonishing presence of mind" during the engagement of February 18, 1852.

War blows away the imagined defenses of the young. On the other hand, for *molodtsy*, war as "blood, suffering, and death" poses the ultimate challenge to their manhood. This is one reason why Nikolai Tolstoy "loved" it, as his then pacifist brother reported in 1900 without comment, and also the reason that Denis Davydov gives for his exhilaration as a young soldier under fire.

Those were the first bullets to whistle past my ears. I am no Charles XII, but at that age, in that moment, in the intoxicating fumes of first dangers, I understood the vow of that crowned seeker of adventures. I looked proudly at myself, blackened by gunpowder, and the whole civilian world and everything outside of military service, all of this in my opinion sank beneath me, down to the antipodes!³⁰

The *molodets* loves war *because* of its deadly chaos. In his memoirs, Colonel P. N. Glebov, under whom Tolstoy served in the Crimean War, disparaged

him as just such a thrill-seeker.³¹ When Tolstoy was reading histories and memoirs while writing *War and Peace*, it was Davydov whose account "was the first to ring true" about the wars between Russia and Napoleon (*PSS* 15: 240). Tolstoy agreed with him that chance governs war. Davydov argued that the effective soldier must train for the unexpected, the "chance happenings in battle," and he blames the Prussian loss at Jena (1806) for a lack of preparedness in precisely this regard.³²

Davydov preferred partisan war, which allows maximum flexibility in the field and therefore maximum response to chance, and so did Tolstoy. It is no accident that career army officer Colonel Glebov disapprovingly dubbed Tolstoy a "partisan."³³ Of course partisan warfare, as opposed to individual risk-taking, is possible only under certain conditions. Lacking the usual defenses built into a hierarchical army structure, it requires initiative, willingness to gamble, and daring. Soldiers will only engage in it for plunder or when fighting on their home territory. Davydov explains that the idea of partisan warfare first came to him at Borodino because it happened to take place near his ancestral estate; therefore he knew the terrain, and he was especially motivated to defend it.³⁴ (Similarly, in *War and Peace*, the defiling of his Smolensk estates infuriates Prince Andrei.) In the Caucasus, Tolstoy had found himself on the wrong side of a partisan effort. As he ponders in a draft to "The Raid," the mountain warrior defending his village has a personal interest in fighting that is absent in the Russian (*PSS* 3: 234–35). A career soldier like Captain Khlopov fights from duty in the one story written in the Caucasus ("The Raid"), but there is no talk of patriotism here or in Tolstoy's letters or diaries from the period. Indeed, within a few months of having joined the army, Tolstoy was thinking of leaving it, and this theme recurs from time to time in his Caucasian diary. His attitude changed markedly during the Crimean War once he and his comrades were fighting invaders. Under those conditions Russian soldiers and front-line officers like Tolstoy, undersupplied, with inferior weaponry, and poorly led at the top, fought ferociously and willingly engaged in partisan-like night raids on enemy trenches.

It is significant that the first outburst of patriotic rhetoric in Tolstoy's diary comes in response to the disastrous Battle of Inkerman, which the Russians had expected to win.³⁵ Railing against leaders he considered responsible for the defeat, Tolstoy defiantly celebrates "the moral strength of the Russian people" as demonstrated in the fighting spirit of the doomed warriors, conscripts and officers alike. He is determined to fight in Sevastopol, especially after the "useless" death at Inkerman of his friend Staff Captain Komstadius, writing that "It's as if I feel ashamed before him" (*PSS* 47: 28). At the end of

"Sevastopol in August," anger (*zloba*) and shame along with "repentance" are what the Russian soldiers evacuating Sevastopol are said to feel as they vow revenge for their humiliation. These are the circumstances under which Tolstoy himself embraced the cult of *molodechestvo*.

The most alien element for Tolstoy in *molodechestvo* was the role in it of anger and revenge, and yet his war experience allowed him to understand even this, if he did not condone it. In a draft to "The Raid," he had asserted that the feeling of "fury" (*zlost'*) could not be sustained though a whole conflict and therefore could not explain war (*PSS* 3: 228). In the Crimean War, he discovered its power to provoke and feed it. On December 7, 1854, he reported without criticism many raids against French positions that were "not so much bloody as cruel." In one such raid, a Lieutenant Titov sprayed enemy trenches with gunfire, and "they say that in the trench there was such a groan that it could be heard in the third and the fifth bastions" (*PSS* 47: 33–34). This horrific story and no doubt others like it did not restrain Tolstoy himself from joining a raiding party on March 10 (*PSS* 47: 37); he never divulged what he did or saw during it, nor did he choose to describe this common tactic in his Sevastopol stories. A front-line officer in "Sevastopol in December" does report the death of a "*molodets*" who had participated in six raids. And in that same story, speaking from the notorious fourth bastion, the narrator reveals to a surprised viewer "the feeling of anger (*zloba*) and "vengeance" (*mshchenie*) that motivates the soldiers there (*PSS* 4: 14).

If war is "murder," then all the bloodletting during it cannot be accidental or in justifiable self-defense. Tolstoy knew this, of course, but he underemphasizes it in his war fiction. The Sevastopol sketches do not dramatize a single killing committed with intentional malice. In *War and Peace*, the most terrible such death is the mob killing of Vereshchagin incited by Count Rostopchin. We know that Dolokhov and the peasant Shcherbatyi kill defenseless French prisoners offstage. (As if to make up for this earlier squeamishness, *Hadji Murat* ends with the beheading of the hero in detail, and from the point of view of the victim; here the motivation is revenge and intimidation.) There are a number of killings in *War and Peace*, like those of the arsonists in Moscow or of Platon Karataev, that are ascribed to an anonymous murderous force (*sila*) that deprives the direct perpetrators of free will. But how does this ferocious *sila* possess its agents? Fear is usually a catalyst. In the execution of the arsonists, it grips everyone, from the victims to the firing squad of French soldiers who know that they will be punished if they do not shoot (*PSS* 12: 41). On the battlefield, too, fear motivates fighters. In the encounter at Borodino between Pierre and a

French officer, Pierre, “beside himself with fear” – in Russian, literally, “not remembering himself” (*ne pomnia sebja*) – loses his moral center of gravity and starts to throttle his adversary from sheer impulse of self-defense (vol. 3, pt. 2, ch. 32; *PSS* 11: 236–37). Fear can provoke first anger and then courageous action. In “Sevastopol in August,” as the storming of the fifth bastion begins, *molodets* Mikhail Kozeltsov, overcoming an initial chill of fear with anger, goes on to a heroic death. But anger is also responsible for atrocities in war, and therefore it is a primary cause for the murderous *sila* that stalks the battlefield.

The spokesman in *War and Peace* for righteous anger as the motivator of the warrior is Prince Andrei. His speech to Pierre on the eve of Borodino makes a positive case for war in its most brutal form (*PSS* 11: 205–12). According to Andrei, it should be waged only as an unconditional fight to the death. Laws that limit it make it less deadly, more like gaming for glory, and therefore more frequent. Andrei specifically recommends that no prisoners be taken; this is the policy of Dolokhov that so horrifies Denisov during the partisan war. Andrei speaks with the tone of *zloba* (anger; *PSS* 11: 207) that Tolstoy noted in the soldiers retreating from Sevastopol, and Andrei’s men, represented by Timokhin, who care nothing for glory, share his feeling. It is precisely in Andrei’s call for no mercy and a fight to the death that Pierre finally discovers the meaning of the expression that he has been seeing on every Russian face before Borodino. Just as the defeat does in “Sevastopol in August,” patriotism here expresses itself in a tone of justifiable *zloba*.

He understood the hidden (latent, as they say in physics) warmth of patriotism, which was in all of the people whom he saw, and which explained to him why all these people calmly and as it were, light-heartedly, were preparing themselves for death. (*PSS* 11: 210)

The reference to physics is significant. As Andrei defines war, it violates human nature by engaging *only* the determined, the animal, in man; it is in this sense that we are not ourselves when we slaughter others in battle. We may do this from simple motives of self-preservation, or from more complicated but still related ones. Patriotism as Tolstoy presents it may be understood as the extension of the animal goal of self-preservation to include the preservation of home and family. Hence Andrei’s diatribe climaxes in rage against enemies who “*worst of all*, kill my children, my father, and then they talk about the laws of war and magnanimity to enemies” (*PSS* 11: 210; my emphasis). Patriotism is therefore an expression of the brutal *sila* that prevails in war and generates atrocities otherwise not

humanly comprehensible. Faced with a life or death situation, men lash out as animals in defense of themselves and their own. Such feelings are not confined to Russians, of course; in chapter 17 of *Hadji Murat*, after Russian troops have destroyed their *aoûl* (village), the Chechens set about rebuilding and resisting under the influence of a feeling “stronger than hatred.”

What all the Chechens, from youngest to oldest, felt, was stronger than hatred. It was not hatred, but a refusal to acknowledge these Russian dogs as human beings and such repulsion, disgust, and incomprehension in the face of the absurd cruelty of these beings that the desire to destroy them, like the desire to destroy rats, poisonous spiders, and wolves, was as natural a feeling as the feeling of self-preservation.

A hostile contemporary reader, N. Flerovskii, picked up on the larger context and importance of Andrei’s speech for the novel.

All the war scenes in the novel are full of sympathetic stories about Denisov’s obtuse lack of control, about the savage, destructive instincts of the army, which mows unripe grain, about the bloodthirstiness of Bolkonsky, who recommends not taking prisoners. The novel consistently takes the same attitude toward the business of war as drunken marauders.³⁶

Though Tolstoy and Davydov abhor cruelty for its own sake, understandable rage and desire for vengeance, the “savage, destructive instincts” of *zloba* deplored by Flerovskii, keep the Russians upright and fighting at Borodino against repeated French attacks. Partisan warfare too feeds off *zloba*, as Davydov illustrates in his memoirs.³⁷

Andrei finds his insight into the true nature of war almost unbearable, but Tolstoy’s text contains a more shocking truth that Flerovskii detects in the “disgusting” hunting scenes.

With a kind of disgust you read the rapturous description of hunting with hounds, where people melt with delight watching as whole packs of dogs tear a single hare to pieces; and the author strives to describe these people as strong and energetic.³⁸

Merriment is a leitmotif in vol. 3, pt. 2 of the novel in which the Battle of Borodino takes place: words with the root *vesel-*, “merry,” occur twenty-eight times in this part, most of these related to the war. On the battlefield, soldiers fight “merrily” (*veselo*). On and off it, they crack jokes. Most difficult for Tolstoy and many of his readers to acknowledge, the practice of war itself can bring pleasure. Tolstoy does not dwell on what his “merry” soldiers do in battle, but Davydov does. The first quotation records his own joy in battle, the second – that of his men.

The pursuit continued until noon. We cut, slashed, shot, and dragged into captivity officers, soldiers, and horses – in a word, the victory was complete. I was overflowing with joy!

[Davydov tells his Cossacks not to take prisoners because there isn't the time or manpower to do so.] My Scythians needed no further urging, while you should have seen the terror that suddenly gripped the whole enormous crowd of travelers! You had to have witnessed yourself the mix of screams of desperation with encouraging voices, the shots of the defenders, the crackle of artillery shots flying through the air, and the thunderous *Hurrahs* of my Cossacks!³⁹

It is pleasant to indulge our anger; this is why Lermontov's mountaineers love revenge so much. This explains the "joyful exclamations" of the men fighting in the fourth bastion when they see that enemies have been killed in "Sevastopol in December" (*PSS* 14: 14). Tolstoy does not emphasize this fact, but he records it. The soldiers feel "the attraction and charm of rage" that comes over Pierre in *War and Peace* when he threatens his adulterous wife Helene (vol. 1, pt. 4, ch. 6), or the "joy of rage" that Pierre feels as he attacks a French soldier molesting a young woman in occupied Moscow (vol. 3, pt. 3, ch. 34).

Fury has its own rewards. The pleasure described by Davydov may occur when the very desperation of their situation carries fighting men beyond fear. This happens to Kozeltsov senior ("Sevastopol in August"), who fights more bravely because he is certain he will die (*PSS* 4: 113). Freed from preoccupation with themselves, soldiers in this state throw themselves into communal activity in a way that mimics and indeed produces self-sacrifice. The only other such pleasurable self-forgetting is sexual. Boris Eikhenbaum characterized war in Davydov's poetry as "eroticized" because it is depicted through the "rampage of feelings" of the soldier narrator.⁴⁰ As Eikhenbaum's formulation suggests, the escape in war from all restraints imposed by others and by the self is pleasurable. Young soldiers like Nikolai Rostov are looking for this experience as they go to war. Nikolai's moral sensitivity overweighs his merry energy when he looks into the eyes of the French youth whom he captures; after this he will do his duty as an officer, but restrict the expression of unrestrained *molodechestvo* to the hunt. The "Scythians" who fight for Davydov feel no such scruples, and Davydov himself is not ashamed to call himself a descendant of "Genghis Khan," who "powerfully cleaved with his Tatar's hand / All that opposed the mighty hero."⁴¹ For Russian officers like Davydov, *molodechestvo* was lawless freedom permissible up to a certain point within loyal service to the Tsar.⁴² Under conditions of all-out and justifiable war, it allowed them to behave like Genghis Khan and his followers rather than according to rules of chivalry. Tolstoy references this element of the Russian warrior code in

War and Peace when, responding to invasion, Russians lay down their swords and take up clubs to drive out the invaders (vol. 4, pt. 3, ch. 1).⁴³ It is Denis Davydov, with his “Russian instinct,” who first understands and formalizes this response (vol. 4, pt. 3, ch. 3). Denisov, Davydov’s fictional double in the novel, leads the partisan effort, and Tolstoy, later the world-famous pacifist, calls this effort “blessed” (*ibid.*).

In Tolstoy’s conscripted soldiers, *molodechestvo* can also be pleasurable, and can have ugly consequences. Tolstoy knew that soldiers could be brutes, writing in his 1857 diary that “you have only to dress a man in uniform, distance him from his family, and beat a drum, to make a beast out of him.”⁴⁴ He usually blamed this state of mind on the arbitrary discipline of military life to which the soldier adjusts by regarding himself as not morally culpable for deeds he must commit.⁴⁵ Elaborating this argument in the second epilogue to *War and Peace*, Tolstoy imagines an army in the shape of a cone, in which those who do the killing form the base, and the one who orders it the tip. But in the first epilogue he makes a significant exception to this rule for a “national war,” in which the soldiers willfully commit brutal deeds, and do not need a leader to justify these. This is illustrated in the novel during the partisan war. Denisov’s own right-hand man, the Cossack NCO Lovaiskii, approves of Dolokhov’s take no prisoners ethos.⁴⁶ Mounted, Lovaiskii, with a “calm, self-satisfied expression both on his face and in his ride ... is not a man sitting on a horse, but man and horse together, a being doubled in strength (*sila*)” (vol. 4, pt. 3, ch. 4). Centaurs like this, terrorizing the enemy, are the epitome of Cossack *molodechestvo*. Though Tolstoy is uncomfortable with such a model, he presents it here as a necessary and therefore legitimate part of Russian resistance.

Napoleon’s animal will to power for its own sake is criminal, while Alexander I acts in justifiable defense of his country; this makes it easier for Tolstoy to depict Russians enjoying themselves in battle in *War and Peace*. Nonetheless, he observed the merry animal spirits of Russian soldiers even in the Caucasus, and records its existence as a kind of puzzle in a prominent place at the very end of “The Raid.” Whatever its cause, it is a crucial part of the “incommunicable experience of war” that American Civil War veteran Oliver Wendell Holmes called “the passion of life to its top.”⁴⁷ Holmes’ war – fought to save his nation and end slavery – was a just one, and this allowed him to celebrate it. But the experience to which Holmes alludes is not in itself virtuous, and the desire for it may be one underlying cause of the persistence of war.

No other Russian wars besides the Siege of Sevastopol during Tolstoy’s lifetime were “national” (*narodnyi*), and therefore, in Tolstoy’s opinion,

none gained the consent of the people. During unnecessary wars, decent soldiers fight from fear or from a sense of duty that is not the same as informed consent. Thus, in *Anna Karenina*, the old peasant beekeeper, when asked his opinion of the Russo-Turkish War, defers to the judgment of his sovereign just as Tolstoy says that soldiers do when they find themselves forced to fight wars not of their choosing. Necessary wars are part of what Tolstoy in *War and Peace* calls the swarm life of mankind; the beekeeper in *Anna Karenina* is busy controlling swarms. In that novel military *molodechestvo* is mostly negative, while *molodtsy* like the peasant Ivan Parmenev and the successful suitor Konstantin Levin occupy themselves with peaceful elements of swarm life such as harvests, weddings, and births. If the *molodets* could satisfy himself with such pursuits, there would be no war, or at least no willing warriors. As Levin's triumphant wooing of Kitty after his bear hunt (a deliberate counter-pose to the one staged for the foreign prince) suggests, however, exposure to danger scores victories even in the peaceful shire (PSS 18: 404–5).

The tide of war in Tolstoy's fiction crests in *War and Peace* and then retreats. The novel is his most expansive and complete treatment of the subject, and therefore of *molodechestvo*. The *molodets* of Tolstoy's old age is *dzhigit* Hadji Murat, whose life unfolds within a war of Russian imperialism. Raised in a warrior culture, he fights for honor and revenge, but in the end chooses his family over potential glory. Although he therefore dies for the one cause that Prince Andrei deemed sufficient for war, its inherent tragedy and injustice is illustrated by the fact that Murat kills someone else's son while attempting to rescue his own.⁴⁸ As in earlier works, in *Hadji Murat* warriors – soldiers, officers, and Caucasian warriors alike – are “merry,” and war itself makes a merry impression on Butlet, last of the stand-ins for Tolstoy as a young officer. In this work, however, the narrator intervenes directly in chapter 16 to inform us that Butler “unconsciously” avoids thinking about “the other side of war: death, the wounds of soldiers, officers, and mountaineers,” because that would undercut his merriment (PSS 35: 79). The “merry” engagement in which Butler tests his manhood results in the destruction of a mountain village and the decision of its enraged inhabitants to take up arms to defend themselves. Readers may justly conclude that war is to be avoided whenever possible, and should never be fought for pleasure, no matter how keen and natural.

Yet a reader of Tolstoy's epic would also have to conclude that without war there could be no Hadji Murat, and that poses a dilemma for the reader who vicariously lives “the passion of life to its top” through him. Tolstoy himself models this role by placing himself in the frame narrative, from

which he both comments as a pacifist on the action, and creates a timeless fantasy of a warrior. Murat is more hero than villain or victim. As he does in *War and Peace*, Tolstoy assigns the most frightening aspects of *molodechestvo* to minor characters (the inhabitants of the *aoul*, the killers of Murat, and Murat's menacing side-kick Gamzalo, for instance), and does not show Murat enraged except momentarily when (in chapter 20) he must defend himself against an unexpected attack. Unlike Achilles, Murat commits no egregious crime from excessive rage, nor does he display the excessive craftiness of an Odysseus or, in the novel, of Shamil and Vorontsov. Like Denis Davydov, he does not agonize over the need to kill in what he regards as a just cause, but, unlike Davydov, he is not shown to fight "merrily" (although such a man as he would surely have done so). We cannot imagine Murat walking away from a fight, and we would not respect him for it. In the chaos of war, he acts decisively in one crisis after another. Prince Andrei thinks his way out of the desire for glory, but still dies fighting in a just war, so that his son Nikolenka dreams of emulating him as a warrior. Murat does not reject glory on principle, but he easily turns his back on it when something more important intervenes. He too dies in battle, and he too will be a model for his son. His thinking can be moral as well as strategic, but it is not self-castigating; he does not reject his warrior ethos. Most seductive for us as for Tolstoy, Murat can look death in the eye and not blink; in the final episode of the work he both accepts the probability of his death, and fights to live. Like Petya Rostov, we mostly do not dwell on the ferocity of the *molodets* in battle; indeed, at times we wonder whether, if it were necessary, we could be as ferocious. We want to be *molodtsy*, as whole, strong, and self-confident as Hadji Murat, and so does Tolstoy's narrator. As long as people want to test themselves against death and chaos, as long as injustice or the perception of it exists, it seems that when wars call, *molodtsy* will come.

NOTES

1. L. N. Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochineniia*, 90 vols. (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1928–58), 3: 228. Hereafter cited as PSS. Unless otherwise stated, all translations in this chapter are my own.
2. See the diary entry for January 4, 1853, PSS 46: 155. See John L. N. Keep, *Soldiers of the Tsar: Army and Society in Russia, 1462–1874* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 210, for this as a problem in the Russian ranks.
3. The literature on war in Tolstoy is vast, especially in Russia, and reflects the confusing situation that I have sketched. I. Ianovskii reconciles the two sides of Tolstoy by blaming his pacifism on the injustice of the Old Regime in Russia and

- the wars it waged (*Chelovek i voina v tvorchestve L. N. Tolstogo* [Kiev: Vishcha shkola, 1978]). More often, because Tolstoy's treatment of war is complex, critics tend to focus on what is essential to themselves and their own times. Compare, for instance, Leonid Grossman's 1916 antiwar article, which emphasizes the horror of war ("Stendal' i Tolstoi. Batalizm i psikhologija ras v literature XIX veka," *Russkaia mysl'* [June, 1916]: 32–51), and anticipates Boris Eikhenbaum's *The Young Tolstoi* (1921; trans. Gary Kern, Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1972); with M. Tsiavlovskii's approving summary of Tolstoy as patriot and warrior, published in 1940 in *Literaturnaia gazeta*, November 17. In general the war theme in Tolstoy became very important in Soviet criticism with the outbreak of World War II. (Russians call the invasion of Russia by Germany the Great Patriotic War, thereby linking it to the Patriotic War of 1812, and thence to *War and Peace*.) Compare Shklovsky's attack in 1936 ("O staroi russkoi voennoi i o sovetskoi oboronnoi proze," *Znamia* 1 [1936]: 218–27) on Tolstoy as a "barin" who, in publications like "Sevastopol in December" and "The Wood-Felling," soft-pedaled the truth about the tsarist army as he depicted it in unpublished works like "A Note on the negative sides of the Russian soldier and officer" (*PSS* 4: 285–94; 1855), to Lidia Ginzburg's "O romane Tolstogo 'Voina i mir'" (*Zvezda* 1 [1944]: 125–38), which, like many other positive Soviet discussions of Tolstoy, emphasizes his skill at portraying the triumph of "communal life" during war. Ginzburg's article appeared just as the siege of Leningrad, which she endured, was lifted.
4. S. Chubakov (*Lev Tolstoi o voine i militarizme* [Minsk: Izdatel'stvo BFU, 1973]) and especially S. Doroshenko (*Lev Tolstoi – voin i patriot: voennaia sud'ba i voennaia deiatel'nost'* [Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1966]) provide the most information about Tolstoy's military service.
 5. Tolstoy recalled the battle several times, often on its anniversary. See his diary entry for February 18, 1897 (*PSS* 53: 138) and a letter to G. Rusanov, February 18, 1906 (*PSS* 76: 103). Nikolai Tolstoy wrote his brother on February 18, 1855 reminding him of the dual significance of the date (*Perepiska L. N. Tolstogo s sestrami i brat'iami* [Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1990], 180).
 6. For the positive semantics surrounding the young officer, see A. T. Gulak, "'Raspuskaiushchiisia': stilistiko-rechevye kraski obraza iunogo voina v rasskazakh L. Tolstogo 50-kh gg.," *Russkii iazyk v shkole* 5 (September 2000): 70–74.
 7. See Eikhenbaum's *The Young Tolstoi*, ch. 3, for the first exposition of this theory.
 8. On the formation of such abstract nouns, see Charles E. Townsend, *Russian Word-Formation* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), 167.
 9. *Tolkovyi slovar' russkogo iazyka*, ed. D. Ushakov (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarei, 1938). The word exists in two forms with different stresses. The Common Slavic *mólodets*, associated with folk poetry, is first attested in Old Russian in 1186; *molodéts* is a specifically Russian variation that is neutral in tone. See *Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka*, ed. A. F. Zhuravlev and N. M. Shanskii, vol. 10 (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 2007). The first attestation of *molodechestvo* according to the authoritative *Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo iazyka*, ed. V. Chernyshev, vol. 6 (Moscow and Leningrad, 1957) is in a dictionary in the year 1731.

10. *Molodechestvo* is negative in anti-war and anti-military works like A. Kuprin's *The Duel* (1905), in which it never appears in a positive light.
11. For Tolstoy's unquestioning love of country and military valor in childhood, see "A ma chère Tante. Amour de la Patrie," *PSS* 1: 215.
12. *PSS* 39: 219. The last sentence is crossed out. See also his discussion in 1886 with French author and politician Paul Déroulède (1846–1914) (as transcribed by Tolstoy's distant cousin E. F. Iunge, who was present; *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 75, no. 1 [1965]: 536–40).
13. He was especially dismayed by the behavior of his beloved and admired brother Nikolai. See diary entries for March 30 and 31, 1852, *PSS* 46: 103–6.
14. On the circle in Bucharest, see Chubakov, *Lev Tolstoi o voine i militarizme*, 43.
15. Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: The Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 134. Layton has chapters on both works, which were written at the same time, in the early 1830s, although Lermontov's poem was only published in 1843.
16. *PSS* 47: 10. Tolstoy read Lermontov intensively and more than once during his army service; see *PSS* 46: 154; 47: 7, 9–10. Note the Lermontovian lament that begins the diary entry of February 5, 1852, quoted above.
17. The best exposition of anarchic individualism in Lermontov is David Powelstock, *Becoming Mikhail Lermontov: The Ironies of Romantic Individualism in Nicholas I's Russia* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2005).
18. See Faddei Bulgarin, *Vospominaniia* (Moscow: Zakharov, 2001), 173 (pt. 2, ch. 3). The cautious Bulgarin assures his readers (and the censors) that soldiers today do not behave this way (*ibid.*).
19. *Ibid.* 606 (pt. 5, ch. 3). An exact translation would be that he took it to the point of "desperation" (*otchaianie*). For the meaning of this word in both Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, see Orwin, *Consequences of Consciousness: Turgenev, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007), 161–66.
20. *PSS* 34: 393. P. Biriukov, *L. N. Tolstoi, Biografiia*, 3 vols. (Berlin, Izd. I. P. Ladyzhnikova, 1921), vol. 1, 89. "Transgressive" is an exact etymological equivalent in English of the word *prestupnyi*, usually rendered as "criminal."
21. Bulgarin, *Vospominaniia*, 172.
22. On the indebtedness of "Dva gusara" to Davydov, see E. M. Zhiliakova, "Denis Davydov i povest' L. N. Tolstogo *Dva gusara*," in A. S. Ianushkevich, ed., *Russkaia povest' kak forma vremeni* (Tomsk: Izd. Tomskogo un-ta, 2002), 216–26.
23. Besides the well-known references to partisan warfare, there are many other implicit ones to Davydov's memoirs in *War and Peace*.
24. Tolstoy himself called the work an idyll when he first conceived it. See *PSS* 47: 40.
25. The excellent translation of these lines in ch. 1 is by David McDuff.
26. N. Apostolov, *Lev Tolstoi nad strannitsami istorii: istoriko-literaturnye nabliudeniia* (Moscow: Komissiiia po oznamenovaniuu stoletiiia so dnia rozhdeniia L. N. Tolstogo, 1928), 24. Apostolov took this quote from Boyer's memoirs, published in 1901, of his visit to Tolstoy.
27. See P. A. Sergeenko, *Kak zhivet i rabotaet L. N. Tolstoi* (Moscow, 1908), 106–7.

28. Doroshenko, *Lev Tolstoi – voïn i patriot* (76–79), provides a more thorough depiction of the operation on February 18 from other sources.
29. For Tolstoy's debt to Plato in this regard, see Orwin, "Tolstoy and Courage" in Donna Tussing Orwin, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 222–36.
30. *Voennye zapiski partizana Denisa Davydova* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1940), 78. Charles XII (reigned 1697–1718) was a daring Swedish king who fought Peter I in the Great Northern War that led to the downfall of the Swedish empire.
31. "Zapiski Porfiria Nikolaevicha Glebova," *Russkaia starina* 3 (1905): 528–29.
32. *Voennye zapiski*, 118, 153.
33. "Zapiski Porfiria Nikolaevicha Glebova," 528.
34. *Voennye zapiski*, 197.
35. *PSS* 47: 27–28. On the Battle of Inkerman, see John Shelton Curtiss, *Russia's Crimean War* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1979), 332–41.
36. "Iziashchnyi romanist i ego iziashchnye kritiki," *Delo* 6 (1868): Sovremennoe obozrenie, 1–28 (27). Flerovskii (1829–1918), a well-known leftist economist and sociologist, is also known by the pseudonym V. V. Bervi, and signed this particular article as S. Navalin.
37. See, for instance, his advice to peasants in occupied territory about how to kill French marauders without alerting the authorities (*Voennye zapiski*, 209); his order to set fire to huts full of French soldiers in revenge for an earlier battle in which he lost thirty-five men (221); and the execution of a turncoat (242–43). For a similar Soviet defense of cruelty in war, see A. A. Saburov, "Obraz russkogo voïna v 'Voïne i mire'," in D. D. Blagoi, ed., *L. N. Tolstoi: Sbornik stat'ei i materialov* (Moscow: Izd-stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1951), 390–424 (402–5).
38. Flerovskii, "Iziashchnyi romanist i ego iziashchnye kritiki," 23.
39. Davydov, *Voennye zapiski*, 234–35, 252.
40. "Ot voennoi ody k 'gusarskoi pesne'," in B. M. Eikhenbaum, *O poezii* (Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1969), 148–68 (166–67).
41. *Grafu P. A. Stroganovu*. See also *Voennye zapiski*, 262, where, having ordered huts full of enemy soldiers set alight, he calls himself "a true son of Genghis Khan."
42. See Laurence Leighton ("Denis Davydov's Hussar Style," *Slavic and East European Journal* 7 [1963]: 349–60 [349–50]) on Davydov's participation in a loyal opposition of officers who opposed Alexander's Prussianization of the army.
43. On the Russian perception of dueling as alien, see Irina Reyfman, *Ritualized Violence Russian Style: The Duel in Russian Culture and Literature* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999).
44. April 1/13, Geneva; *PSS* 47: 204.
45. See also his "Diaden'ka Zhdanov i kavaler Chernov" (*PSS* 3: 271–73; 1854) and "Zapiska ob otritsatel'nykh storonakh russkogo soldata i ofitsera" (*PSS* 4: 285–94; 1855).

46. Lovaiskii smiles approvingly when Dolokhov articulates this. See vol. 4, pt. 3, ch. 8.
47. The first phrase is from a speech delivered on Memorial Day, 1895, to the Harvard graduating class; and the second one from another Memorial Day speech, this one delivered in 1884, in Keene, New Hampshire.
48. See Donald Fanger, "Nazarov's Mother: Notes toward an Interpretation of *Hadji Murat*," *Iberomania* (1974): 99–104.