

South Atlantic Modern Language Association

Prince Andrey as Epic Hero in Tolstoy's "War and Peace"

Author(s): Laura Jepsen

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *South Atlantic Bulletin*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Nov., 1969), pp. 5-7

Published by: [South Atlantic Modern Language Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3196957>

Accessed: 14/01/2013 14:56

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



South Atlantic Modern Language Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *South Atlantic Bulletin*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

us "situations for which the ordinary meanings of words are inadequate and language that conveys something other than the meanings of its words."⁹ What he really offers is a carefully contrived illusion which makes it impossible for us to judge his plays in conventional terms.

The effect of Pinter's method is to force a new attention on audiences dulled by exposure to traditional dramatic technique. We find it difficult to be indifferent to Ruth or to dismiss her as commonplace. Most playgoers leave the theatre angry at her unresolved inconsistencies

9. Bernhard, "Beyond Realism," 185.

and disturbed by the suspicion that they have somehow been had. Most of us are uncomfortable when forced into a world in which there are no assignable causes and values, particularly when that world is in the theatre where we are long accustomed to find causes and values. To watch Pinter with justice, we must surrender to the play's existence rather than search for its meanings. The fact that the leg moves and the lips speak is more important than what either say.

Such a denial of dramatic meaning is analogous to the philosophical denial of real meaning and value which holds that the world is absurd. Pinter's plays communicate

the impression of absurdity not by presenting us that idea through conventional dramatic technique as do, for example, the plays of Sartre, but by making absurdity the essence of dramatic technique itself. That is why his plays are so disturbing and controversial and why, I believe, we must ultimately judge the quality of his achievement not from the subject matter of his plays and the relative "realism" of his dialogue but from the essentials of technique itself. We must learn to take a fresh look at Pinter's characters.

WILLIAM J. FREE,
University of Georgia.

Prince Andrey as Epic Hero in Tolstoy's "War and Peace"

Commentators on *War and Peace* who emphasize what seem to them the epic qualities of Tolstoy find support in the authority of the author, who defined his masterpiece as "Homeric." Tolstoy further insisted that *War and Peace* was a new *Iliad*. Likenesses between the two epics have been discovered by critics in mood, theme, and style. However, a more plausible similarity seems to lie in the concept of heroism inherent in Homeric tradition. This concept appears early in *War and Peace*, though ultimately Tolstoy's attitude toward heroism is antithetical to Homeric tradition.

Repeatedly Tolstoy has acknowledged indebtedness to the Homeric archetype with which he became acquainted early in his literary career. When in 1857 Tolstoy first read the *Iliad*, in translation, he was greatly impressed. The biographer Maude tells us that when Tolstoy finished reading "the inexpressibly beautiful conclusion of the *Iliad*," he compared Homer's resolution of the epic to that of the Sermon on the Mount, and moved by the beauty of both works, he regretted that there was no connection between them.¹ However, the concept of heroism represented in *War and Peace* suggests an unremitting effort on the part of the author—no doubt a subconscious effort—to reconcile two disparate views of heroic tradition, that of the *Iliad* and that of the Gospel according to St. Matthew.

1. Aylmer Maude, *The Life of Tolstoy: First Fifty Years* (London, 1908), I, 172.

Subsequent readings of the *Iliad*, both in translation and in the original, seem to have enhanced Tolstoy's appreciation of Homer and to have influenced his conception of heroism. With the depiction of Prince Andrey as epic hero, modeled in some respects on Achilles, in other respects on St. Matthew's Christ, this paper is chiefly concerned. It may not be amiss to suggest that the evolving characterization of Prince Andrey follows closely the evolution of the author's own ideational development.

Unlike many of the other characters for whom the author found living prototypes, Prince Andrey is entirely fictitious. With the appearance in 1869 of the last volume of *War and Peace*, a vast epic in the writing of which the author had been engaged for almost six years, it became apparent that Tolstoy had modeled many of his characters upon kinfolk or acquaintances, upon those he knew personally or through study of records. In general, members of Tolstoy's father's family are represented by the Rostovs and members of his mother's family by the Bolkonskys. For instance, Andrey Bolkonsky's sister, Princess Marya, is modeled upon Tolstoy's mother, who was an only child. But for Prince Andrey Bolkonsky the author found no familial prototype.

In a letter addressed to L. I. Volkonskaya, who had asked the author who was represented by the character named Andrey Bolkonsky, Tolstoy replied:

In the Battle of Austerlitz,

which will be described later, but with which I began the novel, I needed a brilliant young man to be killed. Later in the novel I needed only the old Bolkonsky and his daughter. But since it is awkward to describe a character not connected with anything in the novel, I decided to make the brilliant young man a son of the old Bolkonsky. Then he caught my interest, a role appeared for him later in the novel, and I took mercy on him, only wounding him severely instead of killing him.²

Significantly, in the early sections of the book describing events culminating in the defeat of forces opposing Napoleon at the battle of Austerlitz in 1805, the influence of Homeric epic seems most apparent. But more significant is the fact that the salient example of Homeric heroism is the fictional character Prince Andrey, who stands as a transitional figure revealing the author's concept of heroism, exemplifying first Homeric, then Christian ideals. Although the early Andrey has a number of Homeric attributes, he dies a Christian hero.

Perhaps Tolstoy's family and friends, to whom he read the initial part of the book and who delighted in seeing themselves portrayed as characters, identified no member of the group with Prince Andrey because of the inconsistency resulting from the author's own dilemma. Tolstoy's wife, who copied the man-

2. Letter to L. I. Volkonskaya, May 3, 1865.

uscript of *War and Peace* many times, expressed a favorable opinion of Andrey's sister, "I like everything about Princess Marya!" she said. "You see her so clearly. Such a splendid, sympathetic character." But of the brother of the Princess she remarked that the characterization was "not yet quite clear."³

As Tolstoy has indicated, Andrey of the early work, *Eighteen Hundred and Five*, was destined to be killed in battle, but his life was spared by the author. Like Achilles, Andrey was first designed as a short-lived hero who would die gloriously, "leaving manhood and youth," according to the Homeric lament. As in the example of Achilles, Andrey's death is foretold following the battle of Austerlitz, though the rumor is false and Andrey is saved to become a Christian hero.

Moreover, as in the case of the Homeric archetype, the heroic ideal of Prince Andrey is, initially, personal glory. Tolstoy is true to the epic tradition, for epics, deriving from old heroic lays, generally glorify war. The ideal of glory demands the praise of great military heroes. The hero's glory is his immortality and it is a heroic paradox that by dying gloriously the hero may achieve immortal life. Consequently Homer rewards his epic heroes with nothing but pagan immortality, the memory in the minds of men of the hero's glorious deeds.

However, Andrey's ultimate acceptance of Christian ideals is antithetical to Homeric tradition. That new view develops gradually as Andrey faces death on the battlefield. Before Prince Andrey leaves for the battle of Austerlitz his sister offers him an ikon. Reluctantly Prince Andrey accepts the blessing of the holy ikon, with his sister's assurance, "Against your own will He will save and will have mercy on you and turn you to Himself."⁴

This is the early Andrey of the first part of *War and Peace* who has expressed admiration of the military tactics of his hero, the Russian enemy, Napoleon. Later, after Vienna has been occupied by the French and Brünn is about to fall, Andrey has mixed feelings. He continues to admire the genius of his hero Napoleon, but at the same time, like Achilles, he is resolved to win per-

sonal glory in defense of his countrymen, allied with the Austrians against the French. On the eve of the battle of Austerlitz, Andrey expresses a Homeric desire, "Dear and precious as many people are to me: father, sister, wife — yet dreadful and unnatural as it seems, I would give them all up for a moment of glory."

Nevertheless, after Andrey has been wounded at the battle of Austerlitz his attitude toward war changes. Falling with the flagstaff in his hand, while attempting to hoist the flag over the cannons, Andrey, in agony of suffering, is aware for the first time of the lofty, infinite sky, the emblem of peace and triumph. As he lies on the field littered with dead and wounded, he is noticed by his hero Napoleon, who is making a tour of the battlefield. Napoleon stands over Andrey. "That's a fine death," says the man addressed as "your majesty."

Now Tolstoy speaks for Andrey: "He knew it was Napoleon — his hero — but at that moment Napoleon seemed to him such a small, insignificant creature in comparison with what was passing between his soul and that lofty, limitless sky." Andrey remembers the holy ikon his sister has given him. "How good it would be if all were as clear and simple as it seems to Marie," he reflects. He would ask mercy of "that God, who has been sewn up here in this locket by Marie."

Although by his family Prince Andrey is supposed dead, the author cannot let Andrey die, for, as he has indicated, "a role appeared for him later in the novel." The wounded Andrey returns home. On the night of his arrival a son is born, his wife dies. The death of Andrey's wife is significant because by freeing Andrey of family ties the author has freed himself to develop the theme of love essential to the portrayal of a Christian hero.

Recovering from his wounds, Andrey is at first disillusioned. Then he meets Natasha Rostova and life, which had seemed meaningless, renews itself in Prince Andrey, even as do the branches of the symbolic leafing oak. Dancing with Natasha at the ball, he feels "full of life and youth again." Andrey and Natasha are engaged but the marriage is postponed for a year. During Prince Andrey's absence Natasha attempts to elope with Anatole Kuragin. Andrey consequently is deep-

ly hurt. He is unable to forgive Natasha and he resolves to get revenge on Anatole. The *menis* theme, the theme of wrath due to insulted honor, is now developed. As in the case of Achilles who lost his prize of war, the woman Briseis, so loss of a woman instigates Andrey's desire for revenge.

It is the year 1812, seven years after the battle of Austerlitz in which the wounded Andrey lying on the battlefield perceived the insignificance of his hero Napoleon against the background of the infinite sky. On the eve of the battle of Borodino, Andrey is thinking of his youthful belief in "ideal love" which was to have kept Natasha faithful to him for a year. Suddenly he remembers that his foe Anatole is still alive and happy. Again he is moved by the desire for revenge.

But Tolstoy has second thoughts about his Homeric hero. During the battle Andrey is wounded by a grenade. At the ambulance station he lies on an operating table adjoining a table on which lies a man whose leg is being amputated. In that miserable, abject, sobbing creature he recognizes Anatole Kuragin. Gradually he recalls that this man is somehow closely associated with his life. The theme of wrath is now to be supplanted by the theme of love.

All at once an unexpected memory of Natasha as he had seen her first, the night of the ball in 1810, arouses in his heart a love stronger than ever. Love of a woman will eventually be transmuted into love of the enemy and ultimately into love of Christ. At this moment love for Natasha extends even to love for the enemy Anatole. "Prince Andrey remembered everything, and a passionate pity and love for that suffering man filled his happy heart."

The wounded Andrey now echoes the Christian precept the author enunciated a decade later in the *Confession* but which permeates not only his later but much of his earlier works: "Sympathy, love for our brothers, for those who love us, love for those who hate us, love for our enemies; yes, the love that God preached upon earth, that Marie sought to teach me, and I did not understand, that is why I am sorry to part with life, that is what was left of me if I had lived." Tolstoy's Homeric hero of 1805 has become the Christian hero of 1812. The *Iliad* which Tolstoy so greatly admired is

3. Ernest J. Simmons, *Leo Tolstoy* (Boston, 1946), p. 160.

4. Quotations from *War and Peace* are taken from the Modern Library Edition.

yielding in significance to the Sermon on the Mount.

Meanwhile, as war comes closer to Moscow, the city is being abandoned. During the departure Natasha and Andrey meet face to face and, thereafter, as Natasha nurses the dying Andrey, the theme of love undergoes a final transmutation. Andrey at first finds in Natasha the woman he had once loved and whose betrayal he has forgiven. At length he calls for the Gospel. Human love which has bound him to life is about to be supplanted by divine love which will allow him to detach himself from life. Tolstoy now enunciates the Christian paradox of life in death. Love is life, love hinders death — that Prince Andrey understands because of his earthly love for Natasha. But on the level of the supernatural, Andrey perceives, "Love is God, and

dying means for me a particle of love, to go back to the universal and eternal source of love."

Shortly before his death Prince Andrey awakes from a dream, and "with his awakening from sleep that day there began for Prince Andrey an awakening from life." Thus Tolstoy's Christian hero finds peace in death. The paradox of life in death as represented in the death of Prince Andrey foreshadows with its probing what some critics are disposed to call the author's spiritual crisis, expounded in his *Confession*, published ten years after the publication of *War and Peace*. Thus the *Confession* is the result of reflections in earlier years.

The distinguished critic Strakhov, who later became one of Tolstoy's admired friends, observed, upon the publication of *War and Peace*, that

two kinds of heroism are represented in the novel. "The aim of the whole story of *War and Peace* is to prove the superiority of meek heroism over active heroism," Strakhov asserted.⁵ In the character of Prince Andrey, as has been noted, both types of heroism are represented, the active hero of Homeric tradition and the meek hero of the Sermon on the Mount. Gradually, then, as has been indicated in the characterization of Prince Andrey, the Homeric hero's quest for immortality, as measured by his prowess in war, leads to the hero's renunciation of life in a Christian quest for immortality.

Laura Jepsen,
Florida State University.

5. From N. N. Strakhov, *Kriticheskie staty ob I. S. Turgenev i L. N. Tolstom*, 3rd ed. (St. Petersburg, 1895), pp. 352-61. Translated by George Gibian.

Courtly Love in the Works of Jorge Ferreira de Vasconcellos

The court writer, Jorge Ferreira de Vasconcellos, composed four novels during the years between 1537 and 1567. Three of the works (*Eufrosina*, *Ulyssippo*, and *Aulegracia*) are written in dramatic, or dialogue, form and are traditionally referred to as being based on the Spanish *Celestina*. They present a realistic picture of life in sixteenth-century Lisbon and Coimbra, and to this extent are unique in Portuguese Renaissance fiction. The fourth work, *O Memorial das proezas da segunda tvola redonda*, is a novel of chivalry in which the author attempts to cast the history of Portugal in the mold of medieval romance. The final episode of the *Memorial* brings history and fantasy together in the account of a tournament which actually took place at Xabregas in 1552, and in which Prince John, father of the future king, Sebastian, took a leading part.

Ferreira de Vasconcellos was not unique in his fondness for combining contemporary reality with the ideals of medieval chivalry. We recall that the historian Joo de Barros composed his famous *Decadas da sia* on the fundamental assumption that his nation's overseas expansion was a natural outgrowth of the medieval crusade. In this connection, Hernani Cidade tells us that "a luta com o mouro, primeiro no territrio metropolitano, depois no norte de Africa, finalmente no long-

ingo Oriente, foi dos mais poderosos factores na modelao do nosso espritu, como nos rumos da nossa Histria."¹ It is also noteworthy that Joo de Barros' earliest work, *A Crnica do Imperador Clarimundo* (1520), although a novel of chivalry, was conceived by its author to be essentially an outline of Portuguese history.² Barros, therefore, with his skillful blending of history, geography, and the chivalric ideal, set the stage for Portugal's crowning literary treatment of the maritime venture, *Os Lusadas* of Luis de Cames.

Although Ferreira refers only indirectly to the saga of discovery and conquest, he gives central importance to the theme of chivalry in all of his writings. Chivalry, as it applies to his court gentlemen, is a formalized standard of behavior based on the art of gallantry. As such, it governs the courtier's attitude toward life in general, and toward women in particular. It is, in short, Renaissance man's extension and application of the medieval code of courtly love. As the Middle Ages waned, the courtly elements of chivalry gradually eclipsed its military and religious aspects, and love became a highly formalized *fin amour*

replacing the crude, uncomplicated sexual relationship of the early feudal period. With the advent of the Renaissance humanists, the concept of love underwent a consciously intellectualized reorientation. The courtier was now a scholar as well as a gentleman, and felt entitled to discourse learnedly on any and all subjects, drinking deeply from classical fountains to prove his arguments. Like Spencer, the Renaissance courtier strove, both in his person and in his writings, to "join seraphic intellect and manhood fused with female grace."³

As *moo de cmaro* to three royal scions (Dom Duarte, Dom Joo, and Dom Sebasto), and as the holder of a modest position in the Royal Treasury, Ferreira de Vasconcellos was in an excellent situation to observe not only the elegant manners of court society but also the increasing commercialism of an overseas empire that was rapidly losing sight of its original crusading nature. It is precisely this conflict between luxury, on the one hand, and militant Christianity, on the other, that explains Ferreira's ambivalent attitude toward the society which he portrays.

It is doubtful that our author was familiar with Castiglione's *Cortegiano*, if we accept Asensio's judgment on this point as stated in the

1. Hernani Cidade, "A Influncia dos descobrimentos na literatura," *Memrias de congresso de mundo portuguesa*. (Lisboa, 1940), V, 409.

2. Tefilo Braga, *Cames*. (Porto, 1911), II, 388.

3. William H. Scheffeld, *Chivalry in English Literature*. (Cambridge, Mass., 1912), p. 179.