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The epilogue of *Anna Karenina*, with its harsh criticism of the Panslavic mood which had spread in Russia by the middle of the 1870s, was a surprise to many of Leo Tolstoy's admirers. The origins of such critical views of Tolstoy's are still obscure. This study of ours is a modest attempt to investigate a possible connection, in the sphere of ideas, between Konstantin Leontiev and Leo Tolstoy. As such it can be regarded as a case study leading to further investigations, which subsequently would concentrate on the influence exercised by Leontiev over Eurasianism, the doctrine which emerged in the milieu of Russian émigrés in 1921, with the publication of a collective volume *Iskhod k Vostoku (Exodus to the East)*.

While this volume marked the official inauguration of Eurasianism, it had an important predecessor, namely, *Europe and Mankind* by Prince Nikolai Trubezkoy, in which the author, one of the founders of the Eurasian movement, claimed that the ideas expressed in the book took shape in his mind more than ten years ago. This statement he repeated in his letter to Roman Jakobson on March 7, 1921: 'I conceived this book long ago (in 1909-1910)...' Not surprisingly, therefore, that, as N. V. Riasanovsky points out, 'in reading *Exodus to the East* and other Eurasian literature one is repeatedly reminded of *The Signposts – Vekhi*.

---

1 This publication was prepared in part under a grant from the Heiwa Nakajima Zaidan. The statements and views expressed herein are those of the authors and are not necessarily those of the Heiwa Nakajima Zaidan.

This famous self-critical manifesto of Russian intellectuals, which appeared in 1909, was destined to generate a widespread polemics in the years to come\(^6\). Partly owing to this polemics, one can safely attribute the revival of interest in Leontiev's ideological heritage, which took place in Russia in the 1910s when the memorial volume dedicated to Leontiev (appeared in 1911)\(^7\) was followed by publication of the first nine volumes of his *Collected writings* in 1912-1913. One can agree with George Ivask's assessments, that Leontiev's 'positive contribution to philosophy is minor, but, as a critic of the social and cultural institutions and values of his day, he was possessed of an almost demonic clarity of vision and insight'\(^8\). For the topic into consideration, of great importance is Leontiev's criticism of the Panslavic trend in the Russian thought. The analysis of this criticism and some of its ramifications will constitute the core of the present article.

By 1879, the novel *Anna Karenina* was being praised (in an American review) as 'a masterpiece without equal in any literature'\(^9\). In 1997, the re-

---


\(^2\) *The legacy of Genghis Khan*, p.338.


\(^5\) Pamiati Konstantina Nikolaevicha Leont'eva. Literaturnyi sbornik (SPb., 191 1).

cent American movie of Bernard Rose was regarded (in a Russian review) as the worst ever cinematized Anna. Had Konstantin Leontiev been alive today he would have argued that the latter is a mere reflection of the Decline of the West.

As a thinker Leontiev, like his contemporary the prominent Slavophile Nikolai la. Danilevsky, anticipated the ideas of Oswald Spengler. But until recently the problem was if Leontiev's methodology was reminiscent of that of Danilevsky, author of the Russia and Europe, a major treatise in the philosophy of history. At one time, Leontiev wrote that he had welcomed Danilevsky's book in 1869 as a fine confirmation of his own - as yet unpublished - ideas. Thanks to a recent publication, this affirmation now can be proved. One can refer to Leontiev's letter written from Tulcha, a townlet on the river Danube, in 1868. In this letter to Count Nikolai Ignatiev, the then Russian ambassador in Constantinopole, Leontiev writes: 'By the autumn or winter, I am going to finish, in French, my letter to John Stuart Mill under the title What is Russia and the Slavonic World about, and why Russia is able to bring to the world something that the West is already unable to.' Like Danilevsky, Leontiev used the idea of a plurality of civilizations. Leontiev shared his theory of cultural-historical types which had succeed each other in the course of human history. Unlike Danilevsky, Leontiev was not a Slavophile in a strict sense. Moreover, Leontiev hated Panslavism in any form; it was modern and therefore bad. It was, furthermore, democratic and vulgar. Some of his hyperconservative and pessimistic views appeared so strange to his contemporaries, that he even gained the nickname "Turkish Abbot" (turetskii igumen) from the Russian Slavophiles.

Konstantin Nikolaevich Leontiev (1831-1891) spent ten years in

---

10 Tunimasona O. Bum-3, ili Ania Karenina i eio boi-frend /// Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti, no. 196, 16 oktiabria 1997, p. 5.
Ottoman Turkey from late 1863 to early 1874. As a Russian consular official, vice-consul and consul, he served in Candia on the island of Crete, in Adrianople, in Tulcha, Yanina, Thessalonica and in Constantinople. Before his official resignation on January 1, 1873 (Old Style), he also spent one year and a half at Mount Athos.

Leontiev entered the Russian diplomatic service as an experienced man. As a military surgeon, he had served in the army during the Crimean war. Even before entering the diplomatic service, he had drifted from the liberal sympathies of his youth towards hard conservatism. By this time, he had already published his first novel. In Turkey, he continued his literary activities. Some critics appreciated the so-called “couleur locale” which can be found in his various works. Vivid ethnographic pictures coupled with incisive remarks on current political events are scattered through the pages of his novels Odysseus Polychroniades, The Egyptian Dove and the cycle of fiction From the Life of Christians in Turkey. A master of “ethnopsychological” analysis, he left many profound descriptions of the “national characters” of the Balkan peoples - especially the Bulgarians, Greeks, and the Turks.

During his life in Ottoman Turkey, Leontiev also developed an original philosophy of history. As he wrote himself, the experiences he had gained while exploring Ottoman Turkey considerably helped him to get to know Russia.¹²

Leontiev finished his essay entitled Byzantinism and Slavdom on the island of Chalkis not far from Constantinople in 1873 after he resigned from the diplomatic service. In this treatise, Leontiev not only formulated

---


¹³ At some length, this topic is discussed in: Kosik V. I. Konstantin Leont'ev: razmyshlenia na slavianskuiu temu (M.: Zertsalo, 1987). However, some conclusions which the author drew from reading Leontiev should be treated with certain reserve. On Leontiev's life in the Ottoman Empire see also Abe G., Zhukov K. Konstantin Leont'ev i ego "vostochnye povesti"// Gengobunka Ronshu (Studies in Languages and Cultures), Institute of Modern Languages and Cultures, University of Tsukuba (Tsukuba, 1998), no. 46, p. 127-148.
his basic philosophical ideas, but also covered a lot of sensitive political issues of the time. Particularly, he expressed his views on the Greco-Bulgarian religious dispute, which had resulted in the establishment, by the Sultan's decree, of the independent Bulgarian-Orthodox Church in the beginning of the seventies. In fact, Leontiev's views on the Bulgarian schism were completely in line with those of Russian religious authorities. However, they differed greatly from the general opinion.

As to Leontiev's conception of Byzantineism, it implied an autocratic state, a rigorous Orthodox Church, and a distinctive culture. According to Leontiev, it was Byzantineism which would be the stronghold against liberal progress leading towards universal equality and, consequently, to the final destruction of culture. He also believed that it was the power of Russia that guaranteed the very existence of the Slavs. But because Byzantineism was necessary for Russia to be strong, those who attacked the authority of the Byzantineism eroded, perhaps unwillingly, the pillars of the Russian statehood. When saying this, he meant the contemporaneous Bulgarian nationalist leaders in the first place. He considered them mere copycats imitating the worst Western patterns of constitutionalism. According to Leontiev, those atheists and demagogues used the religious feelings of the primitive Bulgarian nation only to achieve their own political ambitions. He also keeps mentioning the intention of seeking a dual Bulgaro-Turkish monarchy, which spread among some of those épiciers in the sixties. In the Ottoman Empire, wrote Leontiev in 1873, the Christian faith was no more a victim of oppression. He warned the Russian Slavophiles, that the Bulgarians as well as the other Slavs thought differently. The stubborn, somber, and shrewd Bulgarian could not be a greater contrast to Russian; they differed from each other like the mechanic from the poet. According to Leontiev, the Balkan intelligentsia did not care about the All-Slavonic civilization which was expected by the Slavophiles to bring a new creative power to humanity. Finally, Leontiev was strictly opposed to any idea of uniting the Slavs in one single Slavonic state. In his opinion, this would have been lethal to the very existence of the Great Russian statehood."
When Leontiev's two-volume collection of works *The East, Russia, and Slavdom* was published in 1885-1886, it had already become clear for him that most of his judgments and predictions concerning Balkan affairs had proved to be true. According to Leontiev, the Bulgarian crisis of 1885 had demonstrated this *par excellence*. Leontiev continued disseminating his ideas until his death. He died as a monk, soon after taking his vows in Optina Pustyn' monastery.

Generally speaking, the ideas of Leontiev were met with little response by the Russian press. There is no doubt, however, that they could not be ignored by the best Russian minds of the time. One can suggest, for instance, that they had a real effect upon both Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy - however, the extent of this influence is still to be determined.

In her recent book, an ex-Bulgarian scholar Maria Todorova says:

'During the Eastern crisis of 1875-1878, [...] the Russian intelligentsia was unanimous in passionately opposing the oppression of the Balkan Slavs; many supported also their political efforts to achieve independence from the Porte. Among the well-known Russian writers, Ivan Turgenev, Feodor M. Dostoevskii, Leo N. Tolstoy, M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, Vladimir G. Korolenko, Gleb I. Uspenskii, Vsevolod M. Garshin, Vasilii I. Nemirovich-Danchenko, and many others contributed immensely to the formation of a public opinion that forced Russia to enter the war against the Ottoman Empire. Tolstoy himself, feeling that “All Russia is there, and I should go myself” was dissuaded only with great difficulty from joining as a volunteer."

It seems, that the author hereby not only has interpreted the history but also changed it. Let us concentrate on her picturing Count Tolstoy as both a leader of the public opinion, which allegedly forced Russia to fight the Turks, and an excited person who was about to join the army. Let us make it clear. This fact of Tolstoy's biography is real. Once Tolstoy told

his wife about such an intention[^15]. But seriously, being a true Russian aristocrat, he was a man of honour. It was therefore only natural for him to have the personal feelings of the kind when Russian army suffered great losses at the initial stage of the campaign. Only when Kars, a Turkish stronghold in Asia Minor, was taken by the Russian troops in November 1877, Tolstoy said that he was not ashamed anymore[^7].

As to his views on the war and the Slavophile movement in particular, they were quite the opposite. The negative position of Tolstoy towards Panslavism was openly expressed in the epilogue (i.e. part eight) of *Anna Karenina*, which Katkov, the then editor of the novel, rejected to publish in his literary magazine "Russkii Vestnik" (The Russian Herald). When appeared as a separate publication, the epilogue also incited a severe critique from Feodor Dostoyevsky in his "A Writer’s Diary" of July-August 1877.

They say, that in *Anna Karenina*, Tolstoy rarely displays ideas in philosophical reflection of his own as he used to in *War and Peace*. Ideas are lodged in the minds of his characters, as well as more generally in their lives. However, he did personally subscribe to some of the ideas expressed by Levin. A propos, this name should be pronounced as Lövin. In such a manner, according to Konstantin Leontiev, this name was pronounced by Tolstoy himself. One of these ideas was Levin’s view on the

[^15]: Todorova M. *Imagining the Balkans* (New York - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 85. Todorova continues: ‘Yet, one should not over-estimate the intensity of slavophile feelings and their influence on Russian foreign policy, characterized by Barbara Jelavich as defensive and peaceful rather than expansionist, paternal rather than messianic. The real interests and attention of Russia during the nineteenth century - economic, strategic, military, and even cultural - also involving the Balkans, were not intractably fixated on them; they were almost exclusively concentrated on Central Asia and subsequently on the Far East’ (loc. cit.).


Russian volunteers who were going to Serbia which declared war on the Turks, following the uprising against the Turks in Herzegovina and Bosnia in 1875 and the Bulgarian atrocities in April 1876. There once were around three thousand Russian volunteers there. Most of them were fighting under the command of Russian General Cherniaev. Levin answers the question, why have private individuals no right to go to war, in the following way:

'Oh, my theory is this: on one hand war such a bestial, cruel, dreadful affair that no man - to say nothing of a Christian - can take upon himself personally the responsibility of beginning a war: that can only be done by a government, whose business is to look to these things when they become inevitable. On the other hand, both political science and common sense teach us that in matters of state, especially in the matter of war, private citizens must renounce their personal individual will. [...] He wanted to ask, too, why, if public opinion were an infallible guide, a revolution, a commune were not as legitimate as the movement in favour of the Slavonic question.'

In a draft version of the epilogue, Levin also says: 'If so, why do you condemn communists and socialists? Can't they show you more and worse crimes than the Bulgarian massacre? While now you are dealing with the oppression of the Slavs, they deal with the oppression of half the mankind.' Generally speaking, Tolstoy expresses his thoughts more openly in his drafts than in the final version of the epilogue. There, for instance, the following passage can be found: 'They saved the Serbs from poverty and oppression, the very oppressed, who, according to their own ministers, were fighting badly because they were too fat. And weak and poor Russian muzhiks are coming to save these very Serbs, who were growing fat under oppression. And, under the pretext of a Holy deed, the Russian people, who themselves were suffering from famine, were deprived from their kopecks in favour of these fat Serbs.'

---

19 Tolstoy, *PSS*, vol. 20, no. 201, p. 572.
Interestingly enough, that today such views of Tolstoy are shared by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. In his essay *The Russian Question*, Solzhenitsyn writes the following:

'Two wretched (in the Russian original: unlucky - G. A., K. Zh.) ideas relentlessly tormented and pulled all our rulers in succession: to help and to save the Transcaucasian Christians, and to help and to save the Orthodox in the Balkans. One can acknowledge the loftiness of these moral principles, but not to the extent of neglecting the needs of our own, also Christian people. [...] With the accumulation of national fatigue over three centuries, with our economic and social problems [...], with all this - the endless wars for the Balkan Christians were the crime against the Russian people. One such war was the taxing war with Turkey in 1877-78. Russia sprang into the conflict without assuring herself of allies or trusty well-wishers, impatiently forestalling the listless protest of the European Powers against Turkish atrocities. [...] The war was waged sensationally, impressing all Europe with its successes, including a winter crossing over the Balkan ridge (which brought suffering and death to numerous soldiers). [...] The Treaty of San Stefano seemingly gave the Balkans all that Russia was seeking for them: independence for Serbia, for an enlarged Montenegro, and for Romania; the expansion of Bulgaria, self-rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and an easing restrictions for Christians yet remaining under Turkish rule. Triumph, then, and realization of a century-old dream? England now directly threatened war (with her fleet at the Princes Islands), Austria mobilisation, and all the European Powers demanded that a conference be convened to relieve Russia of her spoils. That is exactly what transpired. At the Congress of Berlin, England, having done preciously little, was given Cyprus; Austria - the right to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina; Bulgaria was once more carved up, Serbia and Montenegro carved down; while Russia herself regained only Bessarabia, which she had lost after the Crimean war. [...] Such a “victorious” war is worth no more than a lost one; cheaper yet - to not start it at all. Russian military and financial strength was undermined, the public's spirit fell; and

---

it was then that the revolutionary era with its terrorism began to gain momentum, leading soon to the assassination of Alexander II.\textsuperscript{2}

In the novel, Tolstoy juxtaposes the ideas of Levin with those of Professor Sergei Ivanovich Kozynshev, Levin's brother-uterine:

'In the circle to which he [Kozynshev] belonged nothing else was written or talked about at that time except the Slavonic question and the Serbian war. Everything the idle crowd usually does to kill time, it now did for the benefit of the Slavs. Balls, concerts, dinners, speeches, fashions, beer, restaurants - all bore witness to public sympathy with the Slavs.

With much that was said and written on the subject, Kozynshev did not agree in detail. He saw that the Slav question had become one of those fashionable distractions which follow one another in quick succession as an occupation for society; he saw also that too many people were taking up the question from motives of self-interest and self-advertisement. He recognized that the newspapers printed much that was unnecessary and exaggerated for the sole purpose of attracting attention and outcry the rivals. He noticed that the people who leaped to the front and shouted loudest in this general surge of enthusiasm were smarting under a sense of injury - generals without armies, ministers without portfolios, journalist without papers, and party leaders without followers. He saw much that was frivolous and absurd. But he saw and admitted an unmistakable, ever-growing enthusiasm, uniting all classes, with which it was impossible not to sympathize. The massacre of Slavs who were co-religionists and brothers excited sympathy for the sufferers and indignation against their oppressors. And the heroism of the Serbians and Montenegrins, fighting for a great cause, begot in the whole nation a longing to help brothers not only in word but in deed.

At the same time another phenomenon rejoiced Kozynshev's heart. It was the manifestation of public opinion. The public had definitely expressed its wishes. "The soul of nation had become articulate", as Kozynshev put it. The

more he studied the movement the more incontestable it seemed to him that it was a cause destined to assume vast dimensions and mark an epoch in the history of Russia.²²

We have already seen how Tolstoy treated the so-called public opinion. So did Levin who 'could not admit that it was right for a handful of men, among them his brother, to assert, [...] that they and the newspapers were expressing the will and feeling of the people - especially when that feeling found its expression in bloodshed (in the Russian original: vengeance - G. A., K. Zh.) and murder. He could not admit this, because he saw no confirmation of such feelings in the masses among whom he was living, nor did he find any such thoughts in himself (and he could not consider himself as other than one of the people making up the Russian nation). Above all, he could not agree because he, in common with the people, did not know and could not know wherein lay the general welfare, though he knew beyond a doubt that this welfare could only be achieved by strict observance of that law of right and wrong (in the Russian original: of goodness - G. A., K. Zh.) which has been revealed to every man, and therefore he could not wish for war or advocate war for any public advantage²³.

This position corresponds perfectly to the epigraph of the novel: "Vengeance is mine, and I will repay". One may also see in it the early signs of what later would be called Tolstoy's "non-resistance to evil".

Indeed, Anna Karenina is a novel not only of love but of ideas. It is also a panoramic novel of Russian life in the seventies. Tolstoy's heroes talk about the matters which were of importance of the day; they read about real events in the newspapers; and read books which were in vogue at their time, and so on. Sometimes Tolstoy prefers to picture such real events in a disguised form or uses them in order to achieve typification. In the final part of the novel, one can read that the appearance of Professor Kozynshev's book Sketch of a Survey of the Principles and Forms of Government in Europe and Russia was followed by almost dead

²² Anna Karenina, p. 805-806.
²³ Ibid., p. 845-846.
silence. This was just the case of Danilevsky’s book *Russia and Europe*, which had sold a mere 1200 copies in 15 years.
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It’s a well-known fact that a number of characters of the novel have their historical prototypes. For example, some scholars believe that General Serpukhovskoi was made out of General Mikhail D. Skobelev - to name just one famous person.

However, the origins of many other characters still remain unclear. Among them, one can mention Golenishchev - a comrade of Vronsky’s in the Corps of Pages, whom Vronsky and Anna met in a small Italian town during their European journey. Golenishchev was working on the second part of the *Two Principles*, the book which 'would deal with almost all questions'. A former liberal, he became a hyperconservative. He rejected atheism, nihilism, and materialism, asserting that the Russians were the heirs of Byzantium. He did this with much agitation, in his efforts to refute all manner of imaginary opponents.

The "Italian chapters" of the novel appeared in the April issue of "The Russian Herald" in 1876. Tolstoy worked on them in his estate Yasnaya Poliana mostly in March and April 1876. There is also a draft written by Tolstoy's hand (ms. 77), which presents a slightly different version of the character of Golenishchev. It says, in particular, that Golenishchev’s book, with its title *The Lessons of Life*, was the product of his ten-year labour.

These basic data enables us to propose the following hypothesis:

---

25 For example, no suggestion of the prototypes of Golenishchev can be found in: Babaev E. G. *Roman i vremia. “Anna Karenina” L. N. Tolstogo* (Tula, 1975), p. 68.
26 *Anna Korenina*, p. 484-488.
28 Tolstoy, *PSS*, vol. 20, no. 116, p. 394
Tolstoy may have been informed of the chief ideas of Konstantin Leontieiev and, in particular, his views on the Balkan Slavs, before the latter’s manifesto Byzantinism and Slavdom was published. By comparing the biographical events of both Tolstoy and Leontieiev, we have come to the conclusion that Tolstoy may have been told about Leontieiev by Pavel D. Golokhvastov, a mutual acquaintance of theirs, as early as August 1874 (Old Style). In our opinion, Golokhvastov could not only serve as the missing link between the the views of both writers. We also believe that Pavel Golokhvastov could be considered as another historical prototype of the same Golenishchev.

There could be therefore at least two historical prototypes of this character, namely Leontieiev and Golokhvastov - a proposition which, in fact, corresponds to Tolstoy’s manner of writing. Once he described this as follows:

'I often picture real life. In the past, I used to write the real names in my drafts and changed them only in the final versions. It would be regrettable if a likeness between the imaginary names and the real ones makes someone think that I was going to picture a real person... . I believe that by describing a real person you get not a type but something particular, exclusive and not interesting. It’s absolutely necessary therefore to take the main traits of one person and add to them the traits of the other people whom you have happened to observe. In this case, the character becomes typical. You need to observe many similar people to produce a distinctive type'.

One may wonder if Leontieiev and Golokhvastov were people of the same kind. To answer this question, let us see first what we know about Pavel D. Golokhvastov (1838-1892). This graduate of the Corps of Pages, an educational establishment for the aristocracy, was an old friend of Tolstoy’s. Tolstoy patronized Golokhvastov and, as can be seen from their correspondence, kept pushing him to finish his work on Russian versification. One such attempt was made in Tolstoy’s letter of March 1876. The

---

letter was sent to Golokhvastov to Italy where the latter had already lived for some time. That March, as we know, Tolstoy worked on the "Italian chapters" of the novel. Golokhvastov's slow manner of working on the book contrasted badly with his enthusiastic manner of expressing his views - which sometimes irritated Tolstoy. There are therefore at least two parallels with the character of Golenishchev, first, in terms of biography (in general - he was a graduate of the Corps of Pages; and in particular - he lived in Italy) and, second, in terms of temperament (compare Golenishchev's words in the novel: 'To be exact, I am not writing yet but preparing and collecting material')

20). While the first can be regarded as a quite common habit in the milieu of the Russian aristocracy, the second is a special trait of the personality. Taken together, they facilitate typification. Shall we also compare the spelling of the names Golenishchev and Golokhvastov, bearing in mind Tolstoy's above-mentioned manner of using first real names before later changing them. Finally, there is a good description of Golokhvastov left by another friend of Tolstoy's, Nikolai Strakhov. In his letter of January 1, 1875, Strakhov writes Tolstoy from St. Petersburg the following: 'I saw here a kind of your Levin. Pavel Dmitrievich Golokhvastov came here and I liked him very much. He sat down with me for two evenings explaining me his theory of Russian versification - a great theory in which I strongly believe. What a sense of the language and verse he has! For the first time in my life, I heard the genuine rendering of the epics (byliny). Not to mention his patriotism, his challenging thoughts about Europe... You know, of course, he is a strong admirer of yours... and is expecting from you the greatest book' 22.

Now let us see what we now about Konstantin Leontiev's biography. Thanks to Leontiev himself, it is possible to trace his life in Russia for a few months after he returned home from Constantinople in spring 1874. He left his memoirs about his failed attempts to become a professional

---

21 Anna Karenina, p. 488.
22 Perepiska L. N. Tolstogo s N. N. Strakhovym, 1870-1894. S predisl. i primech. B. L. Modzalevskogo (SPb, 1914), no. 18, p. 55-56.
writer in September and October 1874. From Turkey he returned with his two major works - a treatise Byzantinism and Slavdom and Odysseus Polychroniades, a panoramic novel in the form of memoirs of a Greek from Epirus. Leontiev came home overwhelmed with his thoughts and feelings. One of his later critics (Vsevolod Soloviev) wrote him that Odysseus did not look like a novel. It rather looked like an endless speech of a man who had been forced to keep silence for many years before getting a chance to speak. Needless to say, Leontiev's greatest desire was to see his works in print as soon as possible. However, the state of his finances was so bleak that he had to postpone his visit to Moscow, to see his previous publisher Mikhail Katkov, until autumn. By 1874, Katkov had already published a few items of Leontiev's, including his article Panslavism and the Greeks (undersigned Constantinov), in his monthly periodical "The Russian Herald."

Now we are coming to the heart of the matter. In August 1874, Leontiev found himself as a guest at Shatilov's. Leontiev and a rich landowner and prominent public figure Iosif Shatilov had known each other since 1856. After the Crimean war, Leontiev as a family doctor spent six months in his Crimean estate. (There, by the way, in 1857 Leontiev also met Ivan Aksakov, who later became a famous Slavophile writer and publisher.) This time, however, Leontiev came to another of Shatilov's estates - Mokhovoe in the government of Tula - and found himself encircled with guests including Pavel Golokhvastov, whom we have already met, and his family. More importantly, they expected one more guest, namely Count Lev Tolstoy, whose estate Yasnaya Poliana was situated in the same government and who promised, in his letters to Pavel Golokhvastov of July 8 and July 29, to be at Shatilov's by August 15 (Old Style). One can imagine that Leontiev could hardly wait. He kept talking to Golokhvastov about the works written in Turkey which he was so eager to see in print.

---

35 Tolstoy PSS vol. 62, no. 85, p. 97-98; no. 89, p.102-103.
We know also that Golokhvastov recommended him to seek assistance from the aged historian Mikhail Pogodin and not to place too much hope in winning the support of Ivan Aksakov\textsuperscript{36}. In fact, Pogodin, the then President of the Imperial Historical Society, would later help Leontiev to publish his *Byzantinism* in the academic "Chteniiia".

As to the expectations of Shatilov's guests with regard to Tolstoy, they passed unfulfilled. Tolstoy could not come. Instead he confirmed his invitation to the Golokhvastovs to pay a visit to Yasnaya in the twenties of August\textsuperscript{37}. What a disaster for Leontiev! He left for Moscow and the Golokhvastovs went to Yasnanya, where they stayed until August 29\textsuperscript{38}. Since the Golokhvastovs had stayed at Yasnaya for a week or so, one may safely argue that Tolstoy had enough time to speak with Pavel Golokhvastov. There is also Tolstoy's reply of September 25(26) in a letter to Golokhvastov, in which Tolstoy, besides making comments on some literary magazines (including "The Russian Herald"), gave him the advice not to publish his article on the Russian verse in an academic periodical like "Chteniiia"\textsuperscript{39}. Unfortunately, the corresponding letter of Golokhvastov has not been preserved. However, judging from the content of this reply of Tolstoy, we can speculate what would be the content of that letter and perhaps the topic of their conversation in Yasnaya too.

In the week after the departure of the Golokhvastovs, Tolstoy had a meeting with Shatilov too - and then went to Moscow. There he talked to Katkov and his aides and soon entered into negotiations concerning *Anna Karenina*. The next year, the first chapters of the novel appeared in Katkov's "The Russian Herald".

As to Leontiev, he was no more lucky in Moscow than in Mokhovoe. He paid a few visits to the Aksakovs' place where to meet a number of influential persons. According to Leontiev, Aksakov kept saying one and the same introductory phrase to his guests: 'Mr. Leontiev, former consul in

\textsuperscript{36} Leontiev, *Moia literaturnaia sud'ba*, p. 454-456.
\textsuperscript{37} Tolstoy. *PSS*, vol. 62 no 96 p 105
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., no. 100, p. 109.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., no. 105, p. 114-115.
Turkey, spent ten years there, the author of *Panslavism and the Greeks*. However, Golokhvastov was right in warning Leontiev about Aksakov. Ivan Aksakov rejected *Byzantinism and Slavdom*. So did Katkov. There was only one success - Katkov accepted Leontiev’s *Odysseus*. Next summer the beginning of the novel was published in three consecutive issues of “The Russian Herald” and received a few favourable reviews. This, however, turned into a failure in 1876 because the continuation of *Odysseus* was published in the same issues of “The Russian Herald” as Anna Karenina’s was (AK: Russkii Vestnik, 1-4; *Odysseus*: Russkii Vestnik, 1-3). Needless to say, Leontiev’s novel was absolutely overshadowed by Tolstoy’s masterpiece. It was a great blow to Leontiev’s feelings of self-importance, because he regarded his novel as good as Goncharov’s *Oblomov* and sometimes even equal to Anna Karenina itself. Another blow from Tolstoy was dealt him a dozen years later, in 1889, when he attempted to have his *Odysseus* published as a book. Through a mediator (Anatolii Aleksandrov), Leontiev failed to persuade Tolsoy to write an introduction to the novel.

The fate of *Byzantinism and Slavdom* was much the same. On the recommendation of the historian Pogodin, Leontiev gave it to an academic quarterly (in May 1875), which obviously was un accessible to the general public. The third volume of the “Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh”, with the treatise in it, appeared after Pogodin’s death, who died on December 8/20, 1875. One may speculate, therefore, that it could
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41 See, for example, the reviews by A. O. (V. G. Avseenko) in: Russkii mir, no. 96, 11/23 iiulia 1875, p. 1-2; no. 125, 9/21 avgusta 1875, p. 1-2; no. 153, 6/18 sentiabria 1875, p. 1-2 and a review by L. V. (M. A. Zagulieva) in: Journal de St.-Pétersbourg, no. 56, 29 feévrier (12 mars) 1876, p. 1-2.
42 Vs. Soloviev writes in his review, that ‘the timing of the appearance of this beautiful narrative is very unfortunate, because the readers’ attention is consumed by Anna Karenina to such an extent, as if the rest of the journal does not exist at all’ (Russkii mir, no. 98, 11/23 Aprilia 1876, p. 2).
43 Aleksandrov A. I. *Pamiati K. N. Leont’eva. II. Pis’ma K. N. Leont’evu k Anatoliyu Aleksandrovu* (Sergiev Posad, 1915), no. 41, p. 83.
44 Ibid., no. 34, p. 70, note 78.
be published in January 1876 or even later (vol. 4 appeared in March 1876, not earlier). There was also the advantage that, according to the rules of the periodical, Leontiev could get 300 offprints of his work. However, it is still unclear when exactly they happened to be at his disposal. From his own letters, we know that for the winter of 1875-1876 he was going to stay in Optina Pustyn’ monastery. We know for sure that he was in Moscow on April 19. By Easter, that is by April 4, 1876, Katkov published a three-volumed collection of Leontiev’s works. He reprinted Leontiev’s stories and the chapters of Odysseus under the title From the Life of Christians in Turkey. This edition was reviewed in Katkov’s newspaper Moskovskie Vedomosti on April 24. As to Leontiev’s Byzantinism it was reviewed by Nikolai Strakhov in the St. Petersburg newspaper Russkii Mir on May 20 (no. 137, p. 1-2). Unlike Professor Koznychev who did this in the novel Anna Karenina, we cannot finely calculate the time necessary for the review to appear in this particular case. We may, however, suggest that Leontiev distributed his offprints also in April. There is therefore only a slight theoretical possibility that Tolstoy would have seen Byzantinism in print, if he ever saw it at all, while working on the “Italian chapters” of the novel Anna Karenina in April. Under the circumstances, it seems more probable that it was Leontiev’s Odysseus which may have made Tolstoy recall one of his many conversations with Pavel Golokhvastov from Yasnaya in late August 1874. Indeed, that particular dialogue might well have been a meditation on the two principles, Byzantinism and Slavdom, of Konstantin Leontiev’s essay, and on its author Konstantin Leontiev himself.

46 Konstantin Leont’ev. Izbrannye pis’ma, no. 49, p. 112.
47 Ibid., no. 56, p. 130.
48 "... the literary present, which Mr. Leont’ev gave us by the holidays’, i. e. the Easter (V. Nekliudov. Moskovskie vedomosti, no. 10, p. 4).
49 It was the only review of the treatise and the only review by Strakhov of any of Leontiev’s works although they had been exchanging letters since the 60’s.
Finally, it was also in March and April 1876, when Tolstoy, for the first time, showed an interest in the Slavonic question. In a few letters to a famous Russian poet Afanasii A. Shenshin-Fet, which were written in this period, that is precisely in the time of working on the "Italian chapters", Tolstoy kept asking his correspondent about the adventures of Fet's brother - Petr Afanasieovich who had gone to Herzegovina as early as 1875. His first attempt to reach his destination was unsuccessful and he returned home by March 1876. Before long Petr Afanasieovich tried again and was more lucky this time. In April 1876, he managed to join the insurgents fighting the Turks in the Balkans. It seems, that such a background can be regarded as an additional argument in support of our theory.

As we have seen, Leontiev and Tolstoy had many mutual acquaintances. It is not clear, however, when they met each other for the first time. It might well have happened in 1882, when Leontiev as a censor was working in Moscow. This year appeared an expanded edition of his essay *Our new Christians: F. M. Dostoevsky and Count Lev Tolstoi* and he himself gained a certain position in literature. Once, in August 1883, Tolstoy told one of his visitors, that he had already known Leontiev, who paid a couple of visits to him in Moscow. 'It seems to me, that we did not very much like each other', - said Tolstoy on that occasion. Tolstoy also visited Leontiev while in Optina Pustyn monastery in December 1890. During this famous meeting, Leontiev promised Tolstoy to have him expelled to Siberia. By that time, Leontiev had already finished his critical essay on Tolstoy's novels. As a matter of fact, Leontiev's criticism of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky is regarded as brilliant and often apt. In his essay, *On the Novels of Count Lev Tolstoi: Analysis, Style, and the Spirit of the Times* (1890), Leontiev wrote *Anna Karenina* up. It was a novel which he, having been a prototype of one of its heroes, was certainly competent to discuss. When analysing some of the characters, he permitted himself to

---

50 Tolstoy *PSS* vol. 62 no. 244, p. 253-254; no. 250, p 258; no. 260, p. 267-268.
51 Ibid., no. 217, p. 217.
52 Tolstoy, *PSS*, vol. 85, p. 313.
make comparisons between them and real persons. He writes, for example, that in the epilogue'... Koznychev plays the same active role as Iv. S. Aksakov did when General Cherniaev made his deeds of arms in Serbia.54 However, as an intelligent man Leontiev never showed, in an open manner at least, his awareness of the origins of Golenishchev. No doubt, he recognized some of his own features depicted in the character of Golenishchev. One can understand this from his letter to Konstantin Gubastov of February 1877, in which he says: 'There is nothing especially new in the literature. Anna Karenina is continued but Tolstoy has somewhat fallen short of my expectations. The continuation is not so good as the first part was [...], there is no same extent of those brilliance and power, that can be found in the narrative before Vronsky's and Anna's trip abroad.55 What a curious coincidence! Shall we repeat once more, that it was during this trip that the couple met Golenishchev?

Another character made out of Leontiev, which is known to exist in Russian literature, is Koz'min in Petr D. Boborykin's novel Pereval (A Pass) published in 189756. Like Golenishchev in Anna Karenina, Boborykin's Koz'min is only an episodical character. And, also like Golenishchev, he speaks about Byzantium. Koz'min preaches that the West Slavs - the Serbs, Bulgarians and others, spoiled by mischievous tricks of the West have abandoned the Byzantine tradition and therefore predicts nothing good for them.57

---

55 Konstantin Leont'ev izbrannye pis'ma, no. 63, p. 144-145.
56 Once a very popular writer, now Boborykin is famous mainly for the term intelligentsia, which he coined in 1866.
On the roots of Eurasianism

One can say, that Leontiev was somehow destined to be linked to the novel *Anna Karenina*, even after his death. Some scholars believe, for instance, that senator Ableukhov, a character of Andrei Belyi’s novel *Petersburg*, was made out of the imaginary Alexei Karenin, on the one hand, and, the real Pobedonostsev, Pleve and Konstantin Leontiev, on the other\(^8\). It seems, that our conclusions link Leontiev to the novel *Anna Karenina* even closer.

4

Having established the historical prototypes of Golenishchev, we can now shed new light on the development of Tolstoy’s perception of Panslavism. Now, we would think, one may safely argue that there was a link between Leontiev’s ideas of “our Bulgarian madness”, on the one hand, and Tolstoy’s views on the “Serbian insanity”, with which Russia was possessed on the eve of the war with Turkey. Both expressions the “Bulgarian madness” and “Serbian insanity” belong to Leontiev and Tolstoy respectively\(^9\). It goes without saying, that Tostoy by no means inherited the set of ideas of Leontiev, which was expressed in Leontiev’s *Byzantinism and Slavdom*. But, in this particular case, one can see a common mood which united both of them. And, in getting this spirit, which was quite unfavourable to Panslavism, Tolstoy might, though indirectly, well have been indebted to Konstantin Leontiev. Obviously such an emotional background could have facilitated the generation of his own original, though seemingly same coloured, ideas.

Finally, it should be highlighted, that Leontiev not only rejected Panslavism but also represented a new Russian approach to Asia. He be-

---


\(^9\) “Nashe bolgarobesie” (K. Leontiev). This neologism can be found in his *Pis’ma oishel’niko / Vostok. Rossiia i slavianstvo*, p. 166. Tolstoy used the following expressions: “erunda serbskogo dvizheniia”, “serbskoe sumasshestvie”, “slavianskaia dur’” (see Tolstoy, *PSS*, vol. 62, no. 294, p. 290-291; no. 326, p. 322; no. 422, p. 411).
lieved, that it was a synthesis of Slavic and Turanian elements which would shape Russian culture into something spiritually independent and distinct from Europe. Such ideas of his were frequently cited by Eurasians, and so he is rightly regarded as a forerunner of the Eurasian movement. But his real importance in this connection is still to be understood. While writing on the emergence of Eurasianism, N. Riasanovsky proposes the following genealogical scheme: 'To paraphrase their own schemes of classification, the Eurasians can perhaps be defined as situated between the Slavophiles and Danilevskii although closer to Danilevskii'⁶⁸. However, he also points out, that 'the problem of origins presents a special difficulty in this case. The difficulty lies in the fact of striking disjointedless, in a lack of fundamental connection between Eurasianism and preceding Russian views of the world'⁶⁹. It seems, that future detailed study of Leontiev's views of the world would help to shed new light on the roots of Eurasianism and perhaps fill the gap mentioned by Riasanovsky. Obviously the Eurasian departure in Russian thought was prepared by many factors, including a strong criticism of Panslavism. In this regard, the significance of Leontiev's contribution can hardly be overestimated.
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⁶⁹ Riasanovsky N. The emergence of Eurasianism, p. 142.
⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 136.