Benjamin M. Sutcliffe
Miami University

When Trifonov read Dostoevsky: Ideology, Avarice, and Violence in late Soviet culture

In one of his last interviews, author Iurii Trifonov (1925-1981) used a mix of praise and awe to discuss *Crime and Punishment*. Describing the novel as "an abyss of thoughts and associations with our time", he was horrified by the way his own world embodied Raskol'nikov's maxim that "everything is permitted".[1] For Trifonov, Dostoevsky revealed the contradictions between ideology, action, altruism, and avarice underlying Soviet culture, yet his reading of the classic writer also illuminates the contradictions within Trifonov's own thoughts. At some moments Trifonov joined orthodox Soviet critics, who tried to retroactively enlist Dostoevsky as a supporter of revolution. This failed effort highlighted the cultural stakes compelling Trifonov to view fiction as a harbinger of socialism.

A prominent *shestidesiatnik*, Trifonov is best known for portraying the Moscow intelligentsia. His celebrated *House on the Embankment* ("Dom na naberezhnoi", 1976) depicts a greedy protagonist who, in the final years of Stalinism, secures a career by betraying his mentor as well as his fiancée. The novella refutes the assumptions that the ends justify the means, a Dostoevskian motif influencing Trifonov's lesser-known *Impatience* ("Neterpenie", 1973). This historical novel, which praised the 1881 assassination of Aleksandr II, defends bloodshed in the struggle that eventually toppled tsarism. These two works give dramatically divergent readings of Dostoevsky, a figure cautiously celebrated during the 1971 sesquicentennial of his birth. *Impatience* even claims that the nineteenth-century author supported the People's Will, while *House on the Embankment* critiques its protagonist by connecting him to Raskol'nikov. I examine how these both narratives, which draw on *The*

1 On Trifonov's praise for *Crime and Punishment*, see his interview with East German scholar Ralf Schröder, "Gespräch mit Juri Trifonow. Ein 'Roman mit den Geschichte'", *Weimarer Beiträge*, n. 8 (1981), S. 133-154, quotation on p. 148, quoted in Sigrid McLaughlin, "Iurii Trifonov's *Dom na naberezhnoi* and Dostoevskii's *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*", *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, n. 2 (1983), pp. 275-283, 277.

Demons, *Brothers Karamazov*, and *Crime and Punishment*, expose Trifonov's concerns with Soviet culture.

Global tensions made Dostoevsky a part of the Cold War; he posed fundamental problems for the USSR's scholars due to his Orthodoxy, hatred of socialism, and suspicion of rationality.[2] In 1972, introducing a volume of articles on the author, Soviet editors heralded Dostoevsky studies as part of the struggle between socialism and capitalism. Émigré Norman Shneidman, writing four years later, lambasted the USSR's "ideological and political considerations" regarding the author – ironically, his politicized view resembled the Soviet analysis he scorned.[3] Dostoevsky studies joined international chess tournaments and piano competitions as another battlefield between the superpowers. Trifonov for his part was deeply apprehensive over the arms race and nuclear proliferation. Commenting on *The Demons*, he worried that in the atomic age a terrorist could cobble together a nuclear weapon (as a young American scientist had recently done).[4]

Susan McReynolds observes that Dostoevsky opposed socialism and capitalism for a similar reason: both reduce human and spiritual interaction to economic exchanges that eclipse spirituality and blunt compassion.[5] For her Dostoevsky is more than a prophet of Soviet culture's darker moments, such as the

2 For a wide-ranging survey of changing Soviet attitudes to Dostoevsky, see Vladimir Seduro, *Dostoevski's Image in Russia Today* (Belmont: Nordland, 1975).

3 On Dostoevsky studies differentiating between capitalism and socialism, see Андрей Гришунин и др., "От редакции", in *Достоевский – художник и мыслитель. Сб. статей* (Москва: Художественная литература, 1972), с.: 3-6, 4. N. N. Shneidman, "Soviet Theory of Literature and the Struggle around Dostoevsky in Recent Soviet Scholarship", *Slavic Review*, n. 3 (1975), pp. 523-538, 523.

4 On worries about nuclear weapons, see Юрий Трифонов, "Ядро правды," in Ю. Трифонов *Ядро правды. Статьи, интервью, эссе* (Москва: Изд. Правда, 1987), с. 12. Concerning *The Demons*, see Юрий В. Трифонов, "Нечаев, Верховенский и другие...," in Ю.В. Трифонов, *Как наше слово отзовется...*, сост. Александр Шитов, примечания Ольги Трифоновой и Александра Шитова (Москва: Советская Россия, 1985), с. 51.

5 Susan McReynolds, "'You Can Buy the Whole World': The Problem of Redemption in *The Brothers Karamazov*", *Slavic and East European Journal,* n. 1 (2008), pp. 87-111, 96. As McReynolds summarizes, the author's own life was shaped by the acute need for money and anxiety over gambling debts (*ibid*., 88). Luzhin from *Crime and Punishment* is entranced by capitalism, which he clumsily combines with Nikolai Chernyshevsky's rational egoism and socialism. See Feodor Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment.* Third Edition. The Coulson Translation. Background and Sources. Essays in Criticism, ed. George Gibian (New York: Norton, 1989), pp. 126-127. For an innovative discussion of Dostoevsky, money, and gender, see Colleen Lucey, *Love for Sale: Representing Prostitution in Imperial Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2021).

passage in *The Demons* when deluded socialists call for one hundred million deaths to create a better society. Trifonov linked this terrifying quotation with Pol Pot's brutal regime. He avoided more apt comparisons with Stalinism and instead attacked an ally of China, which by the late 1970s was a rival for Soviet influence in Asia.[6] Despite his comments on Kampuchea, Trifonov's oeuvre shows how the USSR displayed the immorality and mendacity Dostoevsky ascribed to socialism. Trifonov was all too aware of these problems although he rarely commented on them openly. His father, Valentin Trifonov, was one of the founders of the Red Army executed in 1938; however, the author's first novel, *Students* ("Studenty", 1949), glorified Zhdanov's purge of academia and even won the Stalin Prize. *The House on the Embankment* and Trifonov's unfinished novel *The Disappearance* ("Ischeznovenie", 1987) revisited Stalinism with a critical eye, while *The Old Man* ("Starik", 1978) deplored violence during the Civil War. Trifonov's allusions to Dostoevsky hint at the paradoxes of a culture promising utopia but built on bloodshed.[7]

The Strange Sesquicentennial and Trifonov's Dostoevsky

The first four decades of the USSR were not kind to Dostoevsky. Following the lead of Maksim Gor'ky, critics dismissed the author as an "evil genius" hostile to socialism and atheism. However, Gor'ky also praised the author for being a talent that "was indisputable", likening him to Shakespeare.[8] Wolfgang Iser

6 On killing one hundred million people, see Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Demons*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Vintage Classics, 1994), p. 405. For discussion of Pol Pot, see Trifonov, quoted in the interview with Sergei Task, "Откровенный разговор", *Литературная Россия*, 17 апреля 1981, с. 11.

7 Юрий В. Трифонов, *Студенты*, in Ю.В. Трифонов, *Собрание сочинений в четырех томах*, под ред. С.А. Баруздина и др. (Москва: Художественная литература, 1985), *т*. 1. Subsequent references abbreviate this collection as: *Iurii Trifonov: SS*. Юрий В. Трифонов, *Исчезновение*, in Ю.В. Трифонов, *Отблеск костра: документальная повесть. Исчезновение: роман* (Москва: Советский писатель, 1988). Юрий В. Трифонов, *Старик*, in *Iurii Trifonov: SS*, *т*. 3. For a rare instance of Trifonov critiquing the USSR as a society, see his diary entry on how the rise of Solidarity could destroy the Eastern bloc: "This is the beginning of the collapse of the socialist camp and maybe even the Soviet Union. By the way, this corpse will take a long time to rot" (Ольга Трифонова и Юрий Трифонов, "Из дневников и рабочих тетрадей", *Дружба народов*, № 3 (1999), http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/1999/3/trif.html).

8 On Gor'ky and "evil genius", see Seduro, p. 5. Concerning his praise, see Максим Горький, *О литературе. Литературно-критические статьи* (Москва: Советский писатель, 1953), с. 705, quoted in Seduro, p. 9. Lenin extolled *The House of the Dead* for

explored how intertextuality references the past to define the present, letting authors claim the mantle of literary predecessors. Within this framework, Soviet approaches to Dostoevsky sometimes followed what Harold Bloom termed the "anxiety of influence". Appearing two years after the Dostoevsky sesquicentennial, Bloom's argument fits Soviet prose as well as British poetry: the USSR's authors suffered from "immense anxieties of indebtedness" as they embraced certain Dostoevsky themes (critique of poverty) while assiduously avoiding others (Orthodoxy).[9]

The Thaw was a turning point. A 1956 celebration honored the seventy-fifth anniversary of his death; Bakhtin's *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (expanded publication, 1963) used Dostoevsky's novels to assert the dynamic, incomplete nature of art.[10] This challenged the cultural rhetoric of the Khrushchev years: one year before Bakhtin's book appeared, the General Secretary had declared the current generation would live to see communism and thus the culmination of history. The 1971 sesquicentennial of Dostoevsky's birth exposed intractable problems in Soviet reception of the author. Vadim Kozhinov echoed Bakhtin's belief that the "last word" to describe the world had not yet been uttered; this faith in continuing creative development contrasted with the inertia that the intelligentsia felt after the Prague Spring.[11] As the sesquicentennial approached, there was a boom in Dostoevsky scholarship: writer's notebooks for *Crime and Punishment* and *The Demons* and an academic edition of *Crime and Punish-*

portraying penal servitude as a microcosm of Tsarist oppression, an ironic foreshadowing of how Gulag prose envisioned the USSR as one large labor camp. (Владимир Бончбруевич, "Ленин о книгах и писателях", *Литературная газета*, № 48 (21 апреля 1955), с. 2, quoted in Seduro, p. 18).

9 Wolfgang Iser, "Foreword: Intertextuality; The Epitome of Culture", in Renate Lachmann, *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism*, trans. Roy Sellars and Anthony Wall (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), p. xii. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 5.

10 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. trans. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984). Aleksandr Shitov and Marina Selemeneva both note that Trifonov's final works contain polyphony similar to what Bakhtin praised in Dostoevsky's prose. While this overstates the case, Trifonov's oeuvre from the mid-1970s onwards contains an array of opinions voiced by various characters (Александр Шитов, *Гуманизм в плену... Нравственная упругость прозы Юрия Трифонова* (Москва: Любимая Россия, 2010), с. 23; Марина Селеменева, *Поэтика городской прозы Ю.В. Трифонова* (Воронеж: Научная книга, 2008), с. 206).

11 On Khrushchev's proclamation, see Петр Вайль и Александр Генис, *60-е. Мир советского человека* (Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 1996), с. 12. Вадим Кожинов, "Величие Достоевского", *Новый мир*, № 9 (1971), с. 28-30, 30.

ment all appeared. This did not resolve the quandary of reconciling the Slavophile author with Soviet culture.[12]

One solution was to downplay content in favor of style, as when critics hailed Dostoevsky for enriching realist prose across the globe. The second was that the author's ideas were inconsistent; scholar Il'ja Zil'bershtein applauded the writer's passion for justice but argued he had "deep delusions" as well.[13] This metaphor of contradictions was itself key to late Soviet discourse about problems at home and abroad. The slapstick comedy *Diamond Arm* ("Brilliantovaia ruka", 1969) even mocked the habit of describing places such as New York and Istanbul as interchangeable "cities of contrasts", where plentiful material goods existed alongside an exploited working class. The very presence of contradiction demanded resolution: opposing qualities must be subsumed within a Hegelian synthesis. The sesquicentennial offered no such solution. Iurii Seleznev, writing in 1973, sadly noted that depicting Dostoevsky as a conglomeration of contradictions had not helped to understand him.[14]

Dostoevsky proclaimed that all modern authors came out from under Gogol's overcoat. Trifonov cites Tolstoy, Bunin, Pushkin, and Dostoevsky as prerevolutionary writers shaping his prose.[15] Trifonov's best works boast a density of details evoking nineteenth-century realism, which established everyday life as a topic for serious fiction; Trifonov then "legitimated *byt* as a theme in late Soviet writing".[16] The quotidian blurs with history in his prose. *The Disappear-*

12 For a survey of the publications leading up to the sesquicentennial, see Илья С. Зильберштейн и Лия М. Розенблюм, "От редакции", in *Неизданный Достоевский. Записные книжки и тетради, 1860-1881 гг. Литературное наследие* (Москва: Наука, 1971): с. 5-8, 5-6. See also Shneidman, p. 525.

13 On Dostoevsky's style and global literature, see Валерий Кирпотин, "От составителя", in *Достоевский и русские писатели. Традиция. Новаторство. Мастерство* (Москва: Советский писатель, 1971), с. 5-6, 6; Зильберштейн и Розенблюм, с. 6. For a similar discussion, see Гришунин и др., с. 3.

14 Леонид Гайдай (director), *Бриллиантовая рука* (Мосфильм, 1969). Юрий Селезнев, "Постигая Достоевского ('Юбилейная' литература. Проблемы и размышления)", *Вопросы литературы*, № 8 (1973), с. 218-240, 222.

15 On Trifonov's assessment of Russian classical authors, see his "И.А. Бунин" and "Толстой Лев Николаевич", in Трифонов, *Как наше слово отзовется...* Konstantin Fedin first introduced Trifonov to Bunin's prose in the late 1940s at the Gorky Literary Institute (Трифонов, "И.А. Бунин", с. 26). There was another influence: Trifonov's later writing focuses on middle-aged characters recalling the 'superfluous men' Turgenev made famous in the 1850s-60s (Елена Быкова, "Проблемы личности в творчестве Юрия Трифонова" (автореферат, Московский Педагогический Гос. Университет, 1995), с. 5, 10).

16 Trifonov discusses everyday life in "Выбирать, решаться, жертвовать," in *Как наше слово*

ance portrays the 1937 Pushkin celebration, a massive undertaking that coincides with a schoolmate abruptly vanishing after his parents' arrest. The novel discerns how Stalinist praise perverted the image of the great poet, whose verse opposed the slavish obedience saturating the 1930s.[17]

Trifonov's widow, the author Ol'ga Trifonova-Miroshchnichenko, notes his long struggle with Dostoevsky's ideas. He singled out Dostoevsky as the most talented of the nineteenth-century authors, marveling at that writer's ability to both gaze into the soul and depict emotions erupting like lava.[18] Trifonov was more nuanced than some Soviet critics, who crudely differentiated Dostoevsky's characters from the "'anti-heroes' of Western writers".[19] Trifonov portrayed his own morally ambivalent protagonists against a background of city life, broken families, and the temptations of the material world, all hallmarks of Dostoevsky's prose. However, while Raskol'nikov and Alesha save themselves through faith and self-sacrifice, Trifonov's atheists have far less hope.

Despite manifest differences, the two authors' lives have striking similarities that begin with the loss of a parent. After the publication of *Students*, Trifonov was almost expelled from the Komsomol when authorities discovered the young man had lied about his father's execution and mother's arrest.[20] Dos-

отзовется..., с. 88; Трифонов, "Нет, не о быте – о жизни!!", *ibid*., с. 103-104. For a discussion of Trifonov and *byt*, see Benjamin Sutcliffe, "Utopia of Things? Iurii Trifonov, Sincerity, and the Material World of Soviet Culture", unpublished manuscript.

17 Трифонов, *Ischeznovenie*, с. 183-184.

18 On Trifonov's interest in Dostoevsky, see Ольга Трифонова и Юрий Трифонов, "Из дневников и рабочих тетрадей", *Дружба народов*, № 2 (1999), http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/1999/2/trif-pr.html. Concerning Trifonov's thoughts on Dostoevsky and the soul, see Ральф Шредер [R. Schröder], "Роман с историей," *Вопросы литературы*, № 5 (1982), с. 66-77, 73. On lava, see Трифонов, "Нечаев, Верховенский и другие", с. 38. Those Trifonov characters immersed in the "lava" of crisis make terrifying mistakes, as the protagonist of *The Old Man* thinks when recalling atrocities during the Civil War (*Старик*, с. 473).

19 Concerning "anti-heroes," see Гришунин и др., с. 5. For an alternative to such exclusionary literary politics, see the seminal comparative monograph: Donald Fanger, *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens, and Gogol* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965).

20 Dostoevsky lost first his mother and then his father. David Gillespie gives an overview of Trifonov's biography in *Iurii Trifonov: Unity through Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). Concerning the scandal following the publication of *Students*, see Ольга Трифонова, *Юрий и Ольга Трифоновы вспоминают* (Москва: Совершенно секретно, 2003), с. 3-4. Schröder noted that many critics saw parallels in the interrupted creative paths of Trifonov and Dostoevsky (Schröder, "Gespräch mit Juri Trifonow", S. 146).

toevsky and Trifonov helped create the literary images of Russia's two capitals yet their prose was influenced by the hinterlands of empire (Dostoevsky's imprisonment in Siberia and Trifonov's repeated trips to Turkmenia). Both men were disappointed by the intelligentsia. In his writer's notebooks Trifonov cites Dostoevsky's praise of a Russian officer who died rather than convert to Islam. Trifonov underscored Dostoevsky's caustic comment that an *intelligent* would not have made such a sacrifice.[21] Indeed, in their prose the two writers envision an intelligentsia seduced by its ideas. Raskol'nikov and those in *The Demons* proffer false philosophies; Trifonov's later works show ideology justifying duplicity and greed. The two authors feared that for the naïve or unscrupulous expedience replaces integrity with the "self-delusion" that Trifonov believed plagued Raskol'nikov and also late Soviet culture.[22]

Dostoevsky and Trifonov were fascinated by terrorism as another scourge of modernity. Trifonov claimed that those destroying planes and hospitals in the 1970s were the latest incarnation of nefarious nineteenth-century revolutionary Sergei Nechaev. He singled out Carlos the Jackal as an example, ignoring that the terrorist was partially educated in Moscow, inspired by Marxism, and used tactics resembling those of the People's Will. Émigré critic Mikhail Lekhmin argued that Carlos was the heir of both the People's Will and Nechaev, a link that terrified Trifonov even as the author refused to admit this.[23]

Gillespie observes that Trifonov adapts Dostoevsky for "modern usage," yet does not explore how this was often a flawed process. At times Trifonov intentionally misunderstood the nineteenth-century author, particularly his belief that compassion should never be sacrificed for ideology.[24] *Impatience*, for instance, inadvertently revealed the power of what Bakhtin labeled Dostoevsky's "word-idea" (*slovo-ideia*): the People's Will used socialism to rationalize violence in the name of a brighter future. At other moments, Trifonov shared

21 Трифонова и Трифонов, "Из дневников и рабочих тетрадей", *Дружба народов*, № 2 (1999).

22 Concerning the intelligentsia and loss of integrity, see David Gillespie, "Trifonov on Dostoevskii", in Faith Wigzell (ed.), *Russian Writers on Russian Writers* (Oxford: Berg, 1994): pp. 161-168, 163, and Вячеслав Суханов, "Феномен жизне-смерти в повестях Ю. Трифонова", in Александр С. Янушкевич (под ред.), *Русская повесть как форма времени: сборник статей* (Томск: ТГУ, 2002), с. 301-309, 306. On Trifonov's comment about self-delusion, see Шредер, с. 74.

23 Трифонов, "Нечаев, Верховенский и другие", с. 47-48. Михаил Лехмин, "Желябов, Нечаев, Карлос и другое...", Континент, № 49 (1986), с. 359-369, 367, 368. Gillespie believes Trifonov's final, unfinished project was a study of German Lopatin, a member of the People's Will (*Iurii Trifonov*, p. 159).

24 Gillespie, "Trifonov on Dostoevskii", p. 167.

Dostoevsky's fear of a society where 'everything is permitted', whether for personal gain or egalitarian principle.[25]

Impatience, *Nechaev, and Dostoevsky: The Horror of Certainty*

Impatience and *House on the Embankment*, appearing soon after the 1971 jubilee, inherited the fascination with Dostoevsky but drew different conclusions about his meaning for Soviet culture. *Impatience* is an unwieldly work of historical fiction with multiple plots. These focus on the revolutionary Andrei Zheliabov and his comrades in the People's Will, which makes several attempts on the life of Aleksandr II. Zheliabov is arrested before the group succeeds but demands to be tried with the regicides. The novel closes with his execution next to those who carried out the assassination. *Impatience*, along with *Students*, is Trifonov's least talented work, yet this *roman à thèse* points to crucial issues implicating Soviet culture and its misuse of Dostoevsky.[26]

In one of the few serious studies of *Impatience*, Polly Jones analyzes the novel as a part of Fiery Revolutionaries (*Plamennye revoliutsionery*), a series that Politizdat published to revive interest in opponents of tsarism. The books paid well (the publisher was referred to as a "feeder" given its generous royalties). Trifonova-Miroshchnichenko claims her husband wrote the novel due to limited options; after 1968, works focusing on contemporary life were scrutinized by censors. However, the novel's publication constituted the very action Trifonov's late prose criticized: exchanging one's sincerity for a comfortable existence.[27] *Impatience* is a return to the false narrative of Marxist-Leninist history

25 On the word-idea, see Игорь Сухих, "Пытка памятью", *Звезда*, № 6 (2002), http://magazines.russ.ru/zvezda/2002/6/su.html. The socialist Rakitin in *The Brothers Karamazov* is one of several Dostoevsky characters claiming that all is permitted in a world without God – Dmitry rephrases this statement while speaking with Alesha (Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov. A Novel in Four Parts with Epilogue*, trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002, p. 589).

26 Трифонов, *Нетерпение*, с. 385, 404. For a short but interesting discussion of Trifonov and historical fiction, see Polly Jones, "Burned by History, but Forever Drawn to its Afterglow. Yuriy Trifonov's Historical Writing", *Forschungsstelle Osteuropa*, https://www.forschungsstelle.uni-bremen.de/de/13/20140605113358/20201103131348/.html.

27 Polly Jones, *Revolution Rekindled: The Writers and Readers of Late Soviet Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), pp. 13-14. Concerning the "feeder", see David Lowe, *Russian Writing since 1953: A Critical Survey* (New York: Ungar, 1987), p. 49, quoted in Jones, *Revolution Rekindled*, p. 23. At the time *Impatience* was published, Trifonov was married to Alla Pastukhova, the deputy editor of the series (Jones, *Revolution Rekindled*,

he wisely abandoned after *Students*. Natal'ia Ivanova, in the first monograph on Trifonov, notes that the Russian title of *Impatience* connotes "intolerance" (*neterpimost'*), a quality Trifonov despised in others but eulogized in Zheliabov. *Impatience* exposes the cracks in Trifonov's understanding of Dostoevsky. Two closely connected factors make this clear: how *Impatience* tries to distinguish Nechaev from the People's Will, and the ways that Dostoevsky satirizes both Nechaev and the terrorists as destructive. *Impatience* fails to make a coherent argument because Trifonov could not concede the connections between these elements. Doing so would rejected a core assumption of Soviet culture: revolution justifies violence.[28]

Trifonov was horrified by Nechaev, the charismatic revolutionary who in 1869 instigated and participated in the killing of a comrade. The writer no doubt sensed but never acknowledged how Nechaev's paranoia, violence, and hypocrisy augured the much greater destruction Stalinism unleashed decades later. In the novel Zheliabov meets with Nechaev, entering the grounds of the Peter and Paul Fortress under cover of night. Outside the prisoner's cell, he listens to his plans. Nechaev wants to spread pamphlets falsely announcing reimposition of serfdom, lengthening conscription, and persecuting Old Believers. These claims would stoke resentment of the state, cause confusion, and clear the way for a new society. Nechaev's scheme transfixes Zheliabov for a moment.

> And little by little – as the seconds went by – [Zheliabov] felt a strange hypnotic force drugging him, coming through the grated window. At one point it seemed to him that this was a brilliant idea! And there would be no need to execute the Tsar. All of Russia would rise up. However, after a second he said to himself: nonsense! All of this had been tried and had failed [...]. The man in the cell was cut off from the world. Only fragments of events made their way to him. He was struggling alone and concocting his fantasies alone. How could Zheliabov tell him that freedom and true life were getting

p. 151). Trifonova-Miroshchnichenko discusses *Impatience* in: Трифонова и Трифонов, "Из дневников и рабочих тетрадей", *Дружба народов*, № 1 (1999), http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/1999/1/trif.html. On Trifonov's theme of trading morality for comfort, see Михаил Синельников, "Испытание повседневностью: некоторые итоги", *Вопросы литературы*, № 2 (1972), с. 46-62, 51, and Josephine Woll, *Invented Truth: Soviet Reality and the Literary Imagination of Iurii Trifonov* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), p. 26.

28 Наталья Иванова, *Проза Юрия Трифонова* (Москва: Советский писатель, 1984), с. 170. In the essay "On Intolerance" Trifonov laments how *neterpimost'* leads to critics misreading what they analyze and artists harming their own creations (Трифонов, "О нетерпимости", in *Как наше слово отзовется*..., с. 67, 70).

> farther and farther away from one another? And no one knew how long this would continue.[29]

Zheliabov is swayed by this "strange hypnotic force". What saves him is being in touch with "events": he understands the mood in Russia, knows the course of history, and realizes that only assassination will bring progress. In an article tellingly titled "Moral Lessons of the People's Will", Soviet critic Valentin Oskotsky praises *Impatience* but adds that the two men's encounter may be fabricated. Ivanova is more categorical: the conversation did not occur and its fictitious portrayal underscores Nechaev's influence on the People's Will. Trifonov needed to invent this conversation to better contrast Nechaev and the revolutionaries, an artificial tactic that points to their similarities.[30]

The protagonist's actions emulate Nechaev's dishonesty. To inflate his group's stature, Zheliabov creates a stamp for a nonexistent executive committee. At another moment the revolutionaries vote to spend one-third of their funds on terrorism and two-thirds on helping peasants, acknowledging that aid to the villages will never be disbursed. Such tactics suggest Nechaev's subterfuge more than honest efforts to better the *narod*; lies take on their own reality and taint cooperation between the radical intelligentsia and peasantry.[31]

Applauding Zheliabov's determination and self-sacrifice, *Impatience* contends that history can be predicted and even controlled.[32] Zheliabov, in prison and awaiting his execution, reflects on his life: "Everything that had happened to him in the past year was the only possibility. There had been no other ways. He had bobbed through the gutter like rainwater in a barrel".[33] Zheliabov sees his life following the "only possibility", the current of history carrying him "like rainwater". There is, however, a more accurate and disturbing interpretation:

29 Трифонов, *Нетерпение*, с. 365, 366.

30 Валентин Оскотский, "Нравственные уроки «Народной воли»", *Литературное обозрение*, № 11 (1973), с. 55-61, 60. Иванова, с. 178.

31 Трифонов, *Нетерпение*, с. 83, 155. Early in the novel, a resident of Zheliabov's village sympathizes with the revolutionaries but adds that horrible things have been done in the name of justice (*ibid*., с. 59).

32 Assuming history is linear constitutes an anomalous return to *Students* and its praise of the Stalinist march into the radiant future. After the mid-1960s Trifonov's works suggested that history was difficult to understand, let alone control. In *The Old Man*, for instance, protagonist Pavel Evgrafovich scrupulously recalls the Civil War yet forgets how he helped destroy a rival during the struggle (Трифонов, *Старик*, 606).

33 Трифонов, *Нетерпение*, с. 386.

Zheliabov is caught in a torrent he can neither control nor escape. His execution is the result of hubris – like Raskol'nikov, he wrongly believes that extraordinary people can shape history.[34]

In a later article Trifonov realized that, in distinguishing Zheliabov from Nechaev, *Impatience* underlined their commonalities. The author remarked that the assassination of the Tsar postponed the constitution that Aleksandr II may have planned to support (the novel notes that People's Will did not know of this possibility). In the same article Trifonov admitted the revolutionaries were too eager for change, an error reducing them to "bomb-throwers".[35] Critic Ol'ga Sukhikh observed that the failure of the People's Will proved that violence cannot improve humanity, a realization shaping *Crime and Punishment*, *The Demons*, and *Brothers Karamazov*. As with Ivan Karamazov's "Legend" of the Grand Inquisitor, the terrorists murdering the Tsar achieved the opposite of their intention. Ivan tries to shake his brother's faith yet solidifies it; Zheliabov wants to hurry history but delays it.[36]

Zheliabov draws strength from ideas that purport to explain how the past, present, and future interact. In a stilted scene the terrorist ponders how

> Actions, words, gestures, phrases all die – the only thing that will live forever, as long as humanity exists, is ideas. There are not many of them. They can be mistaken. But they are indestructible, they will arise again and again, in different forms but remaining the same.[37]

He then excitedly explains the political program of the People's Will to Sof'ia Perovskaia, his fellow terrorist and lover. For Ivanova, such moments are a warning of how ideas can take over consciousness; *The Demons* makes this clear via the epigraph involving evil spirits causing swine to drown themselves. Zheliabov sacrifice himself and others for ideas. *Impatience* mentions how, years before plotting to kill the Tsar, he abandoned his wife and children

34 Some critics supported Zheliabov's belief that he was following the true course of history; see, for example, Оскотский, с. 58. On Raskol'nikov, see Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, p. 219.

35 Трифонов, "Нечаев, Верховенский и другие", с. 49. On the Tsar's possible support for the constitution, see Трифонов, *Нетерпение*, с. 377. For the mention of "bomb-throwers", see Schröder, p. 69.

36 Concerning the Grand Inquisitor and assassination of Aleksandr II, see Ольга Сухих, "От великого инквизитора к «народной воле» (переосмысление философской проблематики произведений Ф.М. Достоевского в романе Ю.В. Трифонова «Нетерпение»)", *Вестник Нижегородского университета*, № 3 (2011), с. 314-320, 315.

37 Трифонов, *Нетерпение*, с. 332.

to join the revolutionaries. Trifonov, whose father was murdered by the state, lauded a parent who left his family to foment violence.[38]

Impatience tried to explain lies and murder committed for progress. However, its plot renders this argument a farce recalling the bumbling revolutionaries in *The Demons*. Zheliabov, despite being the novel's protagonist, is not directly involved in the assassination (an event that harms the terrorist' goals). Grishnevitsky, who threw the second bomb and killed the Tsar, receives no character development because he is a minor figure in the movement. The terrorist responsible for the first bomb, Rysakov, was a novice who lamented getting caught. By describing such errors and incompetence *Impatience*, despite the author's wishes, shows the unpredictability of history.[39]

Trifonov praised *The Demons* for its prescient critique of modern problems yet shied away from the work's rejection of socialism. In doing so he followed the pattern of the sesquicentennial and the "rules of the game" Josephine Woll espied in Soviet culture: some aspects of the USSR could be criticized but its bedrock ideology was sacrosanct. To this end Trifonov asserted that Dostoevsky opposed "pseudorevolution", not revolution itself. Such a usefully vague term critiques Nechaev's actions and those of the socialists in *The Demons*, but not the 'real' change motivating Zheliabov (and later the Bolsheviks).[40]

In *Impatience* Nechaev and the People's Will advocate carnage and chaos to shock the populace into supporting the end of tsarism. East German scholar Ralf Schroeder, in a heated interview with Trifonov, maintained that *Impatience* supported Nechaev's immoral axiom that all is permitted. Trifonov countered by referring to *The Brothers Karamazov*: Nechaev, like the Jesuits who ran the Inquisition, believed the ends were important but the means were not. Trifonov then claimed that terror cannot create social change and that the People's Will, unlike Nechaev or those in *The Demons*, was concerned with the morality of methods as well as goals. This logic is itself worthy of the Grand Inquisitor – Trifonov deemed one group of terrorists to be more compassionate than another, despite the People's Will killing more people than Nechaev and his followers.[41]

38 Иванова, с. 185. Трифонов, *Нетерпение*, с. 8.

39 *Ibid*., с. 381, 384, 391, 394.

40 Woll uses this phrase to discuss film in the Khrushchev era (Josephine Woll, *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2000). Трифонов, "Нечаев, Верховенский и другие", с. 40.

41 For Schröder's assertion and Trifonov's response, see Шредер, с. 67, 68. On Dostoevsky and the People's Will versus Nechaev, see Трифонов, "Нечаев, Верховенский и другие", с. 45, 46. Trifonov acknowledged that the People's Will resembled Nechaev's pernicious

The Brothers Karamazov is another troubling intertext for *Impatience*. Oskotsky focuses on how Aleksandr II comforted a boy wounded by the first bomb. Had the ruler not done this, Oskotsky mused, he would have avoided the second explosion. The critic implies that the Tsar was destroyed by his own act of mercy. For Oskotsky this recalls the moment in Dostoevsky's novel when Ivan asks Alesha whether eternal happiness is worth the tear of a single child. Oskotsky refuses to provide an answer. Instead, he states that Trifonov's novel did not resolve the "contradiction" *The Brothers Karamazov* posed: whether harming the innocent is warranted to secure collective happiness. *Impatience* believes that this cost is necessary and, in reaching this conclusion, demonstrates Dostoevsky was correct to fear those who sacrifice morality for radical change.[42] Iser argues that intertextuality is central to how a culture makes sense of its past. By this logic *Impatience* twists Dostoevsky's ideas; such willful misreading shows Trifonov participated in the Soviet distortion of literature and history. This allowed the USSR to justify the actions of the People's Will and elide how the group helped promote massive bloodshed.[43]

House on the Embankment: *Raskol'nikov versus Verkhovensky*

Trifonov's most famous work portrays a culture that embodied many of Dostoevsky's concerns. *House on the Embankment* has a series of narrators; the frame plot, set in the 1970s, focuses on literary scholar Vadim Glebov, a member of the Moscow intellectual elite who even attends a conference in Paris. His health, however, is beginning to fail as he gains weight and overstrains his heart.[44] Two internal narratives depict Glebov during Stalinism. The first focuses on him as a child in the late 1930s, when he lives in a *kommunalka* near the famous House on the Embankment and envies his friends from the prestigious building. The second describes Glebov during the Zhdanov campaign; university administrators pressure the protagonist into joining others in denouncing his mentor, Professor Ganchuk, and thus abandoning his fiancée (Sonia), who is Ganchuk's daughter. The *povest'* has several explicit references to *Crime and Punishment*. However, it also draws on *The Demons*, specifically

"logic" but maintained that the group tried to avoid killing the innocent (*ibid*., c. 47). It was, of course, the terrorists' prerogative to determine who fit this category.

42 Оскотский, с. 59. Dostoevsky, *Brothers Karamazov*, p. 245.

43 Iser, p. xii.

44 On Glebov's body, see Трифонов, *Дом на набережной* in *Iurii Trifonov: SS*, т. 2, с. 369.

how toxic ideas pass from one generation to another.[45] As Anne Dwyer and others discern, *House on the Embankment* deliberately revisits the plot of *Students*, where undergraduate Vadim Belov helps drive Professor Kozel'sky out of his teaching position for 'toadying to the West'. Trifonov's first novel praises the persecutors for uncovering the academic's errors: Kozel'sky downplays Russia's contribution to world literature despite writing a book entitled *The Shadow of Dostoevsky*. (Such a treatise in the postwar era signaled antipathy to socialism.) Not surprisingly, *Students* misses the irony of this reference to Dostoevsky in the final years of Stalinism, when 'everything is permitted' in the service of the word-idea.[46]

By the 1970s Trifonov had effectively renounced *Students*. Speaking with Schröder, he asserted that *House on the Embankment* differed from his first novel – this was not because Trifonov had changed, but because the times were different. Trifonov clearly regretted writing the work but his explanation resembles Glebov's avoidance of guilt. At the beginning of the 1970s plot the protagonist encounters his former friend Shulepnikov, now a bitter alcoholic. Glebov dismisses his rancor, thinking that Shulepnikov should be angry at the era they lived in, not Glebov himself.[47] Both Trifonov and his protagonist displace responsibility for personal actions onto the times.[48]

After the first meeting attacking Ganchuk, Glebov visits his fiancée. Sonia, whose name evokes *Crime and Punishment*, pities Glebov despite his role in their family's problems. The scholar Marina Selemeneva, commenting on her affinities with Sonechka Marmeladova, deems Sonia one of Trifonov's self-sacrificing female characters. She helps alleviate Glebov's slight sense of guilt but cannot save herself and is institutionalized in a psychiatric hospital.[49] Iuliia Mikhailovna, Ganchuk's wife, has a different reaction to Glebov's role in the

45 For a discussion of Soviet responses to *House on the Embankment*, see Woll, *Invented Truth*, p. 77.

46 Anne Dwyer, "Runaway Texts: The Many Life Stories of Iurii Trifonov and Christa Wolf", *Russian Review*, n. 64 (2005), pp. 605-627. On Kozel'sky's toadying and book on Dostoevsky, see Трифонов, *Студенты*, с. 261, 266. Gillespie comments on *Students*, Stalinism, and everything being permitted in *Iurii Trifonov*, p. 25.

47 Шредер, с. 71. On the author's regret over *Students*, see Трифонов, "Записки соседа. Из воспоминаний", in *Как наше слово отзовется...*, с. 147. Трифонов, *Дом на набережной*, *с.* 365.

48 *Ibid*., с. 456-457.

49 *Ibid*., с. 489, 482-483. Марина Селеменева, "Проблема типологии персонажей 'городской' прозы Ю.В. Трифонова (к вопросу о доминантных/периферийных моделях женственности в литературе XX в.)", *Вопросы филологии*, № 2 (2007), с. 82-88, 85.

denunciations. She berates the protagonist in a scene that is one of Trifonov's most important references to Dostoevsky:

> [S]he dropped into a whisper. "I'll give you an antique ring, with a sapphire. You love bourgeois things, don't you? Gold? Gems? [. . .] She ran toward the door of a neighboring room, which was her bedroom, but fortunately she was stopped by Ganchuk, who was coming in. There followed a strange, obscure, jerky conversation about, of all things, the works of Dostoevsky. Ganchuk said that he had hitherto underrated Dostoevsky, that Gorky had been wrong about Dostoevsky and it was time to reassess him. He would have a lot more spare time now and he proposed to work on the subject.
>
> Yulia Mikhailovna stared at her husband with sad intensity. He had said that the thought that had tormented Dostoevsky – if man's last refuge is nothing but a dark room full of spiders, then *all is permitted* – had hitherto been interpreted in a wholly simplistic, trivial sense. All such profound problems had, in fact, been distorted into pathetically inadequate form, but the problems themselves were still there and would not go away. Today's Raskolnikovs did not murder old women moneylenders with an ax, but they were faced with the same agonizing choice: to cross or not to cross the line. In any case, what was the difference between using an ax and any other method? What was the difference between murder and just giving the victim a slight push, provided that it removed him? After all, Raskolnikov didn't commit murder for the sake of world harmony but simply for his own ends, to save his old mother, to get his sister out of a tight spot, and to secure for himself something or other in this life, whatever it might have been...[50]

Iuliia Mikhailovna reprises the scene with the pawnbroker and Raskol'nikov, offering him the "bourgeois" gold and jewels he covets. It is Ganchuk, however, who is Glebov's victim: the student has not used an axe but given the victim "a slight push", joining those who accuse the professor. Glebov does not act for "the sake of world harmony" but simply to advance his material interests – unlike Raskol'nikov (or Zheliabov), he is profoundly apolitical. He acts "for his own ends": after Ganchuk's ouster Glebov is confirmed for graduate study and begins a successful career.

Ganchuk worries that for Glebov "all is permitted" given that what awaits us following death is "nothing but a dark room full of spiders". Here the allusions

50 Yuri Trifonov, *The House on the Embankment*, in Yu. Trifonov, *Another Life* and *The House on the Embankment*, trans. Michael Glenny (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1999), pp. 343-344. Italics are present in the original.

to Dostoevsky become more complex. It is Svidrigailov (not Raskol'nikov) who describes life after death in this way. Ganchuk is a committed socialist who dismisses the possibility of any afterlife. This lack of belief is one hint that the professor, along with many other heroes of the Civil War, helped create the socialist state that eventually ostracizes him.[51] Ganchuk, like Kozel'sky in *Students*, plans to study Dostoevsky and rehabilitate the author after Gor'ky's attacks. In doing so, he realizes that the conditions of the Zhdanov era are as dire as those Raskol'nikov faced. However, the professor does not comprehend that he is living in Dostoevsky's conception of hell on earth, where grasping "spiders" now direct the nation he fought to establish.[52]

The protagonist exhibits the indecision that plagues Raskol'nikov after the murder. The narrator describes Glebov as one of those *bogatyri* who wait at the crossroads until the very last moment, unwilling to make decisions that may bring ruin. Woll connects this to Glebov being a man without qualities – as with Raskol'nikov and the younger socialists in *The Demons*, he absorbs others' ideas. However, unlike these Dostoevsky characters, he lacks any ideology aside from desiring the material comfort Ganchuk and Sonia have.[53] Trifonov derided the protagonist of *Crime and Punishment* for a hypocritical, self-serving relationship with the world around him. In the writer's notebooks from the last years of his life, he remarked that Raskol'nikov first compared himself to Napoleon then accused society of creating the conditions that drove him to murder. In this way Trifonov illuminated the oxymoron of an individual who claims to be above moral constrains yet exculpates himself by attacking the era in which he lives. Shortly after this passage, in his notebook Trifonov critiqued terrorists in the West: they resemble Raskol'nikov in blaming society. Glebov is far from being an extremist but, like Zheliabov, he believes the ends justify the means.[54]

In *House on the Embankment* Stalinist culture abets Glebov's crime yet the novella suggests the protagonist is responsible for his own transgressions. Here Trifonov borrows from Tolstoy as well as Dostoevsky. In an article he concurred with Tolstoy's assertion that we must transform ourselves before trying to remake the world. Otherwise, Trifonov clarified, it will be "as if I plan to renovate my apartment and begin to live according to my conscience, but in the meantime, while there is dirty wallpaper and old furniture, I have the right

51 Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, p. 245.

52 On Ganchuk, spiders, and Stalinism, see McLaughlin, p. 281.

53 Трифонов, *Дом на набережной*, с. 452. Woll, *Invented Truth*, p. 94.

54 Трифонова и Трифонов, "Из дневников и рабочих тетрадей", *Дружба народов*, № 3 (1999), http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/1999/3/trif.html.

to live in a bad way. And it ends up that wallpaper is to blame for a man's bad actions".[55]

Significantly, Trifonov uses a material metaphor (wallpaper) to discredit those who blame their surroundings for moral shortcomings: by the 1970s he was convinced that the love of things was an insidious disease ailing society.[56]

In his interview with Schröder, Trifonov praised Iurii Kariakin's 1976 monograph on Raskol'nikov's "self-delusion". Soviet textbooks, Trifonov continued, did not criticize this character enough given that "self-delusion is the essence of our time".[57] Lying to oneself (and others) contradicts the mythologized ethos of the intelligentsia. Trifonov defined this group in moral terms that immediately exclude both Glebov and *raznochinets* Raskol'nikov.

> An *intelligent* is what we call a person who has spiritual qualities [*dushevnymi kachestvami*] such as selflessness, conscience, the absence of the desire for material gain. An *intelligent* simply cannot be someone who is trying to get ahead, who wishes to get more than his share from life. In my understanding *intelligentnost'* is three concepts together: education, spiritual qualities, and understanding of the world.[58]

Glebov has the "education" but not the more important traits of "selflessness, conscience", and lack of greed. He belongs instead to the "smatterers" (*obrazovanschina*), a term Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn used to dismiss those *intelligenty* whom the state co-opted through privileges.[59]

House on the Embankment hints that Glebov's self-interest has sources that predate his own childhood – Stalinism merely exacerbated the problem. Here Trifonov unintentionally borrows from Dostoevsky to envision how Soviet culture passes corruption from generation to generation. In *The Demons* Stepan Verkhovensky leaves his son in the care of others and their dangerous ideas, choosing to educate Stavrogin instead. Petr Stepanovich then brings

55 On Tolstoy, see Трифонов, "Толстой Лев Николаевич", с. 34.

56 For Trifonov's worries about materialism and consumption, see "Ядро правды," с. 12. His Moscow novellas were crucial to debates over the problem of *meshchanstvo* in the Brezhnev era, as Selemenova discusses in *Поэтика городской прозы Ю.В. Трифонова*, с. 130.

57 Шредер, с. 74. The book Trifonov praises is Юрий Карякин, *Самообман Раскольникова: Роман Ф.М. Достоевского Преступление и наказание* (Москва: Художественная литература, 1976).

58 Трифонов, *Как наше слово отзовется...,* с. 348, note 2.

59 Alexander Solzhenitsyn, "The Smatterers," in A. Solzhenitsyn, *From under the Rubble*, trans. A. M. Brock, et al. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1975), pp. 229–278, 240-241.

disaster to his town. The younger Verkhovensky, like Stavrogin, has been infected by the same word-idea that begins with his father's muddled liberalism, mutates into socialism, and spreads to Shatov, Kirillov, and the other would-be revolutionaries.

The relationship between Ganchuk and Glebov has filial overtones resembling those in *The Demons*: the professor will soon be his father-in-law and is already his mentor. Ganchuk, who once fought for the Red Army, now has a fur coat and dacha, lives in the House on the Embankment, and is part of the Stalinist literary elite.[60] After the denunciations of Ganchuk begin, the professor regrets not killing the man now in charge of the investigation (in the 1920s Ganchuk had the chance to do so). Trifonov commented that the professor's fate underscores how one can turn from judge to victim.[61] Ganchuk's material privilege comes from a state that promised egalitarian utopia but instituted a brutal hierarchy. Glebov is Ganchuk's less-worthy successor. He follows the professor's path of gaining a better life by eliminating opponents, but for personal gain instead of political conviction. In this manner *House on the Embankment* echoes Dostoevsky's dark take on the family chronicle. *The Brothers Karamazov* revealed that greed, falsehood, and violence spread through bloodlines. In *The Demons* the father's confused 'free thinking' becomes the son's cynical socialism. Glebov's inheritance from Ganchuk is greed, not ideas: he suffers from a more aggressive version of the materialism that marks Ganchuk's later life.

Glebov and Zheliabov discredit the precept that all is permitted, despite their beliefs to the contrary. The two protagonists demonstrate that morality is weaker than craving for comfort (*House on the Embankment*) or rage for change (*Impatience*). Trifonov's characters live out Dostoevsky's fear that striving for a better tomorrow destroys honesty and compassion. The People's Will attempted to force their future on Russia; *House on the Embankment* depicts the nightmare that such efforts created. Reading Trifonov shows how Soviet culture, in attempting to appropriate Dostoevsky, revealed its own contradictions between ethics and expediency, ideals and reality.

60 Трифонов, *Дом на набережной*, с. 405.

61 On Ganchuk as judge and then victim, see Трифонов, "Каждый человек – судьба. Беседа с корреспондентом газеты «Советская культура»", in *Как наше слово отзовется...*, с. 294. Perpetrators becoming victims during Stalinism was a key trope of writing about the period, as Vasilii Grossman explores in the novella *Everything Flows*, trans. Robert Chandler and Elizabeth Chandler with Anna Aslanyan (New York: New York Review Books, 2009).

Works Cited

Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

Feodor Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov. A Novel in Four Parts with Epilogue*. Trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002).

Feodor Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*. Third Edition. The Coulson Translation. Background and Sources. Essays in Criticism. Ed. George Gibian (New York: Norton, 1989).

Feodor Dostoevsky, *The Demons*. Trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Vintage Classics, 1994).

Anne Dwyer, "Runaway Texts: The Many Life Stories of Iurii Trifonov and Christa Wolf", *Russian Review*, n. 64 (2005), pp. 605-627.

Donald Fanger, *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens, and Gogol* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965).

David Gillespie, *Iurii Trifonov: Unity through Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

David Gillespie, "Trifonov on Dostoevskii", in Faith Wigzell (ed.), *Russian Writers on Russian Writers* (Oxford: Berg, 1994): pp. 161-168.

Vasilii Grossman, *Everything Flows*. Trans. Robert Chandler and Elizabeth Chandler with Anna Aslanyan (New York: New York Review Books, 2009).

Wolfgang Iser, "Foreword: Intertextuality; The Epitome of Culture", in Renate Lachmann, *Memory and Literature: Intertextuality in Russian Modernism*, trans. Roy Sellars and Anthony Wall (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), pp. vii-xviii.

Polly Jones, "Burned by History, But Forever Drawn to its Afterglow. Yuriy Trifonov's Historical Writing", *Forschungsstelle Osteuropa*, https://www.forschungsstelle.uni bremen.de/de/13/20140605113358/20201103131348/.html

Polly Jones, *Revolution Rekindled: The Writers and Readers of Late Soviet Biography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019).

David Lowe, *Russian Writing since 1953: A Critical Survey* (New York: Ungar, 1987).

Colleen Lucey, *Love for Sale: Representing Prostitution in Imperial Russia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2021).

Sigrid McLaughlin, "Iurii Trifonov's Dom na naberezhnoi and Dostoevskii's Prestuplenie i nakazanie", *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, n. 2 (1983), pp. 275-283.

Susan McReynolds, "'You Can Buy the Whole World': The Problem of Redemption in The Brothers Karamazov", *Slavic and East European Journal*, n. 1 (2008), pp. 87-111.
Ralf Schröder, "Gespräch mit Juri Trifonow. Ein 'Roman mit den Geschichte'", *Weimarer Beiträge*, n. 8 (1981), S. 133-154.
Vladimir Seduro, *Dostoevski's Image in Russia Today* (Belmont: Nordland, 1975).
N.N. Shneidman, "Soviet Theory of Literature and the Struggle around Dostoevsky in Recent Soviet Scholarship", *Slavic Review*, n. 3 (1975), p. 523-538.
Alexander Solzhenitsyn, "The Smatterers", in A. Solzhenitsyn, *From under the Rubble*. Translated by A. M. Brock et al. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1975).
Benjamin Sutcliffe, "Utopia of Things? Iurii Trifonov, Sincerity, and the Material World of Soviet Culture." Unpublished manuscript.
Yuri Trifonov, *Another Life and The House on the Embankment*. Trans. Michael Glenny (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1999).
Josephine Woll, *Invented Truth: Soviet Reality and the Literary Imagination of Iurii Trifonov* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991).
Josephine Woll, *Real Images: Soviet Cinema and the Thaw* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2000).
Владимир Бонч-Бруевич, "Ленин о книгах и писателях", *Литературная газета*, № 48 (21 апреля 1955), с. 2.
Елена Быкова, "Проблемы личности в творчестве Юрия Трифонова" (автореферат, Московский Педагогический Гос. Университет, 1995).
Петр Вайль и Александр Генис, *60-е. Мир советского человека* (Москва: Новое литературное обозрение, 1996).
Леонид Гайдай (director), *Бриллиантовая рука* (Мосфильм, 1969).
Максим Горький, *О литературе. Литературно-критические статьи* (Москва: Советский писатель, 1953).
Андрей Гришунин и др., "От редакции", in *Достоевский – художник и мыслитель. Сб. статей* (Москва: Художественная литература, 1972).
Илья С. Зильберштейн и Лия М. Розенблюм, "От редакции", in *Неизданный Достоевский. Записные книжки и тетради, 1860-1881 гг. Литературное наследие* (Москва: Наука, 1971): с. 5-8.
Наталья Иванова, *Проза Юрия Трифонова* (Москва: Советский писатель, 1984).
Юрий Карякин, *Самообман Раскольникова: Роман Ф.М. Достоевского Преступление и наказание* (Москва: Художественная литература, 1976).
Валерий Кирпотин, "От составителя", in *Достоевский и русские писатели.*

Традиция. Новаторство. Мастерство (Москва: Советский писатель, 1971), с. 5-6.

Вадим Кожинов, "Величие Достоевского", *Новый мир*, № 9 (1971), с. 28-30.

Михаил Лехмин, "Желябов, Нечаев, Карлос и другое...", *Континент*, № 49 (1986), с. 359-369.

Валентин Оскотский, "Нравственные уроки «Народной воли»", *Литературное обозрение*, № 11 (1973), с. 55-61.

Юрий Селезнев, "Постигая Достоевского ('Юбилейная' литература. Проблемы и размышления)", *Вопросы литературы*, № 8 (1973), с. 218-240.

Марина Селеменова, *Поэтика городской прозы Ю.В. Трифонова* (Воронеж: Научная книга, 2008).

Марина Селеменова, "Проблема типологии персонажей 'городской' прозы Ю.В. Трифонова (к вопросу о доминантных/периферийных моделях женственности в литературе XX в.)", *Вопросы филологии*, № 2 (2007), с. 82-88.

Михаил Синельников, "Испытание повседневностью: некоторые итоги", *Вопросы литературы*, № 2 (1972), с. 46-62.

Вячеслав Суханов, "Феномен жизне-смерти в повестях Ю. Трифонова", in Александр С. Янушкевич (под ред.), *Русская повесть как форма времени: сборник статей* (Томск: ТГУ, 2002), с. 301-309.

Игорь Сухих, "Пытка памятью", *Звезда*, № 6 (2002), http://magazines.russ.ru/zvezda/2002/6/su.html.

Ольга Сухих, "От великого инквизитора к «народной воле» (переосмысление философской проблематики произведений Ф.М. Достоевского в романе Ю.В. Трифонова «Нетерпение»)", *Вестник Нижегородского университета*, № 3 (2011), с. 314-320.

Сергей Таск, "Откровенный разговор," *Литературная Россия*, 17 апреля 1981, с. 11.

Юрий Трифонов, *Избранные произведения в двух томах* (Москва: Художественная литература, 1978).

Юрий Трифонов, *Собрание сочинений в четырех томах*, под ред. С.А. Баруздина и др. (Москва: Художественная литература, 1985).

Юрий Трифонов, *Как наше слово отзовется...*, сост. Александр Шитов, примечания Ольги Трифоновой и Александра Шитова (Москва: Советская Россия, 1985).

Юрий Трифонов, *Ядро правды. Статьи, интервью, эссе* (Москва: Изд. Правда, 1987).

Юрий Трифонов, *Отблеск костра: документальная повесть. Исчезновение: роман* (Москва: Советский писатель, 1988).
Ольга Трифонова, *Юрий и Ольга Трифоновы вспоминают* (Москва: Совершенно секретно, 2003).
Ольга Трифонова и Юрий Трифонов, "Из дневников и рабочих тетрадей", *Дружба народов*, № 1 (1999), http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/1999/1/trif.html.
Ольга Трифонова и Юрий Трифонов, "Из дневников и рабочих тетрадей", *Дружба народов*, № 2 (1999), http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/1999/2/trif-pr.html.
Ольга Трифонова и Юрий Трифонов, "Из дневников и рабочих тетрадей", *Дружба народов*, № 3 (1999), http://magazines.russ.ru/druzhba/1999/3/trif.html.
Александр Шитов, *Гуманизм в плену... Нравственная упругость прозы Юрия Трифонова* (Москва: Любимая Россия, 2010).
Ральф Шредер, "Роман с историей", *Вопросы литературы*, № 5 (1982), с. 66-77.