

## TOLSTOY'S HAMLET

PHILIP ROGERS, SUNY BINGHAMTON

Rimvydas Silbajoris's thesis that Tolstoy's "anti-Shakespearean tree of discontent" has its roots in "the two writers' different perceptions of the relationship between reality and language" (142-3) appears to be strongly supported by the evidence of Tolstoy's marginal comments and markings in his copy of *Hamlet*.<sup>1</sup> Tolstoy's complaint in *On Shakespeare and the Drama* that in *King Lear* "thoughts arise either from the sound of the words, or by contrast" (409) is implicit in his *Hamlet* marginalia. While several of Tolstoy's comments obviously express objections to Shakespeare's morality and imply doubts about plausibility of motivation, the marginalia are, as George Gibian notes in his analysis of them, preponderantly directed against the artificiality of Shakespeare's language (40-4).<sup>2</sup> Tolstoy's pencil marked the margins of many passages notable for ornateness, elaborate rhetoric or word play. I quote here only a few characteristic examples.<sup>3</sup>

King Claudius' first speeches exemplify for Tolstoy the "inflated, empty language . . . Shakespeare always speaks for his kings" (*On Shakespeare*, 423):

**King:** . . . What wouldst thou beg, Laertes,  
That shall not be my offer, not thy asking?  
The head is not more native to the heart,  
The hand more instrumental to the mouth,  
Than is the throne of Denmark to thy father. (I,ii,45-49)

Polonius's convoluted word play elicited from Tolstoy the marginal comment, "тупо ни к чему" ("dull, pointless")<sup>4</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup>Listed completely in the appendix of this article. Tolstoy's annotations are in volume six of *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare* (Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz, 1844). Gibian's comments on Tolstoy's annotations (40-44) are based on S. Breitburg's transcriptions, published in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* in 1940. My comments on the annotations are based on examination and transcription of both Tolstoy's Tauchnitz *Hamlet* and of V.F. Bulgakov's transcription of Tolstoy's marginalia (unpublished manuscript) at Yasnaya Polyana. I am indebted to the Estate-Museum for permission to use its archive and to A.G. Dolgoff, who assisted me in transcriptions.

<sup>2</sup>Gibian discusses a few of the marginal comments I deal with here, but reaches quite different conclusions about them.

<sup>3</sup>Unless otherwise noted, my reference to marked passages refers to a single black pencil line in the text's margin.

<sup>4</sup>Tolstoy's concern with the lack of "point" in much of Shakespeare's language implied in the remark, "ни к чему" ("pointless"); his interrogative "к чему" ("to what end?"), noted three times; "не к стати" ("not to the point") twice noted; and "зачем" ("what for?") once, suggests the teleological motive Silbajoris

**Polonius:** . . . Your noble son is mad.  
Mad call I it, for, to define true madness,  
What is't but to be nothing else but mad?

Mad let us grant him then; and now remains  
That we find out the cause of this effect,  
Or rather say, the cause of this defect,  
For this effect defective comes by cause. (II,ii,92-94;100-103)

Hamlet's poem to Ophelia, "Doubt thou the stars are fire,/ Doubt that the sun doth move,/ Doubt truth to be a liar,/ But never doubt I love." (II,ii,115-118) Tolstoy considers simply "глупо" ("stupid"). Tolstoy also marked the margin of Polonius's "short tale" of Hamlet's decline:

And he, repelled, a short tale to make,  
Fell into a sadness, then into a fast,  
Thence into a watch, thence into a weakness,  
Thence into a lightness, and, by this declension,  
Into the madness wherein he now raves." (II,ii,145-149)

The first meeting of Hamlet with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern is marked with the comment "всё один язык у всех" ("Everyone speaks the same way"). This marked passage, which unfolds from Hamlet's metaphor of Denmark as a prison, culminates in an exchange which indeed shows the three men to be speaking, stichomythically, the same figurative language:<sup>5</sup>

**Hamlet:** O God, I could be bounded in a nutshell and count myself a king of infinite space, were it not that I have bad dreams.

**Guildenstern:** Which dreams indeed are ambition, for the very substance of the ambitious is merely the shadow of a dream.

**Hamlet:** A dream itself is but a shadow.

**Rosencrantz:** Truly, and I hold ambition of so airy and light a quality that it is but a shadow's shadow. (II, ii,245-251)

Hamlet's playful self-description, "I am but mad north-northwest: when the wind is southerly I know a hawk from a handsaw" (II,ii,349-350) elicited from Tolstoy a marginal "б.с." [без содержания?] (without content?). The conceits of Hamlet's speeches to Ophelia in III,i,111-114;119-127;131-138 ("Get thee to a nunnery") likewise are noted with marginal lines and question marks.

---

identifies as fundamental to Tolstoy's aesthetic.

<sup>5</sup>Gibian finds Tolstoy's claim that all characters speak the same language to be simply "wrong in the matter of fact"(43). Neither Tolstoy's nor Gibian's generalization is valid: sometimes their speech is similar, sometimes individualized.

Hamlet's punning exchange with Polonius on the subject of his acting (marked again "б.с.") provides a nice example of what Silbajoris describes as the "word and its shadow grinning foolishly at each other" (143):

**Hamlet:** "What did you enact?"

**Polonius:** I did enact Julius Caesar. I was killed i' th' Capitol; Brutus killed me.

**Hamlet:** It was a brute part of him to kill so capital a calf there. . . ." (III,ii,88-94)

The entire passage from which the above exchange is drawn (III, ii,81-111), all marked "б.с.," offends too in Hamlet's bawdy, punning exchange with Ophelia on "country manners," of which Tolstoy singles out for separate underlining (not, presumably, because of its artifice), "That's a fair thought to lie between maids' legs." Tolstoy also objected to several passages in III,iv in which Hamlet confronts his mother in her room. The entire speech comparing his father to Claudius ("See what a grace was seated on this brow. . ." 56-87) is judged by Tolstoy as "искуств. ни одного натурального слова." ("artificial. not one natural word"). Of Hamlet's summing up of Claudius as "a murderer and a villain,/A slave that is not twentieth part of the tithe of your precedent lord. . ." (III,iv.98-100) Tolstoy underlines "twentieth. . .tithe," and dismisses the figure with the marginal sarcasm, "арифметика" ("arithmetic"). In the same scene he underlines as well two further instances of paradoxical word play, "Forgive me this my virtue," and "I must be cruel only to be kind" (III,iv,156;182). Also marginally noted here with a question mark are Hamlet's elaborately metaphorical advice to his mother, "No, in despite of sense and secrecy,/ Unpeg the basket on the house's top,/ Let the birds fly. . ./ And break your own neck down" (III,iv,196-200) and his figure for the planned revenge against Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, ". . .'tis the sport to have the engineer [sic]/ Hoist with his own petard, and 't shall go hard/ But I will delve one yard below their mines/ And blow them at the moon. . ." (III,iv,210-213).

The elaborate figures and stichomythia that characterize Hamlet's exchanges with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern again draw marginal fire from Tolstoy in IV,ii. where he inquires sarcastically, "должно быть [остроумно]"<sup>6</sup> (This is supposed to be [witty]?)

**Rosencrantz:** Take you me for a sponge, my lord?

**Hamlet:** Ay, sir, that soaks up the King's countenance.

He keeps them, like an ape in the corner of his jaw,  
first mouthed, to be last swallowed. When he needs  
what you have gleaned, it is but squeezing you and,  
sponge, you shall be dry again.

**Rosencrantz:** My lord, you must tell us where the body is and go with us to the King.

**Hamlet:** The body is with the King, but the King is not with the body. The King is a thing.

<sup>6</sup>"Остроумно" is a guess. The word is smudged and unclear.

**Guildestern:** A thing, my lord?

**Hamlet:** Of nothing. (IV,ii,12-13;15-18;21-26)

Tolstoy's final marginal comment that appears to be directed exclusively at Shakespeare's language in *Hamlet* is seen in V,i, the dialogue between the gravediggers on the subject of Ophelia's death and burial:

**Clown:** "Here lies the water--good. Here stands the man--good. If the man go to this water and drown himself, it is, will he nill he, he goes; mark you that. But if the water come to him and drown him, he drowns not himself. Argal, he that is not guilty of his own death shortens not his own life" (V,i,13-17).

Of this whole passage (V,i,3-35) Tolstoy noted "глупо, скучно, претенциозно" ("stupid, boring, pretentious").

The evidence of these markings clearly supports Silbajoris' thesis that Tolstoy objected to Shakespeare's use of language as an end in itself; obviously Tolstoy disliked the above and many similar passages in *Hamlet* which to him appeared to disconnect language from human reality. Yet Tolstoy's *Hamlet* marginalia also raise a question which requires further interpretation of his response to Shakespeare's language: why does Tolstoy finally have so little to say about the language of *Hamlet* (or of any other play) in *On Shakespeare and the Drama*? While the quantity and vehemence of his marginalia suggest that Tolstoy planned to deal at some length with Shakespeare's language in the discussion of *Hamlet* he originally intended to include in *On Shakespeare and the Drama*<sup>7</sup>, the discussion of *Hamlet* says little about Shakespeare's language, focusing instead on Hamlet's lack of any character. Indeed, while the essay makes suggestive general comments on such topics as the lack of individuality in characters' speech and the inappropriateness of speeches to their dramatic context, it offers almost nothing in the way of specific objections to Shakespeare's language, especially in its relation to reality, beyond the observation, noted above, that in *King Lear* "thoughts arise from the sounds of words and from contrast" (409). Thus Silbajoris is perforce obliged to supplement Tolstoy's remarks with what "Tolstoy might have said" (143).<sup>8</sup> So it is not after all surprising that, as Morson notes (126), Shakespeare's language is generally overlooked as the source of Tolstoy's animus.

In the remainder of this essay I would like to speculate on why Tolstoy did not in fact say what he "might have said" (and indeed appeared fully prepared to say) about language and reality in *Hamlet* and why too he may have abandoned his intention to treat

---

<sup>7</sup>Gibian (40) explains the evidence suggesting Tolstoy originally intended *Hamlet* as "the second target" in a "double-barreled attack."

<sup>8</sup>Silbajoris' reading of Tolstoy's mind here is to me both ingenious and fully persuasive. I question, however, his apparently unqualified seconding of Tolstoy's complaints about Shakespeare's language, especially the conclusion that Shakespeare "merely constructs complex literary texts" (145).

*Hamlet* as fully as he dealt with *King Lear*.

A critique of language in *Hamlet*, from the point of view Silbajoris assumes for Tolstoy, confronts the problem of the play's own consciousness of words and referents, for both Hamlet and *Hamlet* anticipate and thematize Tolstoy's position on language.<sup>9</sup> The relation of word to matter in *Hamlet* is pervasively figured:

**Polonius:** What do you read, my lord?

**Hamlet:** Words, words, words.

**Polonius:** What is the matter, my lord?

**Hamlet:** Between who?

**Polonius:** I mean the matter that you read, my lord. (II,ii,188-193).

Tolstoy marked not merely the ornate, rhetorical passages of *Hamlet*, but also most of the passages whose subject points to Tolstoy's: the disjunction of words and matter, art and the nature it represents. His comments suggest that in choosing to criticize the artificiality of language in *Hamlet*, he is drawn into the thematics of the play itself. Hamlet has taken the "words, words, words" out of Tolstoy's mouth: his advice to the players, a passage Tolstoy heavily marked (both with pencil lines and the bending back of the page, as well as with marginal comments) is perhaps the single best known statement in any literary work about the "right," minimally-mediated relationship of words to nature in art's imitation of humanity:

Suit the action to the word, the word to the action, with this special observance, that you o'erstep not the modesty of nature. For anything so o'erdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure." (III,ii,15-20)<sup>10</sup>

The absoluteness of this assertion, especially its emphatic "both at the first and now, was and is" recalls the enunciation of a similar aesthetic credo: "Герой же моей повести . . . всегда был, есть, и будет прекрасен -- правда" ("The hero of my tale...always was, is, and will be beautiful--the truth") (PSS 4:59). Both the tone and content of Hamlet's indignation at the popular success of egregiously false art would not be out of place in *What is Art?*:

---

<sup>9</sup>A useful study of the thematics of disjoined words and referents in *Hamlet* is accomplished by Margaret W. Ferguson.

<sup>10</sup>Compare the early diary entry of Tolstoy, noted in Silbajoris' account of the development of his aesthetic thinking (14): "L'imagination est le miroir [de la] nature.... La plus belle imagination est le miroir le plus clair et le plus vrai..." ["Imagination is the mirror of nature.... The most beautiful imagination is the clearest and most true mirror."] (PSS 45:69).

O, there be players that I have seen play, and heard others praise, and that highly (not to speak it profanely), that neither having th' accent of Christians, nor the gait of Christian, pagan, nor man, have so strutted and bellowed that I have thought some of Nature's journeymen had made men, and not made them well, they imitated humanity so abominably." (III,ii,24-29)

On Hamlet's advice to the players Tolstoy commented "неуместная вставка" ("a misplaced insertion"). This is not surprising; inasmuch as the mirror principle Hamlet advocates conflicts absolutely with Tolstoy's perception of Hamlet's practice, the principle must be judged entirely out of place in his mouth. To seek a unified explanation of Hamlet's language theory and practice, the method in his word-madness,<sup>11</sup> would be to discover Hamlet in possession of a character, and that, of course, Tolstoy denies. Yet even if Hamlet is an inappropriate spokesman for naturalness of representation, his exposition of "the purpose of playing" (in effect, an answer to the question, "what is art?") nonetheless unsettles the basis of Tolstoy's critique of unnatural language in *Hamlet*. A play so pervasively concerned (as Tolstoy apparently recognized) with the ways in which figurative language (mis)represents reality--the very terms in which Tolstoy means to judge it--cannot plausibly be faulted for its figurative language, especially when the art of those same figures so often represents the "matter" of (mis)representation. Hamlet is not the only character in the play to comment on disjunctions of art and nature. Queen Gertrude's objection to Polonius' maddeningly circular speech on madness ("Your noble son is mad....") could be mistaken for one of Tolstoy's marginal complaints: like him, she demands "more matter, with less art" (II,ii,95). Did the Queen's impatience with Polonius's art perhaps infect Tolstoy? Polonius further enriches the play's concern with the problem of art and matter when, to placate the Queen he attempts artless speech: "Madam, I swear I use no art at all./That he's mad, 'tis true: 'tis true 'tis pity,/And pity 'tis 'tis true--a foolish figure./But farewell it, for I will use no art" (II,ii,96-99). Here Polonius enacts the predicament of an aesthetic that aspires to artless truthfulness in the renunciation of figures, yet discovers nonetheless not nature in the mirror, but its own foolish figuring. Not surprisingly, Tolstoy also finds this passage "ни к чему" ("pointless") for the purposes of his critique.

King Claudius too reflects on the disjunction of truth and art, nature and its representation in words. Here the theme takes on a moral dimension: his guilt is expressed as a disjunction that renders his prayers futile: "My words fly up, my thoughts remain below./ Words without thoughts never to heaven go" (III, iii, 97-98). Tolstoy marked a similar speech of the king in which the disjunction of deed and painted word is expressed in painted words: "The harlot's cheek, beautied with plast'ring art,/Is not more ugly to the thing that helps it/ Than is my deed to my most painted word" (III,i,51-53). Hamlet's exchange with Ophelia on the incompatibility of beauty and honesty presents the same disjunction in yet another context:

---

<sup>11</sup>For which see Ferguson.

**Hamlet:** ...If you be honest and fair, your honesty should admit no discourse to your beauty.

**Ophelia:** Could beauty, my lord, have better commerce than with honesty?

**Hamlet:** Ay, truly; for the power of beauty will sooner transform honesty from what it is to a bawd than the force of honesty can translate beauty into his likeness. This was sometime a paradox, but now the time gives it proof. (III,i,107-114)

Tolstoy noted this assertion of the superior force of beauty to that of honesty ("Ay, truly...proof") with marginal line and question mark.

*Hamlet* likewise represents the obverse of such disjunction in the circumstance of false words representing truths. Thus the "false fire" (III,ii,243) of the "Mousetrap" (the play within the play) reveals the King's true guilt, and Hamlet's mad words conceal his method and expose the false rhetoric of King Claudius (Ferguson 293). Inasmuch as the dramatically central "false fire" of "Mousetrap" and mad words of Hamlet both imply concealment as the motive of artifice and require interpretation in the discovery of their matter, they suggest the "method" of reading the play's artful language generally.

Suffice it here to conclude that in questioning the language of *Hamlet* Tolstoy inescapably exposed himself to the infection of its own questioning. Thus his comments are best read as an argument with *Hamlet*, his thinking *with* the play, rather than a final formulation of it or of a critique of Shakespeare's language. "Искусств. ни одного натурального слова" [artific. not one natural word] and similar remarks reply to Hamlet's claim to hold a mirror up to nature, but do not suggest the basis for criticism that might deal with the complexity of the play's preoccupation with art and matter, language and reality. For scoring the palpable hit on Shakespeare that Tolstoy desired, *King Lear* was an easier target.

## APPENDIX

In addition to writing marginal comments, Tolstoy marked his copy of *Hamlet* with vertical marginal lines (to indicate a passage of several lines), folded page corners, underlined words and sentences, and question marks. Except for one fingernail impression marking (a device he used fairly often in other books), and one in red pencil, all are in black pencil. Act, scene and line references are to the Norton edition. Because line numbering varies in different editions of *Hamlet*, I also provide here the first and last words of marked passages. Editorial speculation is [bracketed].

I.i.12-13. "If you do meet. . .bid them make haste." Marginal line. Additionally, "the rivals" is underlined.

I.i.40. "Peace, break thee off." Marginal question mark.

- I.i.49. "It is offended." Marginal question mark.
- I.ii.46-48. "That shall not be. . . .to thy father." Marginal line.
- II.ii.93-100. "Mad call I it. . . .and now remains." Marginal line. T. also wrote "тупо ни к чему (dull, pointless)."
- II.ii.115-118. "Doubt thou the stars. . . .never doubt I love." Marginal line. T. comments, "глупо (stupid)."
- II.ii.137-154. "Or looked upon. . . .when it proved otherwise?" Marginal line.
- II.ii.214. "You go to seek. . . ." Marginal line.
- II.ii.218. "My excellent good friends!" Marginal line.
- II.ii.231-248. "Then is doomsday. . . .shadow of a dream." Marginal line. T. comments, "Всё один язык у всех" ("Everyone speaks the same way")
- II.ii.302-327. "shall end his part. . . .their own succession?" Marginal line. T. notes, "не к стати" ("not to the point").
- II.ii.349-350. "I am but mad. . . .handsaw." T. notes "б.с." [без содержания?] (without content?).
- II.ii.351-369. "Well be with you. . . .the only men." Marginal line. T. remarks, "ненужная чепуха" ("unnecessary nonsense").
- II.ii.370-376. "O Jephthah. . . .old Jephthah." Marginal line.
- II.ii.380-382. "What follows then. . . .God wot'." T. notes "чеп[уха]" ("nonsense").
- II.ii.403-439. "One said there were no. . . .on the milky head." Marginal line. T. questions, "к чему?" ("to what end?").
- II.ii.440-454. "Of reverend Priam. . . .All you Gods." Marginal line.
- II.ii.460-462. "It shall to the barber's. . . . to Hecuba." Marginal line. T. questions, "Зачем он грубит Полониусу?" ("Why is he rude to Polonius?")
- III.i.1-9. "And can you. . . .some confession." Marginal line. T. asks, "Почему королю нужно узнать?" ("Why does the king need to find out?").
- III.i.48-55. "And pious action. . . .Let's withdraw, my lord." Marginal line. T. asks, "Поч[ему] знает?" ("Why does he know?").
- III.i.92. "well, well, well." T. underlined "well, well, well" and wrote a marginal question mark. [Some editions, e.g. Norton, amend this line to a single "well." Tolstoy's Tauchnitz edition retains all three.
- III.i.111-114. "Ah, truly. . . .I did love you once." Marginal line and question mark.
- III.i.119-128. "Get thee to a nunnery. . . .your father?" Marginal line.
- III. i. 131-138. "O, help him. . . .restore him!" Marginal line. Question mark. "If thou dost marry" underlined with fingernail marking.
- III.ii.1-29. "Speak the speech. . . .so abominably." page-long marginal line, page corner bent back. T. comments on Hamlet's first speech ("Speak the speech. . . .Pray you avoid it") "не к стати" ("not to the point"). Opposite the second speech ("Be not too tame. . . .so abominably.") he notes, "неуместная вставка" ("a misplaced insertion").
- III.ii.32-37. ". . . .for there be of them. . . .make you ready." Marginal line.



III.ii.81-111. "They are coming. . . .Ay, my lord." Marginal line. "That's a fair thought to lie between maids' legs." is underlined. The entire passage is marked "б.[ез] с.[одержания]."

III.ii.257-269. "A whole one. . . .he likes it not, perdy." Marginal line.

III.iii.8-21. "Most holy. . . .petty consequence." Marginal line. Tolstoy questions, "К чему?" ("To what end?").

III.iii.53-72. "That cannot be. . . .may be well." Marginal line in red pencil. T. notes (in black pencil), "Ни то, ни се" ("Neither this nor that").

III.iii.73-78. "Now might I. . . .To heaven." Marginal line. T. comments, "пошло" ("vulgar").

III.iii.79. "Why, this is hire and salary, not revenge." Underlined with marginal question mark.

III.iii.80-86. "'A took my father. . . .fit and seasoned." Marginal line.

III.iii.93. ". . . that his heels may kick at heaven," Underlined. T's note partly illegible: "Д.В." or "Д.С." [?]

III.iv.22-25. "What, ho!. . . .I am slain!" Marginal line. T. asks, "К чему?" ("To what end?").

III.iv.32-35. "Ay, lady. . . .thy fortune." Marginal line. T. asks, "Зачем?" ("What for?").

III.iv.56-82. "See what a. . . .not so mope." Marginal line. T. notes, "Искусств.[енно] ни одного натурального слова." (Artificial. Not a single natural word").

III.iv.82-87. "O shame. . . .gives the charge. . ." Marginal line.

III.iv.89-92. "O Hamlet!. . . .leave their tinct." Marginal line. T. notes, "вдруг" ("suddenly").

III.iv.98. "A slave that is not twentieth part the tithe. . . ." Underlined. T. comments, "арифметика" ("arithmetic").

III.iv.122-125. "And as. . . .thy distemper. . ." Marginal line. "Your bedded hair like life in excrements" underlined.

III.iv.153-159. "Infects unseen. . . .do him good." Marginal line. "Forgive me this my virtue" underlined with marginal question mark.

III.iv.161-175. "O, throw away. . . .desirous to be blest. . . ." Marginal line. T. notes, "говорит автор" ("the author speaks").

III.iv.182. "I must be cruel only to be kind." Underlined with marginal question mark.

III.iv.196-200. "No, in despite. . . .own neck down." Marginal line with question mark.

III.iv.207-213. "Whom I will. . . .most sweet. . ." Marginal line.

IV.i.25-45. "O'er whom. . . .and dismay." No marginal line, but T. comments opposite this passage "Король опять спокоен" ("The king is again calm").

IV.ii.9-26. "That I can keep. . . .all after." Marginal line. T. notes, "Должно быть [остроумно]." ("This is supposed to be [witty]?") The last word is blurred; the

interpretation is Bulgakov's.

IV.iii.8. "This sudden sending. . . ." No marginal line, but T. notes here "Все одно говорит." ("Always says the same thing.")

IV.iv.46-66. "To do't. . . .nothing worth." Marginal line. T. notes, "считает хорошим" ("[This he] considers to be good").

IV.vii.30-36. "That we are made. . . .to the queen." Marginal line. "our beard be shook with danger" underlined.

IV.vii.125-137. "No place. . . .your father." No marginal line, but T. notes of the speech, "как естественно." ("how natural").

IV.vii.182-186. "Alas, then. . . .these are gone." Marginal line. T. notes, "как мило" ("how sweet"). "Too much of water hast thou, poor Ophelia" underlined.

V.i.3-29. "I tell thee. . . .he had none." Marginal line. T. protests, "глупо, скучно, претенциозно" ("stupid, boring, pretentious").

V.i.141-164. " How long will. . . .flashes of merriment. . . ." Marginal line. T. notes, "пошло глупо" ("vulgar, stupid").

V.i.224-227. "What is he. . . .hearers." marginal line.

V.i.229. "Thou pray'st not well." No marginal line. T. notes, "грубо" ("crude").

V.i.239-245. "Until my eyelids. . . .forbear him." Marginal line. "Forty thousand brothers" underlined.

V.i.246-274. "'Swounds. . . .burning zone. . . ." Marginal line. T. notes, "Вдруг [полюбил]" ("Suddenly he [fell in love]"). The last word is blurred; the interpretation is Bulgakov's.

**WORKS CITED**

- Ferguson, Margaret. "Hamlet: Letters and Spirits." *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. Ed. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1985.
- Gibian, George. *Tolstoj and Shakespeare*. 's Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957.
- Morson, G.S. "The Tolstoy Questions: Reflections on the Silbajoris Thesis." *Tolstoy Studies Journal* 4 (1991): 115-141
- Shakespeare, W. *Hamlet*. Ed. Cyrus Hoy. New York: Norton, 1992.
- Silbajoris, Rimvydas. *Tolstoy's Aesthetics and His Art*. Columbus: Slavica, 1991.
- Tolstoy, L.N. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii L.N. Tolstogo*. 90 vols. Moscow: GIXL, 1907-60.
- , *On Shakespeare and the Drama in Tolstoy on Art*. Ed. Aylmer Maude. London: Oxford U.P., 1924.