

# QUEER TOLSTOY

## A Psychobiography

*Javier Sethness Castro*

First published 2023

ISBN: 978-1-032-35850-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-34255-9 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-32896-4 (ebk)

## CHAPTER 2

### LEV NIKOLAEVICH TOLSTOY

#### A Queer, Christian-Anarchist Writer

(CC-BY-NC)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003328964-2

The Funder for this chapter is Javier Sethness Castro

# 2

## LEV NIKOLAEVICH TOLSTOY

### A Queer, Christian-Anarchist Writer

As a prose poet, literary author, journalist, and ethicist, Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy served as a radical critic of the instrumentalization of life, whether perpetrated through war, feudal-capitalist exploitation, or State oppression. In the estimation of Vladimir Vasilievich Stasov (1824–1906), head of the Imperial Academy Library in St. Petersburg, Tolstoy ranks not only among Russia’s greatest writers. He also stands upright alongside the poet-ambassador Alexander Griboyedov (1795–1829) and the revolutionary Populist “father” of Russian socialism Alexander Herzen as one of the three “preeminently intellectual” Russian writers.<sup>1</sup> In parallel, the artist’s fellow Christian anarchist Nikolai Berdyaev (1874–1948) lauds his predecessor for having exposed the “falsehood and injustice [that] lie at the very roots of civilization,” revolted “against the false standards of greatness and the false sanctities of history,” and “rebelled against history and civilization with unheard of radicalism.”<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, according to the literary critic Inessa Medzhibovskaya (b. 1964), Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy was Russia’s “first modern man, the first defender of the autonomous freedom of conscience.”<sup>3</sup>

In his commitment to liberative social ethics, which espouses human equality, liberty, and struggle, Tolstoy was related by creed to the radical Iranian intellectual Ali Shariati (1933–1977), who was “essentially a modern religious man,” as well.<sup>4</sup> As Tolstoy posthumously inspired the Russian Revolution of 1917, so Shariati influenced the coming of the Iranian Revolution after his death. For the Russian novelist and prose poet, the “fundamental desire[s] of the human individual” are for freedom, free cooperation, sympathy, and unity, and love is both the “natural state of the soul” and the “natural form of interaction among people.”<sup>5</sup> In consonance with the Russian existentialist Lev Shestov (1866–1938), his namesake remains “an important witness, to whom one not only can listen but to whom it is our duty to listen”—especially given that this preacher, “throughout all his life, stubbornly professed the conviction that outside the ‘good’ there is no salvation.”<sup>6</sup>

In its edict of February 1901 excommunicating Tolstoy, the Most Holy Governing Synod, an arm of the Tsarist State founded by Peter I (the “Great”), referred to him as a “new false teacher [...] seduc[ed by] his intellectual pride.”<sup>7</sup> Such ideological disciplining functioned to punish the humanist prophet for the “pride” of confidently relying on his own powers, defying the masochistic passivity on which the parasitical existence of Church and State depend, and seeking the liberation of the *Narod* (Народ, “People”) through an anarchistic universalization of his own aristocratic sense of personal dignity.<sup>8</sup> In light of the fundamental threat posed to every abuser by the freedom of the spirit, the Synod’s depravity is unsurprising.<sup>9</sup> These representatives of State authority evidently felt threatened by Tolstoy’s emblematic scorn for the father-figure, and thus also for the internalized aggression, unconscious guilt, and repression expected of those subjected to hierarchical social institutions.<sup>10</sup>

Arguing in better faith than the Synod, the anarchist’s wife Sofia Andreevna Tolstaya (1844–1919) saw her partner “both [as] an artistic genius and a moral hypocrite,” particularly in light of his sexist attitudes.<sup>11</sup> In like fashion, the Formalist literary critic Viktor Shklovsky (1893–1984) perceived that “[t]here lived at Yasnaya Polyana”—the main Volkonsky–Tolstoy estate—“an intemperate, unfulfilled and restless man.”<sup>12</sup> In contrast, his friend, the liberal author Ivan Turgenev, wrote in 1882 that his counterpart was “a very queer fellow but undoubtedly a genius, and the kindest of men,” just as another colleague, the conservative literary critic Nikolai N. Strakhov (1828–1896), painted him as “a sensitive aesthete by nature.”<sup>13</sup> Above all, the Symbolist poet Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky (1866–1941) welcomed the prose poet’s 80th birthday in 1908 as a “celebration of the Russian revolution” against despotism, and the Polish Jewish Marxist Rosa Luxemburg (1871–1919) praised Tolstoy as a “vehement prophet” for tirelessly preaching the abolition of private property, militarism, and the State.<sup>14</sup> The two shared a common commitment to romance and freedom, as summarized by Luxemburg: “My ideal is a social system that allows one to love everybody with a clear conscience.”<sup>15</sup>

One might add that, following his religious “conversion” in the late 1870s, the count semi-consciously repudiated heterosexuality and increasingly withdrew from his marriage, while hinting at his unsatisfied homosexual desires, which in reality had permeated his art from the beginning.<sup>16</sup> Historically, non-normative, alternate, or queer sexuality, particularly as expressed in revolutionism, has had a close relationship with Eastern-Christian monastic and ascetic traditions.<sup>17</sup> Along these lines, during the Russian Civil War (1918–1920), the Bolshevik authorities prosecuted numerous “class enemies,” especially Orthodox clerics, for ostensibly “unnatural acts,” thus anticipating Stalin’s totalitarian mobilization of compulsory heterosexuality in the 1930s.<sup>18</sup>

Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy’s writings flourished as a subversive symbolic system in late Imperial Russia, both despite official preliminary censorship, and because the arts under Tsarism served as “an arena for political, philosophical and religious debate” and the development of social thought “in the absence of a parliament or a free press.”<sup>19</sup> Pervasive in Tolstoy’s work is the concept of “the natural love and unity immanent in [hu]man[ity],” in the formulation of philosopher Ludwig

Feuerbach (1804–1872), who likewise believed in the word’s “power to redeem, to reconcile, to bless, to make free.”<sup>20</sup> Thus, like the literary knight-errant Don Quixote, Lev Nikolaevich sought to “sustain the imaginary universe which captivate[d] him” by connecting with others in affective, sexual, creative, and political ways.<sup>21</sup> The writer believed the “mingl[ing of] souls with another” to be “the very essence of art,” which at its best manifests successful human interrelatedness.<sup>22</sup> Those who—like Tolstoy—have a highly developed “Openness/Intellect” domain of personality often dream and engage in reverie and emotional subversion not just at night, but also during the day.<sup>23</sup> The writer did not fear his dreams or hide them from others. In political and erotic terms, he identified the need to “destro[y] the wall that separates us from the people, retur[n] what we have taken from them, dra[w] nearer to them and unit[e] with them as a natural result of abandoning our privileges.”<sup>24</sup>

Through intercourse of many kinds, whether artistic, social, erotic, or political, we express that “[w]e all want to be together and at one.”<sup>25</sup> One could say that the goal of the “One Big Union” animating the anarcho-syndicalist cause is the same. Yet, in Tolstoy’s case, it is evident that, although the man sought to “merge with” the People, he was “equally a loner, a ‘stranger’” in his relation to the human collective, for both economic and psychological reasons.<sup>26</sup> This thematic opposition between estrangement, or separation, and residence, or union, reverberates throughout Tolstoy’s life and art. His insider-outsider status, his anarchist politics, his delayed marriage, and the precarity of his love bonds with other men, “outside the institutions of family, property, and couple form,” all convey his queerness.<sup>27</sup> Reflecting a cultural introjection of Eastern-Christian concepts, some of which in turn may reflect the imprints of Daoism and Buddhism, the writer believed God could be readily accessed through experiences of residence and redemptive expressions of “anti-authoritarian unity” in the world. As he would declare emphatically, “[m]y anarchism is only an application of Christianity to human relationships.” In contrast, Tolstoy held sin to be “dissociation among people,” or the denial of our essential oneness.<sup>28</sup>

Whereas the “Stranger lives outside the bond of human relatedness,” isolated, unloving, and awaiting death, the Resident affirms life and love, individual and communal, together with “unity in multiplicity and multiplicity in unity.”<sup>29</sup> Given the tragic absence in death of Marya Nikolaevna Tolstaya (1790–1830), Lev’s mother, who died weeks before he turned two, it was his paternal Aunt Tatiana Alexandrovna Ergolskaya—so “peaceful, sweet, [...] and loving,” as he later recalled—who served as a surrogate mother.<sup>30</sup> Likewise, Tolstoy’s father, Nikolai Ilych, about whom the artist wrote less than his mother, died suddenly before his youngest son’s eighth birthday.<sup>31</sup> Thus, in effect, his orphanage constituted a serious psychological conflict to which the poet would frequently return through the “living past” of transference, both as a bottomless well of suffering, and as an inspiration for his highest ideals and art.<sup>32</sup> Historically speaking, we speculate that Tolstoy took up a psychoutopian “Redeemer phantasy” in committing himself to ascetic militancy, political rationalism, and horizontal collectivism, with the aim of

healing the fragmentation rending Russian society and impelling a new age: namely, to overcome the seventeenth-century schism between the Orthodox Church and Old Believers, which echoed the eleventh-century split between the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches, together with Tsar Peter Romanov's despotic self-assertion.<sup>33</sup>

Even so, seeking to be the Resident in tune with the authentic collective, Tolstoy was a Stranger and a horizontal individualist who prioritized autonomy and justice over the conventions of his in-group.<sup>34</sup> In particular, the defiant Lev Nikolaevich appears to have felt an intense need to undo the damage wrought by his ancestor Peter Andreevich Tolstoy (1645–1729), who had served as Tsar Peter I's envoy to the self-exiled heir, Prince Alexis Petrovich Romanov (1690–1718). The *tsarevich* Alexei had rejected the Tsar's methods. Yet Peter Andreevich succeeded in convincing him to return to Imperial Russia, where he was duly murdered on his self-aggrandizing father's orders.<sup>35</sup> In contrast, Tolstoy's resignation from his commission as an artillery officer conveyed his loyalty to Jesus the Nazarene, who momentarily repudiates Satan's temptation of sovereignty over humanity in the desert by proclaiming that we are called to serve the Kingdom of God instead.<sup>36</sup> The artist's focus on the Old Believer sect, the community from which hailed the pioneering poet Mikhail Alekseevich Kuzmin (1872–1936)—author of the modern world's first gay memoir—evinces Tolstoy's political *and* psychosexual interest in anarchism and revolutionary Populism.<sup>37</sup> Indeed, Lev Nikolaevich must have found the erotic dissidence and asceticism of non-conformist communities fascinating, for *Khlysty* (“flagellants”) and *Skoptsy* (“castrators”) reportedly practiced homosexuality and bisexuality openly, while *Postniki* (“fasters”) would ritualistically fast, and *Skoptsy* would observe sexual abstinence and/or mutilate themselves.<sup>38</sup>

## From the Loss of Maternal Love to Proselytizing the Kingdom of God

In turn working through the maternal love he missed, affirming motherly archetypes and the theory of primordial matriarchal communism, and lending credence to the philosopher John Dewey's belief that “‘associational’ or ‘communal’ behavior constitutes a basic feature of all things,” Tolstoy retrospectively declared that he had felt the happiest in life on three occasions. This was when he was teaching at the rural peasant schools he had first founded at his Yasnaya Polyana estate in 1849, composing the *ABC* (*Азбука*, 1872/1875), and collaborating philanthropically with Countess Tolstaya and their daughters Tanya and Masha to provide famine relief to peasants in the Tula and Ryazan regions between 1891 and 1893.<sup>39</sup>

Integrating psychology, anthropology, history, Enlightenment philosophy, Eastern-Christian and Asian theology, and robust popular traditions, Count Tolstoy's extensive life-work seeks to establish a legacy of love, based on the ideal of (allo) maternal affection provided during infancy and early childhood, that will persist beyond the grave.<sup>40</sup> From this starting point follow his efforts to uncover and fight for what he calls the Kingdom of God, which is not to be deferred to any afterlife,

but rather, to be realized through generations of struggle to combat finitude by creating a global utopia. In the words of the Eastern-Christian existentialist Berdyaev, who was expelled from the Soviet Union on the so-called “philosopher’s ship” in 1922, rather than the cataphatic theology which celebrates, the Kingdom of God is intimately connected with the negativity of apophatic theology.<sup>41</sup>

There is absolute truth in anarchism and it is to be seen in its attitude to the sovereignty of the state and to every form of state absolutism. It is an exposure of the wrongness of despotic centralization [...]. The religious truth of anarchism consists in this, that power over man [*sic*] is bound up with sin and evil, that a state of perfection is a state where there is no power of man over man [or woman], that is to say, anarchy. The Kingdom of God is freedom and the absence of such power [...]. The Kingdom of God is anarchy.<sup>42</sup>

Likewise, Tolstoy wrote the following in his diary in May 1890:

I’ve been thinking all this time [...]. The anarchists are right about everything—the rejection of what exists and the assertion that anything worse than the oppression of authority, with its existing rights, would be impossible in the absence of that authority.<sup>43</sup>

For the artist, the point of life is to “assist in the creation of the Kingdom of God.”<sup>44</sup> He avows self-help, self-perfection, self-determination (*разумение*), and fusion, or unity with others, toward this end.<sup>45</sup> In his fiction, Count Tolstoy uses defamiliarizing, deprovincializing, and estranging effects to call into question dominant social institutions, hegemonic lies, and learned helplessness, as through emblematic *Weltanschauungskriegen*, or wars over worldviews.<sup>46</sup> His art poses questions, expresses truths, and suggests proposals through an iconic “theology in colors” that helps us both to “discern what is good and what is bad,” and “to help the former and resist the latter.”<sup>47</sup> His writings represent expressive therapy, or “social daydreaming,” that explores “imagined solutions to real life problems” at the personal, interpersonal, and societal levels.<sup>48</sup> Politically, Lev Nikolaevich combines his reading of the German idealist Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) with the revolutionary Populism of his compatriots to champion an anarcho-Populist vision that seeks to overthrow the Church, State, and landlord class. He aimed to transform the condition of the *Narod* by means of “the establishment of social rights, redistributive policies, and self-government institutions,” utilizing a blend of respect for popular institutions and customs with Enlightenment philosophy.<sup>49</sup> The “prophetic humanism” of Tolstoyan anarcho-Populism thus naturally appealed to conscious intellectuals and progressive peasants who sought “communit[ies] of cooperative subjects” in late Imperial and early post-revolutionary Russia.<sup>50</sup>

Arguably, Tolstoyans and insurgent *Narodniki* alike resembled subversive monastic orders in their cross-class organizing, embodying the Christian concept of *kenosis*, or renunciation, regarding past and future, as these activists knew they

would face persecution and martyrdom for their organizing efforts.<sup>51</sup> Over a thousand radical young Russians suffered imprisonment and torment by the Tsarist State for having “gone to the people” in the 1870s, aiming to share their plight and exhort them to revolt and level society, while hundreds of Tolstoyans were killed by Lenin and Stalin’s regimes.<sup>52</sup> Instead of the reactionary suicide of a living death serving authority, Populist and Tolstoyan youth, mirroring Jesus and Lev Nikolaevich himself, were prepared for revolutionary suicide: to serve and die for the People, as Huey P. Newton (1942–1989), co-founder of the Black Panther Party, would theorize in the 1970s.<sup>53</sup>

Despite greatly sympathizing with and advancing anarchism and human freedom, while grievously contradicting both causes through his misogyny, Tolstoy was not *per se* an organizer like his revolutionary compatriots Herzen, Bakunin, Nikolai Chaikovsky, Peter Kropotkin, Vera Zasulich, or Sofia Perovskaya. Perhaps this is all for the better, in the interest of avoiding the masochistic compulsion to repeat prior defeats and identify with the “Big” or “Dominant” Other.<sup>54</sup> Remarkably in this sense, Tolstoy’s distant cousin, General Sergei Grigorievich Volkonsky (1788–1865), a revolutionary Decembrist leader, veteran of the war of 1812, and “peasant-prince,” did not adequately prepare for the insurrection that his fellow constitutionalist and socialist mutineers had planned during Nicholas I’s accession to power in December 1825. Crucially, he had avoided organizing with the rank-and-file soldiers.<sup>55</sup> Likewise, one could argue that the Paris Commune of March–May 1871 was doomed by its Central Committee’s reluctance to use the Communards’ initial overwhelming military advantage to march on the Versailles government, which would soon thereafter crush them.<sup>56</sup> In his poem “The Insect,” Turgenev emblemizes such defeatism by considering how a literary salon of idealists is disturbed by the sudden appearance of a bug—yet, no one acts to defend the collective against the insect, which promptly starts killing them.<sup>57</sup>

Nevertheless, we must not reduce Tolstoy to his erstwhile friend’s caricature. Rather, let us look to Lev Nikolaevich’s “writings, his personal example, and the stimulus and inspiration he gave,” as a military officer who resigned his post, a Rousseaunist teacher of peasant children, a world-renowned novelist who renounced his previous art-work (искусство) as artificial (искусственное), and a wealthy landowning aristocrat who, imperfectly observing his wish to divest himself of his property through class suicide, became “a ploughman, a mower, a sower, a woodsman, a stovebuilder, a carpenter and a bootmaker” late in life.<sup>58</sup> As an atypical proprietor, Count Tolstoy decided to work the land he owned together with the peasants, to become vegetarian, and to adopt a simple manner of living.<sup>59</sup> Be that as it may, although he personally renounced his property late in life, swore off writing, and performed manual labor in the fields, Lev Nikolaevich paradoxically continued “liv[ing] off his property and writ[ing] literary works” until his final flight from home in October 1910.<sup>60</sup>

## From Dionysianism to Asceticism

Like most others, Tolstoy’s life provides evidence for the idea that the human being is a “freak of nature,” whose sexuality is “polymorphously perverse.”<sup>61</sup> Like

*Frankenstein's* Creature, as imagined by Mary Shelley (1797–1851), the subject is akin to a monster that conveys our deepest fears and desires.<sup>62</sup> We find ourselves “thrown” into a world not of our own choosing, confronting life and death. How we respond to this interplay of Eros and Thanatos, libido and *mortido*, shapes our character. In the case of that “strange being” Lev Nikolaevich, it is evident that almost “[e]verything [he] did in his life he did with intensity.”<sup>63</sup> His biographer Richard F. Gustafson comments: “Few men, and especially men of such noble position and privilege as Count Tolstoy, have lived life thus on the brink” of existential crisis and suicide.<sup>64</sup> His friend Vasily P. Botkin (1812–1869), in reacting to a characteristic rift that had opened in the early 1860s between Tolstoy and Turgenev, writes that he “believe[s] that in reality Tolstoy has a passionately loving soul [...]. [But] his mind is in a chaos [...]. His soul burns with unquenchable thirst.”<sup>65</sup>

Although his wife Countess Tolstaya found some of his ideas attractive, she believed that the prospects of their realization were often spoiled by her husband's recurrent lack of focus.<sup>66</sup> Her father, Dr. Andrei Behrs, who initially opposed the count's marriage proposal, similarly and knowingly observed that Tolstoy was “skilled at writing and talking, but not [...] when it came to practical things.”<sup>67</sup> As if illustrating their point, a brick hut that Lev Nikolaevich, his daughters Tanya and Masha, and the painter Nikolai Gay had collectively built in 1885 for a widow at Yasnaya Polyana soon collapsed.<sup>68</sup> In psychoanalytic and psychiatric terms, such symptoms are consistent with intense sublimation, post-traumatic stress disorder, bipolar disorder, and the conversion of sexual frustration into depressive anxiety.<sup>69</sup>

Notably, in the wake of one of the most significant turning points of his life, after finishing *Anna Karenina* (1875–1877), Tolstoy began to idealize a monastic type of Christian social life.<sup>70</sup> Along these lines, he outlined what he considered the six cardinal sins perpetuating our individual and collective separation: “self-indulgence, sloth, acquisitiveness, love of power, lechery, and intoxication.”<sup>71</sup> Evidently, the artist himself was steeped in all of these ostensible sins in his youth, and some—especially sexual temptation from potential male *and* female partners—continued to haunt him after his conversion to Christian asceticism, despite his conscious experiments in self-denial. In truth, Tolstoy's lifelong tormented relationship with sexuality is reminiscent of the struggles of Peter Ilych Tchaikovsky (1840–1893), the esteemed gay Russo-Ukrainian composer who died from cholera rather than suicide, as some have argued, in keeping with negative tropes about the suffering spiritual homosexual.<sup>72</sup>

## Queer Tolstoy

*Queer Tolstoy* challenges the Russian State's aggressive homonegativity, the historians of Russia who re-entrench the dominant sex/gender system by overlooking erotic dissent in the country, the LGBTQ+ historians who ignore same-sex love in the region, and the overall heterosexist presumption that queer people should remain invisible.<sup>73</sup> The aim is to fulfill the Slavist Simon Karlinsky's wish, that a “special study [...] undoubtedly be written one day” about the “theme of homosexuality in the life of Leo Tolstoy.”<sup>74</sup> In this study, seeking to contribute to the “radical” and “progressive”



analysis of the “politics of sexuality,” we argue that the Christian-anarchist and anarcho-Populist ideals guiding Lev Nikolaevich’s art have profoundly queer psychosexual dimensions, reflecting the intimate link between interpersonal relationships and political philosophies.<sup>75</sup> As a reflective elder, in 1903, Tolstoy declared to his biographer Pavel Biryukov that he “owe[d] the brightest time in [his] life not to the love of woman but to love of people [...]”<sup>76</sup> Likewise, in his diary, the 23 year old Lev Nikolaevich confesses, “*I have never been in love with women [...]. I have very often been in love with men.*”<sup>77</sup>

Tolstoy’s admission of his gay impulses here may help to shed a new light on his art and politics, tying together his intellect, his altruism, and his infantile and mature identification with his mother.<sup>78</sup> Lev Nikolaevich’s own anarchist desire to merge with the *Narod* and level feudalism by observing the kenotic “law of descent” involving voluntary subordination and joy in residence with the marginalized is conveyed by the artist’s intense eroticization of male “peasant-Kantians.”<sup>79</sup> The physician-writer Anton Chekhov (1860–1904), Tolstoy’s friend, agrees with the count that war and judgment are social evils, but he clarifies that he could not follow his mentor’s call to wear traditional peasant shoes and “sleep on the stove *with the worker and his wife.*”<sup>80</sup> Along similar lines, Alan Forrest stops just short of explicitly identifying Tolstoy’s queer yearnings in his remarks on how the author “admired the dash and daring of soldiers in battle, the strength and physical prowess that were the very essence of youth,” and incorporated a “strong autobiographical aspect to [...] the feelings he attributed to his characters.”<sup>81</sup>

In the groundbreaking 1948 article “Come Back to the Raft Ag’in, Huck Honey!” the literary critic Leslie Fiedler (1917–2003) places interracial homoerotic relationships among men and boys front and center within the canon of American literature. For this reason, the “Fiedler thesis” is highly relevant to Lev Nikolaevich’s revolutionary-romantic idealization of “enlightened” officers bonding with “dark” serf-soldiers or indigenous warriors to annihilate caste, capital, and empire.<sup>82</sup> Fiedler finds the novels of James Fenimore Cooper, Nathaniel Hawthorne, Herman Melville, Mark Twain, Ernest Hemingway, and Henry James to have idealized “chaste male love as the ultimate emotional experience” and endorsed the subversive “sacred marriage of males.”<sup>83</sup> By means of engaging with these same-sex literary relationships, both authors and audiences access the “childish, impossible [*sic*] dream” of homoerotic union and abolition of racial and class inequalities.<sup>84</sup> Similarly, Tolstoy’s “patrician gayness” marries the gay love that arouses and ascends with the compassionate or kenotic love that descends.<sup>85</sup> In turn, the intersection of queerness and anarchism in Count Tolstoy’s life and art confirms Amia Srinivasan’s argument in *The Right to Sex: Feminism in the Twenty-First Century* (2021) that sexual desire is political and intimately related to the struggle against injustice.<sup>86</sup>

Politically speaking, same-sex union has plenty of subversive potential: as the infamous political consultant Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), the Florentine rulers of early capitalist modernity, and late nineteenth-century French medical forensic writers were all too aware, cross-class mingling could threaten bourgeois

and State authority. Chitty explains how, in the cities, armies, and navies of early-modern Europe, “interclass sexual contact” among men imparted resistance to bourgeois “sexual hegemony,” hence threatening “social anarchy.”<sup>87</sup> In the same vein, the French Trotskyist-turned-anarcho-syndicalist Daniel Guérin (1904–1988) would profess that cross-class gay bonding could promote revolutionary consciousness.<sup>88</sup> In a lyrical scene atop Moscow’s Sparrow Hills in 1826, the noble teenage rebels Alexander Herzen and Nikolai Ogarëv (1813–1877), devastated by the Tsar’s execution of most of the Decembrist leadership, embraced and swore to give their lives to struggling against “that throne, [...] that altar, [and] those cannon.”<sup>89</sup>

Though the above scene in early nineteenth-century Moscow refers to the feudal, proto-capitalist world, several queer theorists have proposed a dialectical relationship between the emergence of global capitalism and the development of gay identities in historical modernity. On this account, young men, rent from their traditional peasant surroundings, jointly suffered abuses *and* experienced joys as workers, soldiers, and sailors in sex-segregated settings, leading to the emergence of gay love “at sea” and “on land.”<sup>90</sup> This was true of the Mediterranean port-cities of Venice, Genoa, Florence, Barcelona, and Cairo, among others, as of such “caravan cities” as Petra and Kandahar.<sup>91</sup> Along similar lines, historian John D’Emilio traces the Stonewall uprising of 1969 in part to “same-sex intimacies enjoyed by soldiers in World War II.”<sup>92</sup> A similar analysis might be made of the Decembrist mutineers of 1825; of the Red sailors who in 1921 declared the Kronstadt Commune in defiance of the Bolshevik autocracy; or of the peasant anarchists who fought in the Revolutionary Insurgent Army of Ukraine, led by the anarchist Nestor Makhno (1888–1934).

We know that lesbian and bisexual women played important roles in Ireland’s ill-fated 1916 Easter Rising, a forerunner of the Irish Revolution against British rule.<sup>93</sup> During the 1871 Paris Commune, women analogously developed revolutionary “bonds of sisterhood” through a combination of friendship and fellow-feeling. Inspired by an at least sublimated lesbianism, they cared for the wounded and defended the communal experiment from its external Prussian and Versaillais enemies, and its internal misogynist foes, alike.<sup>94</sup> As of this writing, the Ukrainian LGBTQ+ community and anarchist collectives are resisting Russia’s full-scale assault on the country, both by coordinating supplies and tending to the injured, and by fighting the invaders directly.<sup>95</sup>

Attesting to the radical power of Eros, Boris Pasternak’s titular character from *Doctor Zhivago* (1957), a humanistic physician and poet, explains that in Tolstoyanism he has found “the dream of a dignified existence, which [had] filled my adolescence.” In parallel, his foil Strelnikov perceptively notes that the causes of socialism and revolution have been impelled by “selfless young men mount[ing] the barricades” and risking their lives.<sup>96</sup> Indeed, the political cultures of both the Russian intelligentsia and the Soviet State encouraged sublimated devotion for the archetype of the male freedom fighter and revolutionary martyr, in keeping with such models as the Sacred Band of Thebes, a fearsome fighting unit from classical Greece that was comprised of 150 male warrior couples.<sup>97</sup> In parallel, virility and the male and female nude permeated the art—and therefore, psychical reality—of twentieth-century Spanish anarcho-syndicalists.<sup>98</sup>

Considering the intimate associations between anarchism and free love, Freud's point that "the repressed is a foreign territory," and the "exotic becomes erotic" theory of sexuality, we speculate that Tolstoy had a youthful gay interest in the Chechen Sado Miserbiyev during his time in the Eastern Caucasus, and that this bond both influenced and reflected his burgeoning cosmopolitan internationalism.<sup>99</sup> In Chechnya, on the edge of what the British Orientalist explorer Richard Burton (1821–1890) termed the "Sotadic Zone"—which refers to a proposed erotic social geography found in the Mediterranean region, Central and East Asia, and among the indigenous peoples of the Americas, where homosexuality, pederasty, and gender fluidity are practiced and observed more openly, so the argument goes, than in northern Europe—Lev Nikolaevich feels liberated to explore his politics and sexuality.<sup>100</sup> In fact, the only time Tolstoy mentions Sado in his diary is within the context of confessing to hyper-sexual mania for women *and* men in Transcaucasia.<sup>101</sup> Likewise, many English, French, and Russian explorers and military officers wrote romantically about the Arab, Circassian, and Afghan men they met, even those they were ordered to fight and kill.<sup>102</sup> Along similar lines, Joseph Massad cites the example of André Gide's novel *L'immoraliste* (1902) as a "prominent example of the new Western fiction of homosexual self-discovery in the Orient."<sup>103</sup> We believe that *The Cossacks* could be read as a less overt, earlier entry in the same genre (see Chapter 4 below).

In light of the humanistic and anti-authoritarian dimensions of Tolstoyan art, the weight placed by the artist on the rationalist concept of self-determination (разумение) can be fruitfully compared with the intimate relationship that exists between Malcolm X's transgressive racial politics and his erotic non-conformism.<sup>104</sup> In other words, alongside Malcolm X (1925–1965), who was persecuted and even martyred by the State—in his case, by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and New York Police Department (NYPD)—Tolstoy was a kindred spirit to Virginia Woolf (1882–1941), who also "drew emotional sustenance from her intense [same-sex] relationships," and in her literature likewise centers the individual's search for meaning and identification.<sup>105</sup> With his closest male friends, Lev Nikolaevich sought what the poet Alexander Pushkin (1799–1837), Tolstoy's third cousin once removed, calls in Orientalist fashion the "Imitation of the Arabic": namely, the sharing of a "sole insurgent fire" and "boundless brotherhood."<sup>106</sup>

## Russian and Ukrainian LGBTQ+ History and the International Homosexual Conspiracy

Now, let us turn to the numerous antecedents for non-traditional sexualities in Russian and Ukrainian history. The medieval Rus' *Legend of Boris and Gleb* features a same-sex couple, Boris and George, who are killed together with Boris' half-brother Gleb, once the power-hungry Sviatoslav the Accursed (c. 978–1019) decides to eliminate them as rivals. In turn, this tragedy echoes the tyrannical Hippias' execution of the Athenian rebel-couple Harmodius and Aristogeiton, following their assassination of the ruler's despotic brother, Hipparchus, in 514 BCE.<sup>107</sup> Likewise, the *Life of*

*St. Moses the Hungarian* features a male slave, brother of the martyred George, who is mutilated by his owner Predslava, a daughter of Great Prince Vladimir I (r. 980–1015), over his preference for male partners and attendant lack of interest in a conventional marriage. Ultimately, Moses retires to a monastery—as Tolstoy will dramatically seek to do, at life’s end. For his part, Grand Prince Vasili II of Moscow (r. 1505–1533), sire to Tsar Ivan IV (“the Terrible”), was nearly exclusively homosexual, and Tsar Peter I was reportedly bisexual. Foreign and domestic observers alike would remark on the open male homosexuality practiced among all social classes, but especially the peasantry, during the Muscovite period which predated the rise of the Romanov Tsarist dynasty.<sup>108</sup>

Many historians find the Russian Orthodox Church to have been relatively less heterosexist, compared to the Roman Catholic Church, at least prior to the Russian Revolution. Be that as it may, Eastern Orthodoxy struggled long to suppress pagan gay practices, including orgies, and Peter I banned same-sex relations in the armed forces in 1716, on the advice of his German advisers. The ban on sodomy, imposed in the interest of “mental or sexual hygiene,” followed the example set by the European “military revolution” of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—and anticipated Stalin’s reimposition of this ban, beginning in 1933, after his predecessors had suspended it after seizing power. Stalin recriminalized homosexuality using the pretext of protecting young soldiers, sailors, students, and Party members from would-be male seducers, foreign agents, and/or seditionists. In parallel, his predecessor Vladimir Lenin considered psychoanalysis, homosexuality, and free love to be bourgeois.<sup>109</sup> However, as Tolstoy’s *War and Peace* clarifies, spontaneous same-sex attachment played a crucial role in the early nineteenth-century Russian military struggle against the *Grand Armée* led by Napoleon Bonaparte.

Although Nicholas I would promulgate a new criminal code extending the ban on homosexual relations to civilians in 1835, even the Grand Duke Constantin Romanov (1858–1915), cousin to Nicholas II, could not resist indulging at the bathhouses of St. Petersburg. Remarkably, Vladimir D. Nabokov (1870–1922), father of the renowned poet and novelist of the same name, openly avowed the decriminalization of same-sex relations in Imperial Russia. Karlinsky discloses that there were “at least seven gay grand dukes”—meaning uncles, nephews, or cousins, related to Tsars Alexander III and Nicholas II.<sup>110</sup>

The truth is that several well-known Russian and Ukrainian artists were LGBTQ+, such as the composer Peter Tchaikovsky, the novelist Nikolai Gogol (1809–1852), the feminist editor Anna Yevreinova (1844–1919), the Symbolist poet Polyxena Soloviova (1867–1924), the actress Alla Nazimova (1879–1945), the bohemian Jewish poet Sofia Parnok (1885–1933), the novelist Lidia Zinovieva-Annibal (1866–1907), the ballet impresario Sergei Diaghilev (1872–1929), and the filmmaker Sergei Eisenstein (1898–1948), among others.<sup>111</sup> The Polish ballet dancer Vaslav Nijinsky (c. 1890–1950) was also an erotic and gender non-conformist, and recently unearthed homoerotic love letters penned by Frederic Chopin (1810–1849) suggest the Polish composer enjoyed the company of other men, too.<sup>112</sup> Moreover, the Georgian Iosef Zhughashvili (1878–1953), who would become the despot Stalin, was

bisexual with repressed homosexual tendencies.<sup>113</sup> For this reason, he resented the camp evident in Eisenstein's *Ivan the Terrible* (1944), a historical figure with whom he identified. Accordingly, the film's second part, despite finishing production in 1946, would only be released in 1958, over five years after Stalin's death.<sup>114</sup>

Then again, despite the patriarchal and homonegative social imaginaries promoted by Tsarism, Victorianism, and Bolshevism alike, Eros can never be totally denied, repressed, or contained.<sup>115</sup> In fact, during the carnival-esque ethos of the February 1917 Revolution, civilian and military protesters spontaneously embraced and kissed each other on the streets of St. Petersburg, and sex workers propositioned clients with newfound appeals to fraternity.<sup>116</sup> Pasternak's depiction of the final meeting between Strelnikov and the titular character of *Doctor Zhivago* (1957) is highly homoerotic, full of phallic imagery, a sense of reunion, and even a blending of Zhivago together with Strelnikov's wife, Larissa Antipova—an homage, perhaps, to Tolstoy's *The Cossacks* (1863; see Chapter 4 below).<sup>117</sup>

On the one hand, the authenticity of such queer relations across fundamental political differences imparts Pasternak and Tolstoy's common interest in male comrades who fight jointly for the Reclusian "Universal Republic."<sup>118</sup> On the other, the emblematic confrontations between Zhivago and Strelnikov replay the political and sexual tensions between the revolutionary-humanist figure of Jesus the Liberator and the bureaucratic Grand Inquisitor.<sup>119</sup> In *The Brothers Karamazov* (1880), Dostoevsky portrays the Grand Inquisitor interrogating Jesus upon his mythical return to Earth. This supreme cleric admits to his enthrallment to the lure of sovereignty and the putatively "powerful and intelligent spirit" of Satan, even as he deceives humanity through the active denial of its freedom, all the while claiming to rule in his teacher's name.<sup>120</sup>

Based on the intense bonds forged while fighting in the First Cavalry Army during the Russian Civil War, up to two thousand partisans communed together in the Red Lighthouse of the Volga River basin in the 1920s.<sup>121</sup> In *Red Cavalry* (1926), the Russian-Jewish journalist Isaac Babel's (1894–1940) fictionalized account of time embedded with this same army during the Polish-Soviet War (1919–1921), the author describes his protagonist's admiration for the "vigorous and dashing" Cossack Dyakov, chief of the Remount Service. Babel adds that, with the young shepherd and celebrated veteran known as "Sashka the Christ," his *alter ego* had "greeted the morning light and accompanied the setting sun quite often by now."<sup>122</sup> According to Lee Siegel, "Babel turns the he-man Cossacks into sexually repressed men who sublimate their [gay] desire[s] [...] into acts of atrocity."<sup>123</sup>

Despite formal decriminalization, the Communists arrested various sailors in 1921 for their supposed participation in pederastic sex parties in Petrograd.<sup>124</sup> Ivan Yermolaev, a camp sailor from the Red (or revolutionary) Fleet, was a hairdresser, syndicalist, poet, and "literary man" who took up "peaceful" civil engineering after release from imprisonment in 1924, secondary to his participation in the Kronstadt Commune of 1921.<sup>125</sup> The anarchy-feminist Emma Goldman, praised for her visionary "defense of homosexual love before the general public" in the US, had at least one lesbian relationship in life.<sup>126</sup> Now, we should view Tolstoy as an integral

member of the long-lived International Homosexual Conspiracy, which advocates for same-sex union while agitating for a “new and better society.”<sup>127</sup>

However, reflecting the intimate link between trauma and taboo that compels a dampening of one’s erotic self-expression, out of fear of alienating one’s family or society, Count Tolstoy was in reality a semi-closeted case.<sup>128</sup> Indeed, the “Tolstoy family secret” persisted until the Russian Freudian Vasily Rozanov (1856–1919) divulged the poet’s queerness, based on conversations with the Ukrainian Itzhak Feinermann (1864–1925), one of the artist’s confidants.<sup>129</sup> According to Tolstoy’s close friend, Marya Alexandrovna Schmidt, “Lev Nikolaevich was very fond of [Feinermann]”: “it used to be [that] he was lying on the grass, disheveled, his black shirt tucked into his pants, and Lev Nikolaevich was sitting nearby,” admiring him.<sup>130</sup> At the same time, the count was not “openly and defiantly gay,” as the historian Dan Healey characterizes his fellow noble from the next generation, Mikhail Alekseevich Kuzmin, as being. Kuzmin wrote *Wings* (1906), the “first modern coming-out story with a happy ending in any language.” This courageous individual only escaped Stalin’s executioners due to his succumbing to pneumonia in 1936.<sup>131</sup> The NKVD arrested and tortured his partner, Yuri Yurkun, for seven months in 1938, before summarily executing him.<sup>132</sup>

By contrast, having married Sofia Andreevna Behrs in 1862 and siring 13 children with her (eight of whom survived to adulthood), Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy sublimated his homoerotic feelings through the heavy use of camp and the integration of emblematic male-bonding experiences as counter-symbols in his literary works. He also did so by forming homophilic bonds with other men, whether they would be his junior or senior partners.<sup>133</sup> In the words of Nina Nikitina, senior researcher at the Yasnaya Polyana estate, “Tolstoy’s intimate space had blurred boundaries,” and his hypersexual “psychophysics” had “androgynous” dimensions.<sup>134</sup> Freud might have said that he conveyed “psychical hermaphroditism.”<sup>135</sup> In a March 2020 interview, Russian journalist Nikolai Uskov likewise recognized that Tolstoy had “constantly struggled with his homosexuality”—though not without adding the requisite nod to the Putin regime’s extreme homonegativity.<sup>136</sup> (In a similar context, during a September 2013 television interview, President Putin quipped that Tchaikovsky’s queerness was “not the reason we love him.”<sup>137</sup>)

Therefore, rather than strictly platonic or homosocial, non-genital attachments, Tolstoy evidently felt emotional and sexual attraction for other men. He “read love signs all the time and was in their power.”<sup>138</sup>

## Queer Tolstoyan Eroticism

In *Childhood* (1852), his first book, Tolstoy recalls how he was smitten by Sergius Ivanin, “whose striking good looks had captivated me from the first, and I felt an irresistible attraction towards him. Only to see him filled me with pleasure [...]. Awake or asleep, I was forever dreaming of him.” Nevertheless, he tells no one about his first love then—not even Sergius. Ultimately, Levochka laments his failure to express his attraction to Serëzha, and so open the possibility for it to be

reciprocated. In his anguish, Tolstoy juxtaposes free love to social conventions of hyper-masculinity, heteronormativity, and self-denial: “I deprived myself of the pure delight of a fresh, childish instinct for the absurd purpose of trying to resemble grown-up [straight] people.”<sup>139</sup> Repeating similar patterns, in a February 1849 letter to his brother Sergei, the youth complains that, in St. Petersburg, “one cannot find a man with whom one could lead an aimless life [...]”<sup>140</sup> For his youthful friend Gautier, who had inherited his father’s bookshop in Moscow, Tolstoy reports “be [ing] thrown into a fever when he entered the room.” Likewise, for Dmitri Dyakov, whom he had met in Kazan as a young man, Lev Nikolaevich recalls one night desiring to “kiss him and cry.” Nevertheless, he confesses, “[m]y love for Islavin ruined for me the whole 8 months of my life in St. Petersburg.”<sup>141</sup> This was so, not only because of the unsatisfying nature of the bond in question, but also because others noticed and shunned him for his supposedly deviant attachment.<sup>142</sup>

Sexologists must “often rely on inference, given the lacunae left by discretion and erasure compelled by social stigma,” discretion, taboo, and history’s “blank spots.” Despite the (hetero)sexualization of life in the post-Soviet context, this dynamic holds true, especially within contexts as intensely homophobic as hegemonic Russian culture, which has lent its support to the enduring criminalization of, and incitement against, the LGBTQ+ community, at least since Soviet times.<sup>143</sup> That being said, the evidence from Tolstoy’s private diaries and letters is confessional and conclusive, emerging chronologically during Erik Erikson’s fifth stage of psychosocial development, when the developing adolescent or young adult struggles with identity vs. role confusion. The tantalizing nature of Tolstoy’s literary relationships with Islavin and Ivanin—the latter character, having been based on his childhood attachment to General Alexander I. Musin-Pushkin (1827–1903), with whom the future artist liked to “play soldier”—is evidently reproduced in the epic *War and Peace*. This can be seen particularly in Prince Andrei’s brief erotic approximation with Captain Tushin, as in Count Rostov’s masochistic desire to serve the Tsar.<sup>144</sup>

In this vein, in the autobiographical short story “Father Sergius,” written in the 1890s and only published posthumously, the artist declares that his *alter ego* Kasatsky, a promising military officer, is “seized by the same rapture” upon seeing the “tall erect figure” of the Tsar that “he experienced later on when he met the woman he loved.”<sup>145</sup> Undoubtedly, in his art, Lev Nikolaevich often daydreams of being subordinated to a dominant Other, reflecting signs of a desired “passive homosexual phantasy.” While conveying the author’s desire for union with a strong man, this recurrent theme could also be read as an ascetic warning about what his follower, the Russo-Soviet philosopher Simon L. Frank (1877–1950), would term a “mass hypnosis resulting from a submission to power.”<sup>146</sup> It simultaneously conveys the concept of Eros as creator *and* destroyer.<sup>147</sup>

Perhaps reflecting the imprint of intimacy with his mother, the influence from his aunts, and his resulting immersion in “[f]eminine imagery” in early life, the young Lev embraced an ethics of care and non-violence, and he rejected Oedipal ideas of gender polarity and normative sexuality. As a consequence, Tolstoy’s gay attachments were not fleeting but enduring, manifesting the “longing for

brotherhood which characterized him from childhood to old age.”<sup>148</sup> Though the writer admits as a young adult that he “experiences this feeling” more rarely and less passionately than before, it nonetheless persisted then, and long thereafter, echoing childhood experiences.<sup>149</sup>

For instance, with his siblings as a young boy, Levochka played an “Ant-Brother” game that involved hiding from the world and cuddling together in the dark.<sup>150</sup> According to Nikitina, this was “Tolstoy’s first, timid, and poetic erotic experience.”<sup>151</sup> Five years after recording his love for Dyakov in his diary, he expresses jealousy and regret, “think[ing] of *the happiness that might have been mine* and which has fallen to the share of that excellent fellow [Princess] A. Obolensk[aya].”<sup>152</sup> Whereas female characters in his early literary works are “all emblematic residents who embody and reveal the way to divine love,” in his later, short fiction, “these female figures are replaced by male peasants who serve the same function [...]”<sup>153</sup>

According to his biographer Andrei Zorin, Count Tolstoy’s youthful heterosexual liaisons mostly involved female sex workers, “servants, peasants, [and Roma] and Cossacks girls,” such that his encounter with Sofia Andreevna Behrs represented “the first time in his life” that “he felt a strong erotic attraction to a woman of his own social standing.”<sup>154</sup> However, Countess Tolstaya will indirectly explore her suspicions about her husband’s bisexuality in her short story “Songs Without Words,” written in the early 1890s as a critical response to Tolstoy’s “Kreutzer Sonata” (1889), which normalizes and even idealizes femicide. At the conclusion of “Songs Without Words,” Sofia Andreevna’s ego-persona (or *alter ego*) suffers in a mental ward, as her object of affection, an emotionally unavailable artist with autistic characteristics, plans to travel abroad with his junior male partner.<sup>155</sup> In fact, in his encounters with the composer Sergei Ivanovich Taneev (1856–1915), a student of Tchaikovsky and confidant to the countess, Lev Nikolaevich confronted a double of sorts: a queer artist interested in music and Esperanto, the international language that had been invented by the Pole L. L. Zamenhof (1859–1917) in the hopes of encouraging world peace.

Ironically, just as Sofia Andreevna attached to Taneev amid the grief of their son Ivan’s death in 1895, so Tolstoy grew close with his enthusiastic follower, Vladimir Grigorievich Chertkov (1854–1936), a wealthy proprietor and former military officer whom he met in 1883. Vladimir Grigorievich was childhood friends with Tsar Alexander III (r. 1881–1894), who would exchange visits to the Chertkov family mansion in Petersburg for invitations to the Romanov palace in Crimea—on land expropriated from the indigenous Tatars. Rumor even had it that Chertkov was Alexander II’s son, born out of wedlock.<sup>156</sup> Tolstoy and Chertkov would collaborate closely until his death. Concretely, this partnership resulted in the founding in 1885 of “The Intermediary” (Посредник) publishing house, established on non-profit grounds with the allowance given Chertkov by his mother, Elizaveta Ivanovna, toward the end of distributing affordable, straightforward, and quality readings for literate peasants and workers.<sup>157</sup> Within four years of its founding, the tremendously successful Intermediary had sold 12 million volumes.<sup>158</sup>



Indeed, the significance of this relationship comes through in Feinermann's 1912 film, *The Departure of a Grand Old Man*. As well, Tolstoy's personal physician Dushan Makovitsky (1866–1921) and daughter Alexandra (1884–1979) respectively observed how “overjoyed” or “buoyant” the man would become at receiving either word or visit from Chertkov, and the writer explicitly told his junior would-be partner in an 1884 letter how much he loved him and would like to live with him. Picking up on this love-bond, Countess Tolstaya would openly accuse Chertkov and her husband of having a gay affair.<sup>159</sup> After his death, Sofia Andreevna came to realize that her partner had “preferred Chertkov at the end of his life.” She reports visiting his grave to plead for forgiveness for having been “unable to make him happier at the end of his life” by accepting Chertkov as his true beloved.<sup>160</sup>

As with studies on Malcolm X's erotic life, the argument of *Queer Tolstoy* is not meant to deny the artist's heterosexual attachments, experiences, or fantasies. These might include his reported loss of virginity with a female sex worker at a brothel to which his elder brothers Nikolai and Sergei had brought him at age 14, his platonic attachment to Zinaida Molostvova in Kazan, the hyper-sexual phases of his marriage with Sofia Andreevna, and the emblematic significance of Natasha's dance in *War and Peace*, through which the countess revitalizes herself after a loss of love and self-love.<sup>161</sup> Rather, the novelty of our approach is to uncover overt and sublimated bisexual queerness in Tolstoy's life-experiences and literature, and to link the artist's erotic dissidence with his anarchist politics and anti-militarist ideal.

Arguably, Tolstoy's sexual debut at a brothel, though with a heterosexual object-choice, permitted a “safe” release of male homoeroticism, given that it was his brothers who put him up to it.<sup>162</sup> Moreover, Tolstoy dreamt repeatedly in his final year of life about a young, androgynous Tatar woman who had been his lover during his service in the Crimean War.<sup>163</sup> Through his literary art, which his brother Nikolai had inspired him to create, referring to a mythical “green stick” that would liberate humanity, Tolstoy served as an encyclopedic “injustice collector.” He denounced the abuses of the powerful and sought to promote human unity across erotic and class lines, in an attempt to preserve self-esteem in the face of trauma, loss, and isolation.<sup>164</sup> By sublimating his libido, Tolstoy could dedicate himself to research, and by engaging in creative writing, he gave voice to his dreams and worries.<sup>165</sup> Thomas Newlin remarks on the link in Tolstoy's psychogeography between the phallic-utopian “green stick” which would encode human happiness, and his own self-concept as an artist and social critic.<sup>166</sup> In this sense, our “tempest-tossed soul” employed “preaching, anger, [and] indignation” not only to destabilize despotism, but also as a means of psychotherapy.<sup>167</sup>

## A Brief History of Tolstoy's Homoerotic Life

Bruce Perry, author of *Malcolm: The Life of a Man who Changed Black America* (1991), finds that Malcolm X had “suggested ties with five homosexual counterparts” prior to his imprisonment and subsequent conversion to Islam.<sup>168</sup> In like fashion, we count at least 19 significant same-sex relationships over the course of Tolstoy's life. In

parallel to the aforementioned figures of St. Moses and Don Quixote, the Russian artist's habitual desire to break radically away from his family, marriage, and upbringing, whether seen reflected in his journey as a young man to the Caucasus, or in his final flight from home in 1910, likely signaled deep sexual frustration.<sup>169</sup>

As a young boy, Lev Nikolaevich was impressed by the beauty and character of his renegade relative Fëdor Ivanovich Tolstoy (1782–1846), an officer within the elite Preobrazhensky Guards who had sailed around the globe on the warship *Nadezhda* (“Hope”). Perhaps unconsciously, the young Lev, “still enmeshed in feudal property relations,” was excited by hearing Fëdor Ivanovich's stories and vicariously experiencing same-sex intimacy and intrigue on the high seas.<sup>170</sup> Lev Nikolaevich would base the character Fëdr Dolokhov in *War and Peace* on this “extraordinary, lawless, and attractive man,” and fantasize about having a gay relationship enshrining comrade-love with him on at least one occasion: namely, in his depictions of the spontaneous infatuation of his adolescent *alter ego*, Petya Rostov. On the symbolic front, Petya joins Dolokhov on a daring mission to rescue their compatriots from imprisonment and execution by the retreating French, thus evincing an autonomous interest in homosexuality and liberation.<sup>171</sup>

The relationship between Lev and his childhood serf-companion Vanusha, who was effectively fettered to his master as the family moved from Moscow to Kazan in 1841, may have had homoerotic dimensions as well.<sup>172</sup> Now dubbed the “Third Capital of Russia,” after Moscow and St. Petersburg, Kazan evinces “perhaps the clearest illustration of Russia's identity as a transcontinental, multiethnic country straddling both Europe and Asia.”<sup>173</sup> As if channeling Eros, during his visit to Kazan in 1862 en route to Siberia to serve with the Amur Cossack Army, the future anarcho-communist Peter Kropotkin (1842–1921) remarked on the “pretty” Tatar boys and “pleasant faces” of men he encountered in the city.<sup>174</sup> In this light, during his stay there in his adolescence, Tolstoy presumably encountered the customary same-sex relations practiced among Muslims and Christians alike in Central Asia and the Caucasus at this time.<sup>175</sup> In a diary entry written in Tiflis (now Tbilisi, Georgia) in 1851, the disinhibited youth confesses to his frequent emotional and sexual attachments to other men, and lists nine comrades by name, most of them fellow university students, while mentioning “many others.”<sup>176</sup>

Furthermore, Count Tolstoy viewed the robust serf Ufan as a muse for his kenotic, Populist dream of becoming a peasant, and even adopted the bonded agricultural worker's name as a verb expressing this ideal: to “ufanize.”<sup>177</sup> His university friend Dmitri Dyakov, for whom he felt deep ecstasy, was one of the few friends who continued to visit Tolstoy after his wedding.<sup>178</sup> In Chechnya, the youth befriended the Russian-loyalist local Sado Miserbiyev, who became his *kunak*, or blood-brother. Sado may have inspired Lukashka's Dionysian character in *The Cossacks*, and served as model for the tragic minor character Sado in *Hadji Murat*.<sup>179</sup> Tolstoy wrote his own version of “A Prisoner of the Caucasus” (1872), based on a near-miss he experienced while riding ahead of Russian infantry alongside Sado (see Chapter 4 below).<sup>180</sup>

Besides these, the poet and officer Afanasy Fet (1820–1892) bought an estate close to Yasnaya Polyana in the 1850s to live near the artist. A reactionary *krepostnik* landlord who opposed the emancipation of the serfs, Fet expressed jealousy over Tolstoy's marriage to Sofia Andreevna. Despite their political disagreements, the pair would continue exchanging thinly veiled love letters for decades after 1862, the year of Tolstoy's wedding—thus proving Freud's point that, despite conscious heterosexual object-choice, “the homosexual tendencies are not [...] done away with or brought to a stop.”<sup>181</sup> Likewise, the conservative historian Nikolai N. Strakhov, who never married, became “an ardent convert to Tolstoy's way of thinking and an eager assistant in all his enterprises.”<sup>182</sup> With Peter I. Tchaikovsky, a fellow estranged artist, Tolstoy shared a platonic approximation. Both suffered similarly turbulent straight marriages, although Tchaikovsky's was more short-lived than Tolstoy's.<sup>183</sup> In reality, the post-revolutionary Bolshevik State viewed both men's art suspiciously: in 1923, Nadezhda Krupskaya (1869–1939), Lenin's partner, circulated an order to withdraw “counterrevolutionary and art-destructive literature” from municipal libraries. This forbidden list included all of Tolstoy, save for his novels.<sup>184</sup> Plus, Tchaikovsky's music was marginalized, for its melancholic tones were supposedly incompatible with global revolution.<sup>185</sup>

For Vasily Alexeev, a former militant organizer from the Chaikovsky Circle, the disowned son of a noble, and a principled revolutionary, Tolstoy developed a profound affection. Having hired Alexeev as a tutor for his children in 1877, the poet came to greatly admire his younger counterpart, with whom he shared intense political and personal goals. They even corresponded openly about their loving tenderness.<sup>186</sup> In similar fashion, en route to visit the Bakunins at their Priamukhino estate near Tver in the fall of 1881, Tolstoy impulsively deviated his journey to meet the acquaintance of the non-conformist peasant Vasily Siutayev upon first learning of him. Countess Tolstaya looks back on this encounter, noting the strong anti-depressant effect it had on her husband, inspiring him by example, and giving him the courage to proceed with his desired transition to ascetic renunciation.<sup>187</sup> Psychosexually, we presume that Tolstoy's improved mood upon his return from visiting with Siutayev was related to the blending of same-sex love and cooperative labor among Russian *muzhiki*, or male peasants.<sup>188</sup>

Equally importantly, the plant-based Russian mathematician V. K. Heins, otherwise known as William Frey, had left the Tsarist Empire to found a communal-agricultural colony in the US, volunteered at Chaikovsky's exilic farm in Kansas, and then returned to Russia in 1885. Frey and Tolstoy spent “five unforgettable days” together in October 1885, and under their visitor's influence, Lev and his daughters Masha and Tanya, Chertkov, and many Tolstoyans became vegetarians.<sup>189</sup> That same year, Lev Nikolaevich welcomed the 19-year old Orthodox Jew I. B. Feinermann, whose figure, passion, and manner of speech he found pleasing, to Yasnaya Polyana as a volunteer. Feinermann became one of the “dark ones”—peasant Tolstoyans, Jews, and freethinkers—whose presence on the manor vexed the countess.<sup>190</sup>

Feinemann converted to Christianity so as to be able to teach at Yasnaya Polyana, but even after his baptism, he was still barred from the job. Regardless, he chose to stay on the estate and work with the *muzhiki*. After a time, he returned to his hometown of Kremenchug in Ukraine to preach Tolstoyanism to the People.<sup>191</sup> Later, he went on to pen several controversial articles about his relationship with the artist, and he wrote *The Departure of a Grand Old Man* (1912) as a short film about Tolstoy's last days under the pseudonym Teneromo. *Departure* portrays Countess Tolstaya unsympathetically as a self-absorbed proprietor, and her marriage with Tolstoy as tempestuous and nonsensical, while it depicts the elder's bond with Chertkov and the *muzhiki* as sympathetic, authentic, and homoerotic.<sup>192</sup> For these and other reasons, including scenes laying bare the married couple's suicidal impulses, *Departure* provoked "an unprecedented public scandal," and Tolstoy's children called it "an outrageous desecration of the memory of their father."<sup>193</sup>

In a perhaps less emotionally charged way, Lev Nikolaevich took "joy" in his correspondence with John Kenworthy, a former businessman who co-founded the Croydon Brotherhood Church in Essex, England, in 1894.<sup>194</sup> This Church hosted activities, such as youth meetings and exercise classes; published their own writings, together with Tolstoy's; and promoted cooperative production. At Purleigh, which exists to this day, the first English Tolstoyan commune was established the same year.<sup>195</sup> What is more, according to literary critic Peter M. Bitsilli (1879–1953), Tolstoy and Anton Chekhov were Russia's "artists of life." Having met in 1895, they shared an intimate spiritual bond and a commitment to bringing about the Kingdom of God.<sup>196</sup> Demonstrating introjection of Tolstoyan utopianism and the "rationalist utopia of the Enlightenment," Chekhov's play *The Cherry Orchard* (1904) portrays a three-age interpretation of history.<sup>197</sup> In this drama, the feudal lord's private cherry orchard is devastated by capitalists in the name of profit, but then returns on a higher level as a "new garden [...] where all will find a new happiness in new surroundings."<sup>198</sup>

Along similar lines, the writer Maxim Gorky (1868–1936) felt "boundless admiration and fascination" for his elder, but he loathed the artist's followers, especially Chertkov. For his part, Tolstoy found "both Gorky and Chekhov pleasant, especially the former," and considered the journalist a "real man of the people," one blessed with "a great talent." Even so, Gorky and Tolstoy differed on the roles they saw for Western philosophy and the intelligentsia on the one hand, and the peasantry and Slavophilism on the other, in terms of Russia's past, present, and future. Gorky sought to overcome Russia's supposedly "Asiatic" inheritance through the modernization of the economy and State. As a result, he would side with the Marxist Bolsheviks over the *Narodnik* Socialist-Revolutionaries in the Russian Revolution. Later, despite sympathizing with the Kronstadt sailors in 1921, he would disgracefully welcome Stalin's imposition of forcible collectivization. As well, in response to Chekhov's 1922 sympathetic volume on Tolstoy's final home-leaving, Gorky wrote a "vigorous defense" of Sofia Andreevna.<sup>199</sup> This is not to mention his extremely homophobic 1934 article, "Proletarian Humanism," which we will discuss below in Chapter 6.

Next, Lev Nikolaevich met the painter Nikolai N. Gay (1831–1894) during his travels in Rome in 1861. Seeking to reunite with and “embrace” Tolstoy, whose “word [had] set [him] aflame,” the depressed Gay, who was married with a wife, abandoned his farm in Ukraine for Moscow in 1882.<sup>200</sup> Under his fantasied partner’s influence, whom he described as the “only one [...] for me,” Gay adopted a plant-based diet and began to perform manual labor. Count Tolstoy would send Gay unambiguous sexual innuendo in letters written in 1887 and 1889, especially phallic imagery.<sup>201</sup> In turn in a manner traditionally expected of a romantic partner, Gay would complain, before passing away in 1894, that his counterpart “is thinking for the whole human race, but no consideration is paid to his spiritual needs at all.”<sup>202</sup>

In January 1910, Valentin Fedorovich Bulgakov (1886–1966) arrived at Yasnaya Polyana to serve as Tolstoy’s secretary during the latter’s final months. Bulgakov describes his elder’s “almost fulsome” greeting, and the pleasure Tolstoy took in attending to the weary traveler by “putting a blanket around my knees” and “fetching tea for me.” Thus, Bulgakov attests to Tolstoy’s aptitude for nursing, anticipating Carpenter’s discovery from history and anthropology that those of “intermediate” or non-normative sexuality and/or gender have often functioned as priests, shamans, or healers.<sup>203</sup> Thanks to his elder’s warm welcome, Bulgakov thinks, “This [is] a man I could easily love.” Sofia Andreevna herself felt that Bulgakov was attracted to Tolstoy, while in turn, Chertkov’s secretary, P. A. Sergeenko (1854–1930), believed that Tolstoy admired his assistant. Notably, Tolstoy did not use to invite his previous youthful secretary, Nikolai Gusev (1882–1967), to accompany him on trips to the *zaseka*, as he would Bulgakov, who conceded that his elder was “so curious” about him.<sup>204</sup>

Finally, during Tolstoy’s last year of life, the artist corresponded with Mohandas K. Gandhi (1869–1948), with whom he shared many spiritual and political affinities: namely, an emphasis on “human brotherhood, race equality, resistance to tyranny and hatred of war.”<sup>205</sup> Arguably living out the homoerotic “apprentice complex” and reflecting the relatively strong role played by identification in love between men, Gandhi celebrated the centenary of the prose writer’s birth in 1928 by describing him in a speech as one of the three most influential people in his life.<sup>206</sup> However, reflecting the dangers of gay hyper-masculinity, Tolstoy and Gandhi converged in their sexist views on the woman question. Plus, Lev Nikolaevich’s ambivalence over Great-Russian chauvinism has its parallel in the legitimization that Gandhi arguably provided to the starkly hierarchical ideology of Brahmanism, despite his humanization of the Hindu caste system’s most oppressed, the *Avarna* (“untouchables”), as *Harijan* (“God’s children”).<sup>207</sup> Far more radically than the Mahatma, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar (1881–1956) espoused an anti-authoritarian interpretation of Buddhism focused on the outright annihilation of caste.<sup>208</sup> Ambedkar himself was reportedly moved to tears while reading Aylmer Maude’s *Life of Tolstoy* (1908/1930), a major source for this text.<sup>209</sup>

Therefore, out of the 19 same-sex bonds here surveyed—a sum which likely indicates only the “tip of the iceberg” of this return of the repressed—we count two relationships with homosocial features, 12 homophilic relationships, and five

homosexual bonds that provided satisfaction and meaning in Tolstoy's life.<sup>210</sup> Beyond these, the writer himself confesses to having loved at least eight other men at Kazan University, making for a minimum total of 27 same-sex relationships.

Undoubtedly, the boundaries separating homosociality, homophilia, and homosexuality are fluid, as Eros manifests itself in many different ways. This could be through love for a partner, love for a friend or relative, love for one's country or collective, love for humanity, or even a sublimated love for philosophy, art, religion, or cause.<sup>211</sup> When it comes to Tolstoy's queer desires, we cannot say to what extent his libido was sated. In reality, his passions for male company and for sexual and emotional intimacy with his fellow men are constant enough.

## Notes

- 1 Maude 1987b: 428.
- 2 Berdyaev 1966: 86; Berdyaev 2009: 11–12.
- 3 Medzhibovskaya 2008: 35.
- 4 Ken; Byrd 120.
- 5 Orwin 1993: 212; Honneth; Gustafson 1986: 456; Зверев и Туниманов 38; Grodetskaya 100.
- 6 Shestov.
- 7 Maude 1987b: 410; Evtuhov et al. 237–8.
- 8 Gustafson 1986: 440; Rancour-Laferriere 1995: 39; Malia 327; Berdyaev 2009: 9; Hall 169.
- 9 Berdyaev 1966: 87.
- 10 Bulgakov 39; Smith D 148; Hall 164–6; Rubin.
- 11 Hamburg 12.
- 12 Quoted in Medzhibovskaya 2010: 29.
- 13 Maude 1987b: 121; 1987a: 370.
- 14 Bartlett 2011: 345–6, 409.
- 15 Luxemburg 1–2.
- 16 Maude 1987b: 415.
- 17 Johansson 1990j; Dynes 1990b; Yousef; Berdyaev 1966.
- 18 Mole 2; Healey 4–15.
- 19 Figs and Kolonitskii 30; Venturi 142; Figs 2002: xxvii; Berdyaev 1966: 38.
- 20 Feuerbach 70, 79.
- 21 Hall 218.
- 22 Maude 1987a: 256; Mandelker.
- 23 DeYoung.
- 24 Freud 1953; Maude 1987b: 304.
- 25 Gustafson 1986: 432.
- 26 Rancour-Laferriere 1995: 3.
- 27 Nealon 4; Chitty 22–6, 32.
- 28 Tavis 107–8; Gustafson 1986: 190, 397; Capra 173.
- 29 Gustafson 1986: 11–21, 96.
- 30 Maude 1987a: 14–17, 197.
- 31 Bartlett 2011: 58–9.
- 32 Chodorow 1999: 44. After all, Isaac Newton suffered childhood abandonment, but went on to make stunning contributions to mathematics and physics (Williams).
- 33 Hall 167–72; Pietikainen 1–2; Freud 2013: 34; Berdyaev 1966: 14; Triandis.
- 34 Triandis.
- 35 Evtuhov et al.
- 36 Matthew 4: 8–11; Berdyaev 2009: 139.

- 37 Healey 101; Smolski et al.  
 38 Rancour-Laferriere 1995: 25–6; Karlinsky.  
 39 Orwin 2002b: 2, 30; Pietikainen 6, 22; Bartlett 2011: 340; Honneth 60.  
 40 Gustafson 1986: 318–23; Hrdy.  
 41 Jakim 272; Berdyaev 2009: 18.  
 42 Berdyaev 2009: 147–8.  
 43 Tolstoy 1985: 241.  
 44 Gustafson 1986: 274.  
 45 *Ibid* 429; Medzhibovskaya 2004; Benjamin 177.  
 46 Love 2007; Chouliaraki; Reitz.  
 47 Gustafson 1986: xi; Maude 1987a: 419.  
 48 Orwin 2002a: 49–50, 53; Stites 1990: 9.  
 49 Vergara 22; Smolski et al.  
 50 Lundskow; Bartlett 2011: 386; Honneth 51.  
 51 Rancour-Laferriere 1995: 45–6.  
 52 Stites 1990: 138; Mazurin 67; Maximov 195.  
 53 Venturi; Lundskow; Bulgakov.  
 54 Békés et al.  
 55 Rancour-Laferriere 1995: 95; Figes 2002: 88–98.  
 56 Shafer 63–79.  
 57 Shestov.  
 58 Maude 1987b: 183, 240–1.  
 59 Christoyannopoulos 2011: 203–4.  
 60 Rancour-Laferriere 1998: 2, 32.  
 61 Cortina 405; Freud 2016: 91.  
 62 Shelley; Baldwin.  
 63 Freud 1953: 420; Maude 1987a: 49.  
 64 Gustafson 1986: 3.  
 65 Maude 1987a: 234–5.  
 66 *Ibid* 363.  
 67 Bartlett 2011: 154–63.  
 68 Maude 1987b: 178.  
 69 Freud 2016: 75.  
 70 Grodetskaya 97.  
 71 Gustafson 1986: 349.  
 72 Bullock 105–6, 120.  
 73 Healey; Mole 5.  
 74 Karlinsky 1136.  
 75 Rubin 148; Leeder.  
 76 Maude 1987a: 276–7.  
 77 Tolstoy 1985: 32 (emphasis added).  
 78 Rancour-Laferriere 1985: 353. Likewise, the Black LGBTQ+ campaigner Ted Brown (b. 1950), a member of the Gay Liberation Front who organized the UK’s first Pride march in London in 1972, acknowledges his mother for “imbuing him with the spirit of revolutionary love and rejection of bigotry” (Okundaye).  
 79 Rancour-Laferriere 1995: 3, 28; Donaldson 1990b; Medzhibovskaya 2005: 43; Stites 1989.  
 80 ШЕВЕЛЕВ (emphasis added).  
 81 Forrest 70.  
 82 Bulgakov 29; Ramnath; Figes and Kolonitskii 73.  
 83 Dynes 1990i: 398; Fiedler 5–9.  
 84 Fiedler 7–8.  
 85 Nealon 9; Berdyaev 2009: 55–7.  
 86 Zakaria.  
 87 Chitty 34–6, 57, 71, 148–9.  
 88 Shively 1990a.

- 89 Herzen 44n13, 62.  
 90 Burgen.  
 91 Chitty 76–7. According to journalist Tim Reid, before the Taliban took over Kandahar in 1994, the city had been considered the “homosexual capital of South Asia” (Reid). Now, the Taliban have taken over the city yet again.  
 92 Nealon 10.  
 93 McGrattan; O’Dowd.  
 94 Shafer 145–50.  
 95 Ahmed; Koshiw.  
 96 Pasternak 401, 546.  
 97 Figes and Kolonitskii 74–5; Mendelsohn.  
 98 Cohn 284–9; Freud 1953.  
 99 Freud 1964: 57; Lanzieri and Hildebrant 282.  
 100 Chitty 73–5.  
 101 Tolstoy 1985: 31–2.  
 102 Lieven 2000: 218.  
 103 Massad 11.  
 104 Shantz and Williams 161; Bartlett 2011: 102; Phelps.  
 105 Gettone 1404; Clay 215; Zatat.  
 106 Pushkin 458.  
 107 Evtuhov et al. 28–9; Gilman-Opalsky 67.  
 108 Karlinsky.  
 109 Healey 21–2, 78–81, 112–15, 187, 202–3; Mole 2.  
 110 Healey 35, 93, 108.  
 111 Karlinsky; Johansson 1990q; Healey; Mole 10.  
 112 Oltermann and Walker.  
 113 Feldman.  
 114 Rancour-Laferriere 1988.  
 115 Healey 112–14.  
 116 Figes and Kolonitskii 42–59.  
 117 Pasternak 541–9.  
 118 Clark 2021.  
 119 Berdyaev 1966; Pelikan.  
 120 Berdyaev 2009; Dostoevsky 1990: 246–60.  
 121 Freud 2016: 61; Stites 1989: 211.  
 122 Babel 30, 80.  
 123 Siegel.  
 124 Healey 38–46.  
 125 Леонтьев.  
 126 Kennedy 91; Wexler; Falk.  
 127 Roberts 80–2.  
 128 Williams et al.  
 129 Никитина 95.  
 130 Толстой 1928–1964, vol. 85, 253n5.  
 131 Healey 17, 47, 101; Johansson 1990g.  
 132 Healey 190.  
 133 Gerth and Mills; Hamburg 128.  
 134 Никитина 79, 88, 95.  
 135 Freud 2016: 63.  
 136 Книжный чел.  
 137 Bullock 103.  
 138 Никитина 85.  
 139 Tolstoy 2006b.  
 140 Maude 1987a: 51. In this sense, Tolstoy feels himself “as a woman in search of a man” (Freud 2016: 64).



- 141 Tolstoy 1985: 32.  
 142 НИКИТИНА 96–7.  
 143 Bullock 104–5; Phelps 679; Healey 1; Khazov; Khazov-Cassia; Shakhidzhanian and Reiter; Kondakov.  
 144 Громова-Опупльская 400.  
 145 Tolstoy 2009a.  
 146 Freud 1961b: 39; Benjamin; Malatesta; Medzhibovskaya 2004: 22.  
 147 Pietikainen 83.  
 148 Johansson 1990d; Gustafson 1986: 13; Maude 1987b: 140; Rancour-Laferriere 1988; Benjamin; НИКИТИНА 97.  
 149 Tolstoy 1985: 32.  
 150 Maude 1987a: 18.  
 151 НИКИТИНА 81.  
 152 Maude 1987a: 155 (emphasis added).  
 153 Gustafson 1986: 202.  
 154 Zorin 20, 59.  
 155 Tolstaya 2014a. To this point, two 2015 studies corroborate Countess Tolstaya’s hypothesis about the link between creativity/prodigy and autism (University of East Anglia; Ruthsatz et al.).  
 156 Bartlett 2011: 306–66; Evtuhov et al. 399.  
 157 Zorin 126–9; Bartlett 2011: 315.  
 158 Figs 2002: 260.  
 159 Parini 123–4, 131–6, 140; Bartlett 2011: 360–2; Tolstaia 574.  
 160 Tolstaia 668–70.  
 161 Maude 1987a: 34–66; Bartlett 2011: 73, 99; Figs 2002; Phelps; Rancour-Laferriere 1988.  
 162 Rancour-Laferriere 1985: 344.  
 163 Parini 72–3, 279–80.  
 164 Johansson 1990e.  
 165 Freud 1961b: 30; Freud 1953.  
 166 Newlin 368–74.  
 167 Shestov.  
 168 Phelps 665.  
 169 Bartlett 2011: 300–1.  
 170 Chitty 134.  
 171 Bartlett 2011: 49–51; Tolstoy 2010: 205, 1127–38; Figs and Kolonitskii 1; Museu Marítim de Barcelona.  
 172 Maude 1987a: 33.  
 173 Chausovsky.  
 174 Kropotkin 2022: 14.  
 175 Healey 97–8.  
 176 Tolstoy 1985: 32, 488n41. Kropotkin makes an analogous confession in 1863 in the town of Chita in the Far East: namely, that “I am not created for women, and women are not created for me” (Kropotkin 2022: 60).  
 177 Maude 1987a: 199.  
 178 *Ibid* 41, 317; Zorin 78.  
 179 Bartlett 2011: 102; Maude 1987a: 70–2.  
 180 Tolstoy 2005: 287.  
 181 Maude 1987a: 140, 284–317, 373–4; Freud 2013: 87.  
 182 Zorin 87.  
 183 Johansson 1990q; Maude 1987a: 363–5.  
 184 Maximov 221–2; Bartlett 2011: 431–47.  
 185 Bullock 107.  
 186 Bartlett 2011: 258–64; Maude 1987a: 381; 1987b: 13–14, 85–7.  
 187 Maude 1987b: 83–5.  
 188 Healey 27, 49.

- 189 Maude 1987b: 167–9; Bartlett 2011: x, 350.
- 190 Maude 1987b: 174–5; Tolstoy 1985: 218–19; Figes and Kolonitskii 35.
- 191 Матонин 69; Толстой 1928–1964, vol. 85, 253n5.
- 192 Тенеромо.
- 193 Матонин 70.
- 194 Bartlett 2011: 362.
- 195 Osgood.
- 196 Шевелев; Harris 90.
- 197 Sternhell 258.
- 198 Kropotkin 1991: 345–6.
- 199 McLean 2002: 27–8; Tolstoy 1985: 346, 360, 448; Figes 1996: 767; Kropotkin 1991: 120.
- 200 Maude 1987b: 116; Tolstoy 2010: 257.
- 201 Bartlett 2011: 142, 297–308.
- 202 Maude 1987b: 205, 243–9, 267–75, 339.
- 203 Parini 46–8, 90; Carpenter 1919: 14.
- 204 Parini 68, 83–4.
- 205 Balasubramanian 67. This is not to overlook either Gandhi's anti-Black racism, or Tolstoy's ambivalence toward Asians or Jews (Desai and Vahed). For more about Tolstoy's approximation with, and critique of, Orientalism, see Chapter 4.
- 206 Rancour-Laferriere 1985: 345–52; Balasubramanian 66–8.
- 207 Shaw.
- 208 Ramnath.
- 209 Yusufi.
- 210 Rancour-Laferriere 1985: 348. Though limited by their preliminary and speculative nature, these categories are as follows: homosocial: Vanusha, Kenworthy; homophobic: Fëdor Ivanovich Tolstoy, Ufan, Sado Miserbiyev, Frey, Fet, Strakhov, Tchaikovsky, Siutayev, Gorky, Chekhov, Bulgakov, Gandhi; homosexual: Dyakov, Alexeev, Feinermann, Gay, Chertkov.
- 211 Berdyaev 2009: 55–6; Gilman-Opalsky 144; Chitty 169; Freud 1961a: 184.