

## 1: 20 Great Russian Novels You Should Read Right Now | Qwiklit

*The Officer in Nineteenth Century Russian Literature [Mark S. Simpson] on [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com) \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. Russian fiction -- 19th century -- History and criticism.*

Early history[ edit ] Old Russian literature consists of several masterpieces written in the Old Russian language i. The main type of Old Russian historical literature were chronicles , most of them anonymous. Life of Alexander Nevsky offers a well-known example. Bylinas “ oral folk epics ” fused Christian and pagan traditions. Medieval Russian literature had an overwhelmingly religious character and used an adapted form of the Church Slavonic language with many South Slavic elements. The first work in colloquial Russian , the autobiography of the archpriest Avvakum , emerged only in the midth century. The reforms he implemented encouraged Russian artists and scientists to make innovations in their crafts and fields with the intention of creating an economy and culture comparable. Through their debates regarding versification of the Russian language and tone of Russian literature, the writers in the first half of the 18th century were able to lay foundation for the more poignant, topical work of the late 18th century. Vasily Kirillovich Trediakovsky , a poet, playwright, essayist, translator and contemporary to Antioch Kantemir, also found himself deeply entrenched in Enlightenment conventions in his work with the Russian Academy of Sciences and his groundbreaking translations of French and classical works to the Russian language. However, his work was often incredibly theoretical and scholarly, focused on promoting the versification of the language with which he spoke. Although he often disagreed with Trediakovsky, Sumarokov also advocated the use of simple, natural language in order to diversify the audience and make more efficient use of the Russian language. However, the themes and scopes of the works these writers produced were often more poignant, political and controversial. Alexander Nikolayevich Radishchev , for example, shocked the Russian public with his depictions of the socio-economic condition of the serfs. Nikolay Karamzin , “ , for example, is known for his advocacy of Russian writers adopting traits in the poetry and prose like a heightened sense of emotion and physical vanity, considered to be feminine at the time as well as supporting the cause of female Russian writers. His works were thus not universally well received; however, they did reflect in some areas of society a growing respect for, or at least ambivalence toward, a female ruler in Catherine the Great. This concept heralded an era of regarding female characteristics in writing as an abstract concept linked with attributes of frivolity, vanity and pathos. Some writers, on the other hand, were more direct in their praise for Catherine II. Unlike those who took after the grand style of Mikhail Lomonosov and Alexander Sumarokov, Derzhavin was concerned with the minute details of his subjects. Denis Fonvizin , an author primarily of comedy, approached the subject of the Russian nobility with an angle of critique. Fonvizin felt the nobility should be held to the standards they were under the reign of Peter the Great, during which the quality of devotion to the state was rewarded. His works criticized the current system for rewarding the nobility without holding them responsible for the duties they once performed.

## 2: Russian literature - Wikipedia

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

It was the literary critic Vissarion Grigoryevich Belinsky who heralded the reforms: The leading realists began to be published in the late 1840s. Although it had produced several powerful original literary giants, Russia in the 1840s still lacked a general literary movement. He was assisted by Nikolai Gogol, who moved from romanticism to his own eccentric brand of realism. The defeat of the revolutions of 1848 did not bring the same swerve towards reaction in the ideological development of Russia as the rest of Europe, although a sort of period of depression was obviously inevitable. But comparatively soon, in the middle of the 1850s, a new upsurge of democratic ideas began in Russia. The economic, social and political evolution of the country squarely poised the issue of inevitable abolition of serfdom and the general unrest bound up with this had forced the government of the time to grant temporarily a somewhat greater freedom of opinion. The central problem around which the thinking of the Russian society revolved at the time of their activities was the issue of the abolition of serfdom. However, there were sharp differences among various progressive camps regarding the method of liberation. Throughout the fifties this political division was reflected in literature. Chernyshevski and Dobrolyubov were the ideological leaders of the radical democrats against the liberals. This new upsurge of revolutionary democracy in Russia thus took place in politically and socially more advanced conditions than those in which Bielinski fought his ideological battle. The higher level of political struggle is apparent in all writings of Chernyshevski and Dobrolyubov. Literary criticism was now directed not just towards the despotism of autocracy and feudal reaction regarded as the chief enemy by Bielinski, but also towards the liberal bourgeoisie and their ideological representations. For them, any democratic change meant in the first place the political and social liberation of the lower plebeian section of society which involved a complete radical change in the social power structures and ladders of hierarchy. They conceived a social cataclysm, a revolution in the Universalist sense, as a radical change in all human relations and all manifestations of life, from massive economic foundations to the highest form of ideology. Moreover, since both these writers could historically and philosophically gain insight into and digest the period following upon the great French revolution, they could look at the obstacles of the liberation of the popular masses with fewer illusions. In contrast to such ideas, the realist writers laid great emphasis on the connection between literature and society. They believed that life itself, deeply conceived and faithfully reproduced in literature, is the most effective means of throwing light on the problems of social life and an excellent weapon in the ideological preparation of the democratic revolution they expected and desired. They demanded of the writers that in faithfully depicting the everyday destinies of men they should demonstrate the great problems agitating Russian society, and those decisive, fateful social forces which determine its evolution and not a mere naturalistic reproduction of the surface of life. It is to them that we owe the correct appreciation of emerging Russian realist like Turgenev, Goncharov, Ostrovski, Dostoyevski etc. As has been mentioned before, the incipient struggle between liberalism and democracy was one of the central battlegrounds in the Russian political and intellectual atmosphere. Most of the realist writers of the time inclined towards the liberal philosophy, but inasmuch as they depicted Russian reality faithfully, they involuntarily aided revolutionary democracy in many ways. It was precisely because Turgenev was a genuine, serious realist that his work could supply weapons against his own political philosophy.

### 3: 19th Century - Russian Artistic Movements - - [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*Tolstoy's novels, and those of his contemporaries such as Dostoevsky, occupy an important place in Russia's complex religious and social history, which itself found expression through 19th century Russian literature, as Dairmid Gunn describes.*

Photo by sludgegulper at flickr. In literary circles the emergence of the Russian novel as a powerful force in the 19th century is often described as an inexplicable phenomenon. That a country that had seemingly lagged behind Western Europe in cultural and political terms should produce in little over 40 years such eminent writers as Gogol, Turgenev, Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy certainly demands an explication. That explication lies deep in the history of Russia. The adoption of the Christian faith in by the ancient city of Kiev, the cradle of Russian history and civilisation, owed much to its historical attachment to Constantinople, the capital of an empire and the southern end of a trade route from the Baltic. Before the great schism between the Church of Rome and the Eastern Churches in two Greek monks, Cyril and Methodius, had gone on a proselytising mission to central Europe using a southern Slavonic language and a Greek based alphabet, thereafter called the Cyrillic alphabet. Subsequently the language was used to spread Christianity in Serbia and Bulgaria before being used in Kiev. In Kiev it was called Church Slavonic and became both the liturgical and literary language of the state. The everyday language, Russian, an eastern Slavonic language, shared the alphabet of the more refined church language. This linguistic duality existed until the 18th century when the two languages were fused together to form what is now the Russian language. Church Slavonic continued to be used as a liturgical language. These towns, although under the suzerainty of the Mongols or Tartars, continued to trade and maintained a distinct Russian identity. Their presence provided a platform for resistance from invading forces from Western crusaders in and the defeat of the Tartars in The confidence that grew from these victories led to the development of the powerful state of Muscovy and the increased influence of the Church on secular affairs in a period of creative icon painting inspired by such artists as Theophanes the Greek, Andrei Rublev and Dyonisius. After the fall of Constantinople to the Turks, in Moscow assumed even greater importance and status. With this title, the Russians claimed to have a messianic role as the protector of Eastern Christianity. Forty years later the Patriarchate of Russia was formed, marking a break from the ecclesiastical authority of Constantinople. The new autocephalous Church of Russia was quick to flex its muscles. The 17th century witnessed a power struggle between Church and State with the latter emerging as the stronger force. In his admiration of the West and his desire to create a powerful and centralised state with the newly built St Petersburg as its capital, the Tsar saw the Church as a symbol of Russianness that was important but which had to be kept outside the power nexus. To this end he abolished the Patriarchate and established in lieu a Holy Synod on Lutheran lines, controlled by his representative, the General Procurator. The Church had become a department of state. This was a devastating blow to the Orthodox Church in Russia and one that had serious consequences in the struggle between Christianity and atheism in the 19th century. She did much to destroy the influence of the monasteries a challenge to her Western ideas and a source of more revenue for the state , extended her empire to the south and corresponded with the great French writers and philosophers of the time. But events outside Russian could not be controlled. The early years of the 19th century were dominated by the rise of Napoleon and the eventual invasion by him of Russia. In short, the first quarter of the 19th century was a period of intense intellectual and cultural activity; Russia had been rudely opened to Western ways and thoughts, and at the same time made aware of its own history and cultural inheritance. In December a group of officers, many of whom had been to France after the defeat of Napoleon, staged a revolt in St Petersburg, a revolt that was ruthlessly suppressed by the newly enthroned Tsar, Nicholas I. Any ideas of democratic change were suppressed and replaced by a severe form of autocracy. The Tsar or Emperor distrusted the nobility and ensured that the more important posts in his administration were filled by men from the other sections of society. It was in this atmosphere of intimidation and fear that the first great Russian novelist, Nicolai Gogol , a member of the lesser nobility, appeared on the literary scene. After making his name with colourful and fantastic descriptions of country life in his native Ukraine, Gogol moved on to more

universal themes. His emphasis was placed on the smug self-satisfied attitudes of society at all levels. The Russian word *poshlost* that he used frequently can mean banality, triviality, pretentiousness and petty conceit. He added to this unflattering list of negative qualities the absence of any sense of spirituality. In the novella, *The Great Coat*, a key book in Russian literature, he portrays a man on the bottom rung of society in a way that can inspire pity and compassion. His pathetic obsession over acquiring a new greatcoat to improve his status among his colleagues is seen by Gogol, however, as merely a facade behind which the protagonist hides his spiritual nakedness. In that book he likens Russia to a troika out of control heading to an unknown destination. The 1840s saw the beginning of a rift between two general movements in educated society – the Westerners and the Slavophiles. The former imbibed the philosophy of Hegel and Marx and saw in this a blueprint for the creation of a perfect state or Utopia. For them the Emancipation of the serfs in 1861 was not enough to satisfy their craving for secular reform. The group in society who agitated for change were called the intelligentsia and among its members were people of modest rank recruited for government service during the reign of Nicholas I. The Slavophiles clung to traditional beliefs based on the Christianity and saw a better state evolving from them. That the Orthodox Church was considered a department of an autocratic state did not help their cause in opposing the ideas of the Westernisers. For any opposing view to be articulated in a meaningful way, help had to be sought from two great Russian authors – Fyodor Dostoyevsky and Leo Tolstoy. Before the appearance of their finest work another giant of Russian literature, Ivan Turgenev, had described most powerfully the intellectual scene immediately prior to the Emancipation of the Serfs. It depicts a clash of generations and beliefs. The most memorable character, Bazarov, is described as a nihilist, an early use of that term in literature. Although the Westernised aristocrat Turgenev was no supporter of the Church, his book indirectly shows the triumph of old customs and Christianity over the extreme negativism of nihilism. Before Dostoyevsky entered the lists as a Christian writer he had undergone experiences that would have broken the spirit of most men. Because of a flirtation with a revolutionary set in St Petersburg following the success of an epistolary novel, *Poor Folk*, Dostoyevsky had to endure imprisonment, hard labour and army service for 10 years. His description of convict life in *The House of the Dead* is remarkably mild and forgiving. His first great novel, *Crime and Punishment* reflects scenes from the New Testament and portrays punishment more in terms of troubled conscience than physical confinement in prison. In *The Devils* he mercilessly attacks terrorists and their aims. But it is in his last book, *The Brothers Karamazov* that he portrays in depth the fundamental clash between the brilliant rationalist, Ivan, and his deeply religious younger brother, Alyosha. No book could be more powerful and Christian. But what of Tolstoy? As a creator of character and story teller, Tolstoy has few equals. His lofty ideals simply seep into his stories and add an extra dimension to them. His own search for enlightenment and self realisation is reflected in the characters of Pierre Bezukhov in *War and Peace* and Constantine Levin in *Anna Karenina*. Indeed after his so-called conversion in 1880 he turned his back on the conventional religion of the Orthodox Church and was ultimately excommunicated from it. Both writers were hugely influential in promoting spiritual beliefs in a country that was being beset by materialism in all its forms. If there had not been the excessively harsh reaction to the assassination of Emperor Alexander II in 1881, their influence on the more moderate members of society could perhaps have led to the evolution of a more democratic state and the avoidance of the revolutions of 1905 and 1917, the emergence of the totalitarian and atheistic state of Soviet Russia. Dairmid Gunn is a vice president of the Scotland-Russia Forum, a charitable organisation dedicated to improving understanding between the two countries through cultural exchanges and contacts of all kinds on a non political basis. He is a fluent Russian speaker.

### 4: Russian literature | [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*An odd characteristic of Russian literature is that the first novel to appear in the vernacular was not an original work but a translation from the French " and not until the 18th century.*

It was considered more a part of Asia than an outpost of European thought. Russian serfs gained their freedom only in 1861, two years before the American Emancipation Proclamation. However, the nobility of Russia had looked to the West for ideals and fashions since the early 18th Century, when Peter the Great had instituted a series of reforms aimed at modernizing the country. Russian aristocrats traveled extensively in Western Europe and adopted French as the language of polite discourse. They read French and English literature and philosophy, followed Western fashions, and generally considered themselves a part of modern Europe. Petersburg was created the new capital of Russia in 1713, and remained the most Westernized of Russian cities. Indeed, Dostoyevsky was to consider it an alien presence in the land, spiritually vacuous compared to the old Russian capital of Moscow. The German-born czarina Catherine the Great, who reigned from 1762 to 1796, corresponded with Voltaire and fancied herself an Enlightenment monarch; but her plans for liberal reforms came to nothing, and she became better known as vainglorious autocrat. The first great national author of Russia, Alexander Pushkin "despite his celebration of Russian history and folklore" was profoundly influenced by such English writers as Shakespeare, Byron and Scott. Although he plays a role in Russian literature comparable to that of Goethe in Germany or even Shakespeare in England, his works were little known abroad during his lifetime. It was Ivan Turgenev "who lived and wrote for many years in Europe and was profoundly Western in his outlook" that first brought Russian literature to the attention of European readers, but at the cost of often being considered an alien in his own land. It was the twin giants Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoyevsky whose work exploded out of Russia in the 1860s to overwhelm Europeans with their imaginative and emotional power. To many readers it must have seemed as if this distant, obscure country had suddenly leaped to the forefront of contemporary letters. Both were profoundly influenced both by European Romanticism and Realism, but their fiction offered characters more complex and impassioned than those Europeans were used to. Tolstoy is known chiefly for his two masterpieces, War and Peace and Anna Karenina. Like the English Victorian novelists, Tolstoy sought to do more than entertain or even move his readers, taking the writing of fiction seriously as a moral enterprise. In the end Tolstoy became a Christian utopian, abandoning fiction altogether. Dostoyevsky is famous for his complex analyses of the human mind. Unlike Turgenev or Tolstoy, he pays little attention to details of setting or the personal appearance of his characters, instead concentrating on their thoughts and emotions. His work and that of Tolstoy revealed to Europeans that modern fiction could serve ends far more sophisticated than it had in the hands of Zola or even Flaubert. Dostoyevsky had a sensational life which is variously reflected in his fiction. He believed his father to have been murdered by his own serfs, a belief which led him to be obsessed with murder as a subject in many of his greatest works, such as Crime and Punishment and The Brothers Karamazov. After being arrested for his involvement in a radical group the model for The Possessed he was abruptly notified that he was about to be shot, but was spared at the last minute and sent to Siberia for ten years. He often described the traumatic effect which this mock-execution had on him in his fiction, and devoted another novel The House of the Dead to the story of his time in prison. While there, he developed epilepsy, and later made epileptic seizures one of the chief characteristics of the Christ-figure Prince Myshkin in The Idiot. He also analyzed his addiction to gambling in The Gambler. But it is important to note that though his characters always seem to be undergoing some sort of torment, he creates the extreme situations and emotions in his novels not out of mere sensationalism, but to plumb the depths of human experience. Of the other Russian writers of the 19th Century, the only other one to make much of an impression abroad was Anton Chekhov, whose short stories and plays used Realism in a much more understated way. His four great plays written just before and after the turn of the century "The Sea Gull, Uncle Vanya, Three Sisters, and The Cherry Orchard, along with the Realist masterworks of the Norwegian Henrik Ibsen" helped to rescue the theater from the dismal state into which it had plunged after the time of the German Romantics. The theatrical genius of the 19th century seems

to have gone into opera rather than stage plays; few of the plays written between Schiller and Chekhov are remembered or performed today, but his works are seldom absent from the stage for long. Under Communism, Tolstoy was regarded a great national writer despite his mystical leanings because of his sympathies with the peasants and utopian idealism; but Dostoyevsky was out of favor during much of the Stalinist period because he was an outspoken foe of socialism and fervent Christian. Yet abroad, his reputation continued to grow. He was seen as a prophet of the evils which followed in the wake of the Bolshevik Revolution, as a psychologist who anticipated many of the most striking discoveries of Sigmund Freud, and as a welcome challenger to the pervasive celebration of modernity so characteristic of the period. Despite his anti-modernism, Dostoyevsky still speaks directly to many readers in ways that most of his contemporaries do not. In post-Communist Russia he is again celebrated as a national treasure, just as he is revered as a classic abroad.

## 5: 19th Century Russian Literature – Hunter College

*The most celebrated period of Russian literature was the 19th century, which produced, in a remarkably short period, some of the indisputable masterworks of world literature. It has often been noted that the overwhelming majority of Russian works of world significance were produced within the lifetime of one person, Leo Tolstoy ().*

Lives and Culture Openbook Publishers , ix, pp. The essays are examples of what academic writing should be; accessible and clear with explanation of the background. This means the book is an excellent introduction to the subject which can be read by anyone who is interested but without specialist knowledge. The contributors are all leading figures in the field, and notes supply information about further reading. None of the essays deal with the revolution itself, or any leading female revolutionary figures such as Nadezhda Krupskaya or Alexandra Kollontai. It is nevertheless a political book in a broader sense, discussing changing opportunities for women, and attitudes towards them during this period. As Sibelan Forrester points out in the introduction, nineteenth-century Russian women are better known through their fictional representation. This book redresses the balance by an excellent introduction to real women and the culture in which they were involved. Despite many parallels, the position of women in Russia differed from that in Europe and America because the political situation was so different. Serfs were emancipated only in and, as Engel mentions, the transition from a feudal to a capitalist economy, which had taken place over hundreds of years in Europe, was so accelerated in Russia that it took approximately 25 years, intensified by the easier transport provided by railways and steamships p. Women could become factory workers, domestic servants p. Some could afford to dress more fashionably, to buy books and attend dance halls, pleasure gardens and theatres and there were opportunities for education p. Muravyeva, that women resented and fought against these restrictions: While the law was favourable to women in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it no longer supported them by the nineteenth century p. Violence against women was very common and in cases where a wife was accused of disobeying her husband, the court itself ordered her ten lashes p. In England, in the late eighteenth century, appalling cruelty towards women from male family members was taken for granted Memoirs of Charles Lee Lewes, , II, pp. During the nineteenth century, though, the laws began to improve. That case got to court, but generally cases of rape and wife-beating, even where the woman died, were not treated as serious by the courts. Thus a nobleman whose rape of an actress resulted in her death had a comparatively light sentence. Landlords and nobles were seldom punished in the same way as peasants. Because of fear, it was difficult to prove incest against a father and, when such cases went to court, even with witnesses, the woman was often punished as well as the man p. The resurgence in popularity of the Virgin Mary inspired women to be independent in their religious views, as they believed her to be. Nineteenth-century Russian male writers and composers are known worldwide – Tolstoy, Tchaikovsky, Chekhov – yet we do not know their female counterparts. The attitudes which led to this were also common in Western Europe. In the early nineteenth century, upper class women were educated in art and music to a high standard, but they could not become professionals. Some women writers managed to use the fact that the genre was not taken seriously to avoid the censor and convey criticism of social injustice. Women became teachers of music and art and leaders in the study of and development of folk art and music. The case of actresses and singers differs greatly from their opposite numbers in Western Europe. The actresses were despised for what they could not help. Despite this, some actresses developed into great and powerful performers, many famous all over Europe p. They left a legacy of impassioned devotion to and identification with their art. Women in Nineteenth Century Russia shows a very positive picture of women in struggle for greater control of their lives and bodies and for the right to live apart from their husbands and earn their living and to be considered equal to men. It is not surprising that women played a vital role in the Russian Revolution. Details of this book are available at [www.Help us launch Counterfire Media Support our Crowdfunder](http://www.Help us launch Counterfire Media Support our Crowdfunder).

## 6: Russian Studies - Hamilton College Areas of Study

*In this lesser known masterpiece of Russian fiction, Alexander Pushkin combines an engrossing love story, an encyclopedia of early 19th century Russian life, and one of the wittiest social satires.*

Russian Class Levels in the 19th Century By Douglas Matus ; Updated June 28, Russian Class Levels in the 19th Century Nineteenth-century Russian society was rigidly hierarchical, with an established class system that provided the outlines for the social and economic order. The Russian czar presided over a society in which the labor of the lower classes supported a landed aristocracy. This feudal system encouraged class antagonism, which culminated in the rise of the Bolsheviks and overthrow of the monarchy. For the span of the 19th century, however, Russian society had four distinct divisions. **Top of the Heap** The Russian czar presided over an upper class that included members of the nobility and higher clergymen. Russian nobles could own estates and, until the liberation of , the serfs who worked the land. Nobles had the privilege of attendance in exclusive universities and were exempt from military service. The Russian nobility differed from European nobility in that Russian nobles considered themselves servants of the czar, rather than a separate social entity. High clergymen within the Russian Orthodox Church qualified as upper class thanks to their status as property owners. **The Middle Class** The Russian middle class grew in influence from the mid- to late 19th century, and supplanted the nobility after the Russian Revolution. The rise of industrialism allowed individuals to enter the middle class through factory ownership or management. The middle class included trained professionals, such as doctors and lawyers, and civil servants who achieved high ranks in the state bureaucracy. The middle class leaned toward liberalism, and largely opposed the conservative social order of the upper classes. The Russian middle class developed in cities, which grew in population and importance as factory jobs enticed peasants to leave the countryside. **The Working Class** The Russian working class accounted for a small percentage of the population, at least until the turn of the 20th century. Nineteenth-century working class Russians were factory workers, sailors and certified artisans. Common soldiers also were working class. Military service, open to all male Russians, represented one of the only ways for lower class men to rise above their station. The term of service for military recruits, even those conscripted to meet estate quotas, was 25 years, and the children of soldiers attended special schools to prepare for their own entrance into the ranks. **Russian Peasantry** Nineteenth-century Russia had a predominantly agrarian economy, and the peasants who worked the land formed the largest portion of the population. Prior to , Russian peasants acted as virtual slaves, or serfs, upon the estates of landed nobility. Russian serfs had no explicit legal rights, and depended on their estate lords for justice, shelter and subsistence. After the serfdom reforms of Czar Alexander II, Russian peasants gained legal recognition and the right to own property. Unfortunately, the Russian nobility still owned most of the land, which forced peasants to hire themselves out as tenant farmers.

## 7: Superfluous man | literature | www.enganchecubano.com

*Russia has a rich literary tradition which stretches from the early nineteenth century to the present day. Its great writers have done particularly well with the novel, allowing themselves to be influenced by other strong traditions, such as the British and French.*

A Cultural History of Russia and finding more material, which I will quote here for those interested. I suspect Figes is oversimplifying the situation, and as always would welcome responses from those who know more than I. Princess Dashkova, a vocal advocate of Russian culture and the only female president ever of the Russian Academy of Sciences, had the finest European education. French was the language of high society, and in high-born families the language of all personal relationships as well. The Volkonskys, for example, a family whose fortunes we shall follow in this book, spoke mainly French among themselves. Mademoiselle Callame, a French governess in the Volkonsky household, recalled that in nearly fifty years of service she never heard the Volkonskys speak a word of Russian, except to give orders to the domestic staff. Despite the fact that she had been brought up in the Ukrainian provinces, where noble families were more inclined to speak their native Russian tongue, Maria could not write in Russian properly. Her letters to her husband were in French. Her spoken Russian, which she had picked up from the servants, was very primitive and full of peasant slang. It was a common paradox that the most refined and cultured Russians could speak only the peasant form of Russian which they had learnt from the servants as children. This neglect of the Russian language was most pronounced and persistent in the highest echelons of the aristocracy, which had always been the most Europeanized and in more than a few cases of foreign origin. In some families children were forbidden to speak Russian except on Sundays and religious holidays. During her entire education Princess Ekaterina Golitsyn had only seven lessons in her native tongue. Those girls caught speaking Russian were made to wear a red tin bell all day and stand like dunces, stripped of their white aprons, in the corner of the class; they were forced to remain standing even during meals, and received their food last. Other children were even more severely punished if they spoke Russian—sometimes even locked in a room. The attitude seems to have been that Russian, like the Devil, should be beaten out of noble children from an early age, and that even the most childish feelings had to be expressed in a foreign tongue. Later, talking about the Siberian exiles who had participated in the Decembrist revolt p. And all of them were forced, for the first time in their lives, to become fluent in their native tongue. For Maria and Sergei [Volkonsky], accustomed as they were to speak and think in French, this was one of the hardest aspects of their new existence. On their first encounter in that Nerchinsk prison cell they were forced to speak in Russian so that the guards could understand, but they did not know the words for all the complex emotions they were feeling at that moment, so their conversation was somewhat artificial and extremely limited. Maria set about the study of her native language from a copy of the Scriptures in the camp. And on the patriotic effects of the Napoleonic Wars pp. It became a fashion for the sons of noblemen to learn to read and write their native tongue. Dmitry Sheremetev, the orphaned son of Nikolai Petrovich and Praskovya, spent three years on Russian grammar and even rhetoric as a teenager in the sâ€”as much time as he spent on learning French. For lack of Russian texts, children learned to read from the Scripturesâ€”indeed, like Pushkin, they were often taught to read by the church clerk or a local priest. Girls were less likely to be taught the Russian script than boys. Unlike their brothers, who were destined to become army officers or landowners, they would not have much business with the merchants or the serfs and hence little need to read or write their native tongue. But in the provinces there was a growing trend for women as well as men to learn Russian. Without this growing Russian readership the literary renaissance of the nineteenth century would have been inconceivable. Previously the educated classes in Russia had read mainly foreign literature. In the eighteenth century the use of French and Russian had demarcated two entirely separate spheres: French the sphere of thought and sentiment, Russian the sphere of daily life. There were strict conventions on the use of languages. For example, a nobleman was supposed to write to the Tsar in Russian, and it would have seemed audacious if he wrote to him in French; but he always spoke to the Tsar in French, as he spoke to other noblemen. On the other hand, a woman was supposed to write in French, not just

in her correspondence with the sovereign but with all officials, because this was the language of polite society; it would have been deemed a gross indecency if she had used Russian expressions. In private correspondence, however, there were few set rules, and by the end of the eighteenth century the aristocracy had become so bilingual that they slipped quite easily and imperceptibly from Russian into French and back again. Letters of a page or so could switch a dozen times, sometimes even in the middle of a sentence, without prompting by a theme. Maria Raevskaya, but Ekaterina Golitsyn.

## 8: Women in Nineteenth-Century Russia: Lives and Culture - Counterfire

*Of the other Russian writers of the 19th Century, the only other one to make much of an impression abroad was Anton Chekhov (), whose short stories and plays used Realism in a much more understated way.*

Preamble In my lecture today, time permitting, I plan to give you an introduction to Russian literature, along the lines of the title of this lecture. In principle, I will be talking about the following five areas. I begin by looking with you at a series of pictures, to try to raise some issues about how we instinctively see men and women, and so to ask some questions about what is a man, what is a woman, and therefore, what is gender. I then will take this discussion to a more theoretical level, to propose some theories of gender, and to ask again some questions about how we see each other - and ourselves - as gendered beings, as men and women in more common parlance. From there we will move to a more socio-political level, to talk about theories, types and descriptions of what are usually called patriarchal societies, that is, societies where women are oppressed by men, to put it simply, if not simplistically, and in which women have few if any rights. After all these theoretical considerations we then move to have a brief look at the historical position of women in Russia, with particular reference to the nineteenth century. All this should take just half our time: First there will be an overall characterisation of nineteenth century Russian literature - what were the main themes, social issues and story-lines. Then I will talk about men and women writers, and ask in particular why there were so many more of the former than the latter, at least in terms of their so-called greatness. We will then look at the types of women who populate the literature of the period, the female characters, before, finally considering all these issues in the novel covered on the Russian module for this course, *A Hero of Our Time*, written in by Mikhail Lermontov. I should just stress at this point that time may get the better of us, so that I may have to drop some of this material, but you will find the full text of this talk on the ML Russian homepage. Do I know this person? Is this a man or a woman? What features lead you to this judgement? What general conclusions may be drawn from this exercise? British female fencing champion 3. US female construction worker 5. French male rugby player 7. To look at the four women first: She is, of course an athlete, but so is the fencer: Do these preconceptions also apply to Kate Millett No. In America and some other countries female construction workers are by no means uncommon: And what of the men: These days even policemen wear earrings - maybe not quite such striking ones, so does Elton fit into recognised patterns? Certainly, things have changed enormously in the past 25 years, so the Barbie doll vs the Action man images are now probably hopelessly out of date. But I think it is important to bear these kind of polar opposites in mind when we look at images of men and women, in pictures, in films and so on - and equally so when we read literature. I shall return to these issues in the specific context of literature later, but now I want to look briefly at what gender actually is. In fact, over the last years there has been an enormous debate around the nature vs nurture schools, in almost all fields of human enquiry, philosophy and psychology in particular, but also in sciences, linguistics - and, of course, in literary studies. So, what is gender? Women are built to have babies, so that is their function. Anything else, like winning an Olympic gold, or studying at university is a crime against nature, an aberration. Of course, I exaggerate here slightly, and few people these days would openly admit to such views, but such thinking is by no means completely Jurassic. As recently as we could hear such remarks on Radio 4: Men are naturally more suited to be aggressive and assertive and dominant and women more suited to be submissive and give way and be peacemakers. Plato, St Paul, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Tolstoy, Freud and many others are famous - or infamous - for what is now called their misogyny hatred of women, or what is called in simpler terms, their sexism. This binary view of men and women, that is, that each sex or gender has its own sphere, and should stick to it, is indeed very ancient, going back at least to the Greeks on the one hand, and the Jewish Old Testament on the other. One writer says the following, for example: There is no mistaking the fact that Homer fully reveals what remained true for the whole of antiquity, that women were held to be naturally inferior and therefore limited to their function of offspring and the performance of household duties, and that the meaningful social relationships and strong personal attachments were sought and found among men. This seems to me to mean that women were fine to mate with, but if you wanted a decent conversation, you had to

turn to other men. Certainly, this was how Greek society was organised. And so too was ancient Jewish society, under whose laws women were not allowed to participate actively in religious practice. And it is of course Eve who leads Adam astray, by listening to the demon serpent in the garden of Eden. Now, there are, in fact, strong, positive women in the the Old Testament, such as Susanna, Ruth, Sarah and so on, but all the great leaders are men. But really, wherever one might look in human history and its records over the last years or longer, the message generally remains the same. The trouble is that sexism is still very strong, even if great strides have been taken over the last years. Moreover, the crimes of the past should not be forgotten. Another historical practice was that of foot-binding in China, which led to the deliberate crippling of many girls over the centuries. A more modern instance, still all too prevalent, is domestic abuse. Biological definitions of gender, then, are not merely an academic abstraction, but have an awful lot of awful things to answer for. We can try to explain how men got away with all this for so long in a moment, but first I would like to offer some more modern, more neutral definitions of what gender is, definitions which see gender as not the same thing as biological sex, but as a social construct. For example, Maggie Humm in *The Dictionary of Feminist Theory* defines gender as A culturally-shaped group of attributes given to the female or to the male. Such theory takes the view that sex is biological and that gender behaviour is a social construction. In other words we are not born men and women, but become them, or are made into them by socialisation. Moreover, gender should be seen primarily as a relational concept. Just as slave-owners may abuse slaves, or white supremacists may abuse ethnic minorities because they perceive them as lesser beings, so too men have abused, and continue to abuse women, because women are perceived as lesser beings. And all this has been allowed to happen because virtually all recorded human societies are patriarchal in structure and ideology. What does this mean? For example, the term is especially commonly used for such Biblical long-beards as Moses, as depicted by Charlton Heston in *The Ten Commandments*. For present purposes it may be described as a set of social relations between men, which have a material base, and which, though hierarchical, establish or create interdependence and solidarity among men that enable them to dominate women. Patriarchy, given its longevity and ubiquitousness, must therefore be seen not as an accidental phenomenon, but as one that is systematic. Consequently, it permeates all aspects of culture, including, of course, literature. Accordingly, as the celebrated French feminist Simone de Beauvoir argues: This dominance permeates all manifestations of societies and their cultures, including literature. Indeed, it seems incontestable that in all literate societies literature has played a central part, either explicitly or implicitly, in expressing the interests of the dominant group. At least until the nineteenth century, literature was basically written by men and for men. Moreover, it played a fairly central part as an instrument of education and socialisation of women. Literature, that is, acted and still acts as a reinforcing mechanism of established social roles: This had many implications for the writers and consumers of the fiction of the period which concerns us, whether we look at Russia, England, France or Germany. Novels in the nineteenth century - by Jane Austen, for example - seemed designed to protect and enhance the social tradition - the goal of marriage, the ideal of the home. It seemed almost impossible to write a novel which completely defied the sex-role, or gender system. As the example of Jane Austen again illustrates, women writers as well as men tended to play the same game of reinforcing the status quo. Throughout literary history, that is, women have generally been represented either by men, or by women, within the dominant male code. Rarely, then, are women seen from a female point of view. And male writers, for the most part, have not understood women. Paradoxically, however, women have been one of the central themes of art, precisely because of their problematic for men place in culture. As Freud put it in a slightly different context: Other male creators of art would have put it even more bluntly: But first, a few words about women in Russian history. True, there is nothing in Russian society to equal the suttee of India, or the witch hunts of 17th century England. A vivid illustration of this is the book *Domostroi*, or *Household Arrangements* first published in the 17th century. Amongst other things this has lengthy sections of recommendations on wife-beating. It makes for grim reading. As was also the case in Western Europe, nearly all rulers of Russia have been men. This is true from first recorded times in the ninth century, right to the present. Even in Soviet times, when men and women were declared to be equal, all leaders of society were males. A notable exception to this pattern came through several quirks of history, or rather, of birth, in the 18th century, when, following

the death of Peter the Great in , virtually all rulers for the rest of this relatively progressive century were women, culminating in Catherine II, or Great, who reigned from Most notably, she created the first schools for young noble women. Even so, in the period which most concerns us, the nineteenth century, women had very few rights or opportunities. Now, it should be remembered that Russia was generally a pretty backward country in this period. Famines were common, poverty was near universal. But even the so-called privileged elite had few rights. There was no political activity as we would understand it, no parties, no freedom of expression. Political repression was all-pervasive. So, no-one had many civil liberties, but even within this generally bleak landscape men still managed to be better off than women. For example, women could not attend the few universities that existed, nor could they hold their own passports, although they could own property. I would now like to look at the world of the Russian woman in the 19th century. What I have to say concerns the gentry woman - roughly the world equivalent to that of the Jane Austen heroine. This is not because the world of the serf woman is unimportant or uninteresting, but much less is known about it - primarily because they were all illiterate and so left no memoirs. Moreover, the world of Russian literature, which is our central concern, is primarily set precisely in this world, of the young noblewoman.

## 9: Nineteenth Century Russian Realism | Survivingbaenglish

*nineteenth century. The existing literature tends to treat the peasantry as monolithic across space and time, immiserated in the pre-emancipation period by the demands of feudal landlords, and in.*

Russia Table of Contents The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were times of crisis for Russia. Not only did technology and industry continue to develop more rapidly in the West, but also new, dynamic, competitive great powers appeared on the world scene: Otto von Bismarck united Germany in the s, the post-Civil War United States grew in size and strength, and a modernized Japan emerged from the Meiji Restoration of Although Russia was an expanding regional giant in Central Asia, bordering the Ottoman, Persian, British Indian, and Chinese empires, it could not generate enough capital to support rapid industrial development or to compete with advanced countries on a commercial basis. Industry, in general, had greater state involvement than in Western Europe, but in selected sectors it was developing with private initiative, some of it foreign. Agriculture, which was technologically underdeveloped, remained in the hands of former serfs and former state peasants, who together constituted about four-fifths of the rural population. Large estates of more than fifty square kilometers accounted for about 20 percent of all farmland, but few such estates were worked in efficient, large-scale units. Small-scale peasant farming and the growth of the rural population increased the amount of land used for agricultural development, but land was used more for gardens and fields of grain and less for grazing meadows than it had been in the past. Industrial growth was significant, although unsteady, and in absolute terms it was not extensive. By Russia had about 32, kilometers of railroads and 1. Between and , annual coal production had grown about 1, percent to over 6. The state budget had more than doubled, however, and debt expenditures had quadrupled, constituting 28 percent of official expenditures in Until the state introduced high industrial tariffs in the s, it could not finance trade with the West because its surpluses were insufficient to cover the debts. Reforms and Their Limits, Tsar Alexander II, who succeeded Nicholas I in , was a conservative who saw no alternative but to implement change. Alexander initiated substantial reforms in education, the government, the judiciary, and the military. In he proclaimed the emancipation of about 20 million privately held serfs. Local commissions, which were dominated by landlords, effected emancipation by giving land and limited freedom to the serfs. The former serfs usually remained in the village commune, but they were required to make redemption payments to the government over a period of almost fifty years. The government compensated former owners of serfs by issuing them bonds. The regime had envisioned that the 50, landlords who possessed estates of more than hectares would thrive without serfs and would continue to provide loyal political and administrative leadership in the countryside. The new peasants soon fell behind in their payments to the government because the land they had received was poor and because Russian agricultural methods were inadequate. The former owners often had to sell their lands to remain solvent because most of them could neither farm nor manage estates without their former serfs. In addition, the value of their government bonds fell as the peasants failed to make their redemption payments. Reforms of local government closely followed emancipation. In most local government in the European part of Russia was organized into provincial and district zemstva sing. In elected city councils, or dumy sing. Dominated by property owners and constrained by provincial governors and the police, the zemstva and dumy raised taxes and levied labor to support their activities. In the regime implemented judicial reforms. In major towns, it established Western-style courts with juries. In general, the judicial system functioned effectively, but the government lacked the finances and cultural influence to extend the court system to the villages, where traditional peasant justice continued to operate with minimal interference from provincial officials. In addition, the regime instructed judges to decide each case on its merits and not to use precedents, which would have enabled them to construct a body of law independent of state authority. Other major reforms took place in the educational and cultural spheres. The accession of Alexander II brought a social restructuring that required a public discussion of issues and the lifting of some types of censorship. When an attempt was made to assassinate the tsar in , the government reinstated censorship, but not with the severity of pre control. The government also put restrictions on universities in ,

five years after they had gained autonomy. The central government attempted to act through the zemstva to establish uniform curricula for elementary schools and to impose conservative policies, but it lacked resources. In the financial sphere, Russia established the State Bank in 1859, which put the national currency on a firmer footing. The Ministry of Finance supported railroad development, which facilitated vital export activity, but it was cautious and moderate in its foreign ventures. The ministry also founded the Peasant Land Bank in 1863 to enable enterprising farmers to acquire more land. The regime also sought to reform the military. One of the chief reasons for the emancipation of the serfs was to facilitate the transition from a large standing army to a reserve army by instituting territorial levies and mobilization in times of need. Before emancipation, serfs could not receive military training and then return to their owners. Bureaucratic inertia, however, obstructed military reform until the Franco-Prussian War demonstrated the necessity of building a modern army. The levy system introduced in 1861 gave the army a role in teaching many peasants to read and in pioneering medical education for women. But the army remained backward despite these military reforms. Officers often preferred bayonets to bullets, expressing worry that long-range sights on rifles would induce cowardice. In spite of some notable achievements, Russia did not keep pace with Western technological developments in the construction of rifles, machine guns, artillery, ships, and naval ordnance. Russia also failed to use naval modernization as a means of developing its industrial base in the 1860s. In 1881 revolutionaries assassinated Alexander II. His son Alexander III ruled. He strengthened the security police, reorganizing it into an agency known as the Okhrana, gave it extraordinary powers, and placed it under the Ministry of Internal Affairs. In their attempts to "save" Russia from "modernism," they revived religious censorship, persecuted non-Orthodox and non-Russian populations, fostered anti-Semitism, and suppressed the autonomy of the universities. Their attacks on liberal and non-Russian elements alienated large segments of the population. Many Jews emigrated or joined radical movements.

Foreign Affairs after the Crimean War After the Crimean War, Russia pursued cautious and well-calculated foreign policies until nationalist passions and another Balkan crisis almost caused a catastrophic war in the late 1870s. The Treaty of Paris, signed at the end of the Crimean War, had demilitarized the Black Sea and deprived Russia of southern Bessarabia and a narrow strip of land at the mouth of the Danube River. The treaty gave the West European powers the nominal duty of protecting Christians living in the Ottoman Empire, removing that role from Russia, which had been designated as such a protector in the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainarji. Russian statesmen viewed Britain and Austria redesignated as Austria-Hungary in 1867 as opposed to that goal, so foreign policy concentrated on good relations with France, Prussia, and the United States. Following the Crimean War, the regime revived its expansionist policies. Russian troops first moved to gain control of the Caucasus region, where the revolts of Muslim tribesmen--Chechens, Cherkess, and Dagestanis--had continued despite numerous Russian campaigns in the nineteenth century. Once the forces of Aleksandr Baryatinskiy had captured the legendary Chechen rebel leader Shamil in 1859, the army resumed the expansion into Central Asia that had begun under Nicholas I. The capture of Tashkent was a significant victory over the Quqon Kokand Khanate, part of which was annexed in 1864. By 1876 Russian forces had captured enough territory to form the Guberniya Governorate General of Turkestan, the capital of which was Tashkent. To avoid alarming Britain, which had strong interests in protecting nearby India, Russia left the Bukhoran territories directly bordering Afghanistan and Persia nominally independent. The Central Asian khanates retained a degree of autonomy until 1876. Under the Treaty of Aigun in 1858 and the Treaty of Beijing in 1860, China ceded to Russia extensive trading rights and regions adjacent to the Amur and Ussuri rivers and allowed Russia to begin building a port and naval base at Vladivostok. Meanwhile, in the logic of the balance of power and the cost of developing and defending the Amur-Ussuri region dictated that Russia sell Alaska to the United States in order to acquire much-needed funds. A weak Franco-Russian entente soured, however, when France backed a Polish uprising against Russian rule in 1863. Russia then aligned itself more closely with Prussia by approving the unification of Germany in exchange for a revision of the Treaty of Paris and the remilitarization of the Black Sea. After Germany, united under Prussian leadership, was the strongest continental power in Europe. In 1873 Germany formed the loosely knit League of the Three Emperors with Russia and Austria-Hungary to prevent them from forming an alliance with France. Nevertheless, Austro-Hungarian and Russian ambitions clashed in the Balkans, where rivalries among Slavic nationalities and anti-Ottoman sentiments seethed. In the 1890s, Russian

nationalist opinion became a serious domestic factor in its support for liberating Balkan Christians from Ottoman rule and making Bulgaria and Serbia quasi-protectorates of Russia. From 1875 to 1878, the Balkan crisis escalated with rebellions in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bulgaria, which the Ottoman Turks suppressed with such great cruelty that Serbia, but none of the West European powers, declared war. In early 1877, Russia came to the rescue of beleaguered Serbian and Russian volunteer forces when it went to war with the Ottoman Empire. Within one year, Russian troops were nearing Constantinople, and the Ottomans surrendered. When Britain threatened to declare war over the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano, an exhausted Russia backed down. Russian nationalists were furious with Austria-Hungary and Germany for failing to back Russia, but the tsar accepted a revived and strengthened League of the Three Emperors as well as Austro-Hungarian hegemony in the western Balkans. Russian diplomatic and military interests subsequently returned to Central Asia, where Russia had quelled a series of uprisings in the 1850s, and Russia incorporated hitherto independent amirates into the empire. Britain renewed its concerns in 1881 when Russian troops occupied Turkmen lands on the Persian and Afghan borders, but Germany lent diplomatic support to Russian advances, and an Anglo-Russian war was averted. In the dispute that arose between Austria-Hungary and Russia, Germany took a firm position toward Russia while mollifying the tsar with a bilateral defensive alliance, the Reinsurance Treaty of 1879 between Germany and Russia. When Kaiser Wilhelm II dismissed Bismarck in 1890, the loose Russo-Prussian entente collapsed after having lasted for more than twenty-five years. Three years later, Russia allied itself with France by entering into a joint military convention, which matched the dual alliance formed in 1879 by Germany and Austria-Hungary. The regime relied on journals and newspapers to gain support for its domestic and foreign policies. But liberal, nationalist, and radical writers also helped to mold public opinion that was opposed to tsarism, private property, and the imperial state. Because many intellectuals, professionals, peasants, and workers shared these opposition sentiments, the regime regarded the publications and the radical organizations as dangerous. From the 1860s through the 1890s, Russian radicals, collectively known as Populists *Narodniki*, focused chiefly on the peasantry, whom they identified as "the people" *narod*. The leaders of the Populist movement included radical writers, idealists, and advocates of terrorism. In the 1860s, Nikolay Chernyshevskiy, the most important radical writer of the period, posited that Russia could bypass capitalism and move directly to socialism see Glossary. His most influential work, *What Is to Be Done?* Other radicals such as the incendiary anarchist Mikhail Bakunin and his terrorist collaborator, Sergey Nechayev, urged direct action. The calmer Petr Tkachev argued against the advocates of Marxism see Glossary, maintaining that a centralized revolutionary band had to seize power before capitalism could fully develop. Disputing his views, the moralist and individualist Petr Lavrov made a call "to the people," which hundreds of idealists heeded in 1874 and by leaving their schools for the countryside to try to generate a mass movement among the *narod*. The Populist campaign failed, however, when the peasants showed hostility to the urban idealists and the government began to consider nationalist opinion more seriously. The radicals reconsidered their approach, and in 1879 they formed a propagandist organization called *Land and Liberty Zemlya i volya*, which leaned toward terrorism. In 1881 Georgiy Plekhanov formed a propagandist faction of *Land and Liberty* called *Black Repartition Chernyy peredel*, which advocated redistributing all land to the peasantry. This group studied Marxism, which, paradoxically, was principally concerned with urban industrial workers. Witte championed foreign loans, conversion to the gold standard, heavy taxation of the peasantry, accelerated development of heavy industry, and a trans-Siberian railroad. In the accession of the pliable Nicholas II upon the death of Alexander III gave Witte and other powerful ministers the opportunity to dominate the government.

D-Day: spearhead of invasion Byzantine and early Medieval painting Cornish Rex Cats (Cats Set III) Mexican Catholicism in Southern California Abstract algebra theory and applications judson solutions manual Scrap iron destroyers Wellington as military commander Suffering and the image of God Jodies Hanukkah dig Coach yourself through the autism spectrum Immigrants in the city New York and Florence : the music of the twentieth century Young Beginner Singing Method The production plan Amazing Structures Identification Guide to North American Birds part I Corporate psychopaths and organisational constraints Gingers new crush Saltwater salmon angling Owl who couldnt give a hoot! Your career in interior design Found object art II Chapter 6 Findings and Conclusions The role of diffusion limitation in exercise-induced hypoxemia The Jacket I Wear in the Snow (Mulberry Big Book) Polysaccharide microarrays : application to the identification of heparan sulphate mimetics Julien Dheur Primary Design and Technology The relationship between language and sex in English by Jenny Cheshire Dynamics of crowd-minds Receipt of social security benefits by persons incarcerated in penal institutions And Robert Southey's Thalaba the Destroyer Japans security relations with China since 1989 Questions surrounding the hockey stick temperature studies Horngren sundem elliott and philbrick introduction to financial accounting Power : how to get it and how to hang onto it when the action gets heavy Gone Diving Mozambique Spectrum science and technology 2018 I open my heart to others and celebrate our oneness Mari Gayatri Stein. Thoughts rule the world Stump the Duct Tape guys