

From the Editor

It has been said that "Every writer has an address," that is, a place where they can be reached and apprehended, even if they are exiled or at large. The address is the location where an arrest may take place, where the writer may be found *chez lui*, sniffing rotten apples or reposing behind cork-lined walls; the address is the locus where words begin to form and to be spoken or written. It is a peculiarity of Tolstoy's that he has simultaneously one of the most notorious and frequently addressed addresses in literary history -- Yasnaya Polyana -- yet his voice resonates with the authority of the super-addresser whose address may not be specified.

Tolstoy as correspondent with the world opened a dialogue that both demanded and defied response, and though his words emanated from Yasnaya Polyana, his image overpowered his voice, so that it was easy to deify him, as Chertkov, Gorky and even Tolstoy's descendents did in their hagiographic memoirs. In his later years, Tolstoy himself seemed to believe he had adopted a position so reactionary that it would preclude all dialogue and fail to communicate at all, as he wrote of himself, "He denies science and art, he wants to return people to savagery; why even listen to him or talk to him?" Yet, he did not stop talking, but created the image of a prophet speaking into a whirlwind of silence.

In considering the response to Tolstoy in the West, one is struck by how much this mythology shapes the reception of Tolstoy's literary work. Galya Diment's study of Tolstoy's influence on the British writers of Bloomsbury demonstrates how much his presence there was constructed from his philosophical and aesthetic theories, as much as from his actual *oeuvre*. In another assessment of Tolstoy's influence, Robert Edwards examines the numerous parallels between Tolstoy's philosophy and art and the thought of the American philosopher, John Dewey. In her comparative critical study of *Anna Karenina* and *Effi Briest*, Suzanne Osborne suggests the possibility of Tolstoy's influence on Fontane and extends her documentation of parallel thematics in the two novels to a broader consideration of the nineteenth-century adulteress heroine.

Among Tolstoy's most infamous addresses to Western and Russian bourgeois society are his pronouncements on art in *What is Art?* and his essay on *King Lear*. Anticipating the Russian Futurists and Stanford University in jettisoning the "greats" from the "steamship of modernity" and the canon of great art, Tolstoy penned irascible critiques of Shakespeare, Beethoven, etc. that have been dismissed as eccentric or neurotic. Philip Rogers weaves a coherent critique of *Hamlet* from Tolstoy's marginal notes and attaches it to the essay on *King Lear* to suggest consistent and coherent reasons underlying Tolstoy's denigration of Shakespeare. Thomas Barran re-reads *What is Art?* as an implicitly utopian document, styled on Rousseau's *Social Contract*, and explores other aspects of Rousseau's influence on Tolstoy by comparing *What Then Must We Do?* with Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality*.

This is the first of two special issues of the *Tolstoy Studies Journal*. The next special issue will appear as Volume VI, 1993, and will be on the topic of "Tolstoy and Sexuality." Articles, translations, notes, reviews, and review articles relating to any aspect of this topic should be submitted by the deadline of August 1, 1993. Contributors are encouraged to consult the "Style Guide and Information for Authors" at the back of this issue.

Amy Mandelker
New York City
March 11, 1993