

Modern Humanities Research Association

"Zolaizm" in Russia

Author(s): John McNair

Source: *The Modern Language Review*, Vol. 95, No. 2 (Apr., 2000), pp. 450-462

Published by: [Modern Humanities Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3736145>

Accessed: 27-10-2015 01:44 UTC

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.



Modern Humanities Research Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Modern Language Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ZOLAISM IN RUSSIA

In his 1880 preface to *Le roman expérimental*, Zola makes handsome acknowledgement of his debt to the Russian reading public at a critical time in his literary fortunes:

Russia, in one of my dreadful moments of hardship and despair, restored to me all my faith, all my strength by offering me a rostrum and a public — the most well-read, the most impassioned of publics. In this way, she has made me, in literary criticism, what I am today. I cannot speak of this without emotion, and I shall forever be grateful to her for it.¹

Not only did his great theoretical manifesto first see the light of day on the pages of Stasiulevich's *Vestnik Evropy*,² it was in Russia that he first enjoyed fame and popularity as a writer,³ and it was in Russian translation that most of the Rougon-Macquart novels, from *La Faute de l'abbé Mouret* (1875) to *Le Docteur Pascal* (1893), found their first readers, before their publication in France.⁴ If the enthusiasm sometimes waned as the years passed, Zola was nevertheless to enjoy in Russia a prominence that lasted for the rest of his life and a prestige that at times eclipsed his reputation in France itself. Two separate collections of his complete works, as well as a fourteen-volume edition of *Les Rougon-Macquart*, and numerous translations of individual novels, plays, stories, and essays had appeared in Russian by the time of his death in 1902, and in the preceding four decades his Russian admirers (and detractors) had produced some 1500 articles, reviews, and critical studies.⁵

While there is a considerable literature on the general subject of Zola in Russia, on the reception of his novels, his relations with Russian acquaintances and correspondents, his views on Russian literature, his possible 'influence' on Russian writers,⁶ little of it is concerned in any detailed or systematic way with *zolaizm*: that is, with the Russian perception of and response to Zola's literary theories and practices as a phenomenon of *Russian* culture.⁷ For if, as Zola suggested, it was the Russian public that made him what he was as a literary critic, he was to exercise almost as significant a role in Russian literary criticism. Appropriated by Zolaists

¹ Émile Zola, preface to *Le Roman expérimental*, in *Ceuvres complètes*, ed. by Henri Mitterrand, 15 vols (Paris: Cercle du Livre Précieux, 1962–69), x (1968), 1173. Except where otherwise attributed, all translations from French and Russian are my own.

² 'Eksperimental'nyi roman', number 52 in the series of *Parizhskie pis'ma*, appeared in *Vestnik Evropy* (1879:9), 406–38. On Zola's dealings with Stasiulevich, see *M. M. Stasiulevich i ego sovremenniki v ikh perepiske*, ed. by M. K. Lemke, 3 vols (St Petersburg: n.p., 1912), III, 594–630.

³ See Denise Le Blond-Zola, *Émile Zola raconté par sa fille* (Paris: Fasquelle, 1931), p. 93.

⁴ One exception was *Germinal* (1885), whose Russian publication was delayed because Stasiulevich feared a repetition of the scandal provoked by *Nana* (1880); see M. Kleman, 'Emil' Zolia v Rossii', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 2 (1932), 235–48 (p. 235). For details of the publication of Zola's works in Russia, see G. I. Leshchinskaia, *Emil' Zolia: bibliograficheskii ukazatel' russkikh perevodov i kriticheskoi literatury na russkom iazyke 1865–1974* (Moscow: Kniga, 1975), pp. 5–97.

⁵ Leshchinskaia, pp. 98–185. Only a few of the works cited here are to be found in David Baguley, *Bibliographie de la critique sur Émile Zola, 1864–1970* (Toronto, Buffalo, NY, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1974), and *Bibliographie de la critique sur Emile Zola, 1971–1980* (Toronto, Buffalo, NY, and London: University of Toronto Press, 1982).

⁶ See especially the studies by M. Kleman, 'Emil' Zolia v Rossii' and 'Nachal'nyi uspekh Zoli v Rossii', *Iazyk i literatura* (1930:5), 271–328, and 'Iz perepiski E. Zolia s russkimi korrespondentami', ed. by M. Kleman, *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, 31–32 (1937), 943–80.

⁷ Exceptions are the useful (but relatively brief) studies by Philip A. Duncan: 'The Fortunes of Zola's Parizhskie pis'ma in Russia', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 17 (1959), 107–21, and 'Echoes of Zola's Experimental Novel in Russia', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 18 (1974), 11–19. See also (from a Marxist perspective) Ewa Sławicka, 'Miejsce teorii estetycznych Emilia Zoli w rosyjskich sporach o sztuce tendencyjna (Lata siedemdziesiąte — osiemdziesiąte XIX wieku)', *Rocznik Naukowo-Dydaktyczny Wyzszej Szkoły Pedagogicznej w Krakowie. Prace Rusycystyczne*, 5 (1978), 39–54.

and anti-Zolaists alike, *zolaizm* became a vital issue in Russian literary-critical discourse for the remaining decades of the century.

Even before the appearance of *Le roman expérimental*, the terms of the debate on *zolaizm* had been defined on the pages of the Russian periodic press. The prolific *littérateur* P. D. Boborykin, who as early as 1872 had championed Zola's project for 'a philosophical-scientific investigation conducted by means of artistic representation',⁸ devoted one of his public lectures on the realist novel in France (1876)⁹ to an explication of the 'scientific-artistic programme' of the Rougon-Macquart cycle and a defence of its author's application of the techniques of natural science to the study of human life, 'even including its basest instincts and impulses' (p. 73). His enthusiasm provoked an immediate response in the 'literary chronicle' of the newspaper *Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti*:¹⁰

French realism is interesting and remarkable most of all as an extreme and frequently grotesque manifestation of the realist tendency in art, as an immoderate enthusiasm for the realistic manner, as a distortion of techniques, in themselves truthful and reliable when not taken beyond proper limits, but leading to falsification when they dominate exclusively.

(p. 486)

From this perspective, the particular case of Zola illustrated the dangers of 'an exclusive espousal of naturalism' (p. 481), which threatened to reduce his novels to the level of 'vulgarity and triviality' and overwhelm the 'human content' and moral truth of literature with mere physiological detail (p. 481). Yet in the event 'healthy realism' and social conscience triumph over the theoretical programme proposed by the Frenchman and seconded by his 'ardent disciple', and for his readers in Russia Zola remains before all else 'a liberal democratic writer exposing with merciless frankness all the rotteness of the Second Empire' (p. 492).

It is not difficult to recognize in this exchange those conflicting views on literary realism, and indeed on literature itself, at the heart of the *zolaizm* controversy. In raising the banner of the new realist novel, Boborykin (in the first of his lectures) explicitly challenged the old Romantic criticism, whose 'mass of one-sided opinions, tendencies, tastes and prejudices' (p. 329) had until recently dominated literary attitudes, perhaps nowhere more so than in Russia. Deriving its most characteristic assumptions from Hegel and German idealist philosophy, Russian criticism since Belinskii had demanded of literature more than the representation of 'reality', viewing it as a vehicle for speculation as to what reality ought to be; since the 1860s, the particular requirement of its dominant 'civic' school had been for art to pass judgement on the existing social and political order in the name of generally

⁸ P. B. [Boborykin], 'Novye priemy frantsuzskoi belletristiki', *Nedelia*, 1872, No. 14, cols 453–57; No. 15–16, cols 492–97. On Boborykin as a 'Zolaist', see in particular Ewa Slawicka, *Piotr Boborykin: z dziejów naturalizmu w Rosji* (Cracow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP, 1981), and my article 'P. D. Boborykin and his History of the European Novel', *Irish Slavonic Studies*, 3 (1982), 14–38 (p. 35). In citations from this and the other texts of the *zolaizm* debate, no attempt has been made to regularize Russian usage in the transliteration of Zola's surname; the original 'Zola' gave way to the now standard 'Zolia' only gradually.

⁹ Published as 'Real'nyi roman vo Frantsii (Tri publichnykh chteniia P. D. Boborykina)', *Otechestvennye zapiski* (Chtenie I (1876:6), ii, 329–57; Chteniia II–III) (1876:7), ii, 39–92. Page references are to this edition.

¹⁰ [V. V. Markov], 'Literaturnaia letopis', *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti*, 1876, nos. 10, 38, 98, 181, 209; cited in V. V. Markov, *Navstrechu* (St Petersburg: n.p., 1878), p. 481. Page references are to this edition.

accepted 'social ideals'.¹¹ This (in Boborykin's terms) was the 'subjective' criticism that sustained and drew sustenance from the subjective realism and intrusive moralism characteristic of the English realist tradition, and regarded French realism with suspicion (p. 334). It was the 'new' criticism of Sainte-Beuve and Taine, with its 'more correct method', its 'broader formulation of literary problems' and its 'more philosophical approach' (p. 329), which could understand the attempt of the new realism to apply the discoveries of modern science to its objective investigation of contemporary life and society. In view of these underlying philosophical differences, it was inevitable that the Russian debate on Zola should develop at least on one level as a polemic between the proponents of 'scientifically' impartial Naturalism and the defenders of a traditionally 'committed' literature.

The debate gathered momentum as Zola's *Parizhskie pis'ma* began appearing in *Vestnik Evropy* in March 1875, and especially following the publication of the letters on George Sand (July 1876), on Victor Hugo (April 1877), and on the Experimental Novel itself (September 1879).¹² In the review columns of the radical journals, Russian critics hastened to denounce Zola's attacks on the 'idealism' of his literary predecessors and ridicule the spurious scientism of Naturalist aesthetics. One contributor to *Delo* poured scorn on the 'foggy terminology' and 'critical bric-à-brac' of 'realism in the most vulgar sense of the word', while another, the revolutionary populist P. N. Tkachev, warned of the threat to 'progressive' realism of an 'empirical art' that could not (or would not) transcend the 'filth and vulgarity' it portrayed.¹³ Writing as usual in *Otechestvennye zapiski*, N. K. Mikhailovsky, the influential ideologue of 'subjective sociology', took issue with Naturalism's 'ill-fated attempt to tear the Truth in two': drawing his usual distinction between objective or scientific truth (*istina*) and 'the higher truth of human spirit' (*spravedlivost'*, moral truth or justice), he argued that Zola was exalting the former to deny the latter.¹⁴ *Russkaia rech'* was forthright in rejecting the 'naive presumption' of Zola's 'pseudo-scientific' theorizing; while in *Vestnik Evropy* itself, Konstantin Arsen'ev exposed his misapplication of Claude Bernard's ideas and declared 'experimentalism' to be the death-knell of the novel 'as one of the mightiest instruments of human Progress'.¹⁵

¹¹ On the history of Russian literary criticism in general, see R. H. Stacy, *Russian Literary Criticism: A Short History* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1974); René Wellek, *A History of Modern Criticism: 1750-1950*, 5 vols (New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press, 1965). On Belinskii in particular, see Victor Terras, *Belinskij and Russian Literary Criticism: The Heritage of Organic Aesthetics* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974) and Herbert Bowman, *Vissarion Belinski, 1811-1848: A Study in the Origins of Social Criticism in Russia* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1969).

¹² For a general discussion of the Russian response to the letters, see Duncan, 'The Fortunes of Zola's *Parizhskie pis'ma* in Russia'. Following their journal publication, some of the *Parizhskie pis'ma* (but not 'Eksperimental'nyi roman') were published in book form (St Petersburg, 1878; 2nd edn 1882). A selection, *Lettres de Paris*, trans. and ed. by Philip A. Duncan and Vera Erdely, was published in Switzerland (Geneva: Droz, 1963).

¹³ G. B. [G. B. Blagosvetlov], 'Kritik bez kriticheskoi merki', *Delo* (1878:2), 328-45 (pp. 332, 344); P. Nikitin [P. N. Tkachev], 'Salonnoe khudozhestvo', *Delo* (1878:2), 346-68 (pp. 352, 354).

¹⁴ N. K. [N. K. Mikhailovskii] 'Pis'ma o pravde i nepravde', *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1877:12), ii, 309-34 (pp. 324, 332). Mikhailovskii's distinction reflects his view of the ambivalence of the Russian *pravda*; see the discussion of his 'subjective method' in James H. Billington, *Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. 27-36.

¹⁵ E. Markov, 'Kriticheskie besedy. Romantizm i nauchnaia formula', *Russkaia rech'* (1880:1), 310-49; (1880:2), 324-66 (pp. 356-57); Z. Z. [K. K. Arsen'ev], 'Sovremennyi roman v ego predstaviteliakh: 4. Viktor Giugo', *Vestnik Evropy* (1880:1), 286-329 (p. 297), (reprinted as 'Teoriia eksperimental'nogo romana' in K. K. Arsen'ev, *Kriticheskie etudy po russkoi literature*, 2 vols (St Petersburg: Tipografiia M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1888), ii, 336-57).

Thus, while it might have been expected (as Philip Duncan has suggested) that the Russian radical intelligentsia, traditionally as committed to the positivist conception of science as to the ideal of social justice, 'might have seized upon Zola's scientific novel as a contribution to the synthesis of science and ethics which was wanting and even as an instrument of propaganda' (Duncan, 'Echoes', p. 13), nothing of the kind happened. While in its central metaphor of the artist as anatomist, its rejection of the supernatural and the irrational, and its reliance on the deterministic forces of heredity and environment in analysing the behaviour of individuals and society, *Le roman expérimental* echoed the pronouncements of Chernyshevskii, Pisarev, and Turgenev's Bazarov, its repudiation of idealism seemed to imply a denial of the ideas that defined the intelligentsia itself, the notions of social conscience and duty to the people inherent in Mikhailovskii's 'moral truth' as in Belinskii's 'sociality' (*sotsial'nost'*) four decades before.¹⁶ Overlooking or misunderstanding Zola's insistence on the moral and political applications of the experimental method and its capacity 'to solve, finally, all the problems of socialism' ('Eksperimental'nyi roman', p. 420), most of his Russian critics, like Mikhailovskii, contrived to see in his manifesto not only a new summons to 'reconciliation with reality' but an aestheticist challenge to the role of literature as 'the transmitter, if not of political thought, at least of humanitarian ideas'¹⁷ particularly offensive to the Russian intelligentsia, only too familiar as it was with the penalties frequently paid by those who sought to live by their social conscience:

Were he [Zola] sent to some outpost considerably more remote from Paris, where he would have some cause, probably, to feel himself rather worse off, he would stuff his chemical analyses in his pocket and as like as not be glad enough for a politico-satirical novel with a clearly defined tendency. ('Pis'ma o pravde i nepravde', p. 332)

While Boborykin and the other embattled Zolaists ascribed such indignant hostility to the enduring influence of outdated Romanticism and utilitarian aesthetics,¹⁸ it is clear that the literary controversy surrounding *Le roman expérimental* had quickly assumed (as, indeed, was usual in the Russian context) the character of a wider and often less predictable debate on the values and the mission of the intelligentsia. Thus N. V. Shelgunov,¹⁹ a critic no less radical in his orientation than Mikhailovskii, took a very different view of Zola's theories and their relevance to contemporary Russian life. In his exegesis, the realist rejection of ideals was in fact a rejection of hypocritical idealism and a recognition, as overdue in Russia as in France, that a rational and just society could be created only on the basis of a rational (or 'scientific') understanding of real life. Russian hostility to *zolaizm* was largely attributable to the conflict between its Darwinist determinism and the 'egotistic idealism' (p. 320) of the Russian intellectual accustomed to believe in the individual as an agent of social change. Whatever his talent as an artist, Zola's programme as a realist novelist, his conception of literature as a 'purifying furnace'

¹⁶ See Belinskii, letter to V. P. Botkin, 8 September 1841, in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 13 vols (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1953–59), xii (1956), 69.

¹⁷ N. K. [N. K. Mikhailovskii], 'Literaturnye zametki: Parizhskie pis'ma E. Zoli', *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1879:9), ii, 96–119 (p. 97).

¹⁸ See B. D. P. [P. D. Boborykin], 'Mysli o kritike literaturnogo tvorchestva', *Slovo* (1878:5), 59–71; D. K. [D. A. Koropchevskii], 'Rol' kritiki v sovremennoi literature. iv', *Slovo* (1879:12), ii, 118–49 (pp. 146–47).

¹⁹ N. V. Shelgunov, 'Nedorazumeniia nashogo khudozhestvennogo tvorchestva (po povodu real'noi teorii Zoli)', *Delo* (1879:9), 309–40 (pp. 311–21). Page references are to this edition.

for a materialist society (pp. 336–37) is 'immeasurably closer to life' (p. 335) than the 'unconscious' creation of Goncharov (p. 327) and the soulful love stories of Turgenev. However unexpectedly, therefore, Zola becomes an exemplar for a regenerate Russian radicalism, the prophet of a true, higher idealism whose aim is nothing less than 'the cleansing and ennoblement of morals' (p. 336), a critic, like Belinskii, far in advance of the art of his time (p. 335).

In Russia as elsewhere, the publication of *Nana* in 1880 marked a turning-point in the reception of Zola's fiction by his critics.²⁰ Saltykov-Shchedrin's celebrated review of the novel, evoking male and female torsos 'not covered by so much as a fig leaf' pulsating in bestial sexual abandon,²¹ was perhaps the most influential expression of moral outrage, but others were just as outspoken in their condemnation of the 'pornographic' excesses of naturalism, or, as one reviewer in *Delo* had it, 'Nana-turalism'.²² Evgenii Markov could find no escape from the 'noxious miasma' on any of the novel's 524 pages: 'One sees only the rampaging of depraved flesh [. . .] overwhelming everything in its path, impelled by its own satiety to newer, coarser, more corrupting acts of lust.'²³ N. K. Mikhailovskii declared that in his depiction of his 'animal' heroine, Zola had become an animal himself.²⁴ In the following months, the newspaper *Russkie vedomosti* could inform its readers that the regional court in L'vov had banned the sale of translations of the novel as an offence against public decency (see *Russkie vedomosti*, 8 March 1882, p. 3).

The most extreme expression of the reaction against 'Nana-turalism' was the critical study *Zolaizm v Rossii* by S. Temlinskii (*nom de plume* of V. A. Gringmut, editor of *Moskovskie vedomosti*), which appeared in the journal *Krugozor* in the autumn of 1880 and provoked such a response that its author was encouraged to reissue it as a pamphlet of some one hundred and fifty pages later that year, with a second, enlarged edition in 1881.²⁵ For Temlinskii-Gringmut, *Nana* is part of the 'foul stream' polluting the waters of modern French literature and filling the air with miasmas 'from which anyone preserving intact even a particle of undefiled literary taste and common sense will want to flee' (p. 11). This is the prelude to a savage and comprehensive denunciation of Zola ('the muckraker' [*sramnopisets*] (p. 97)), his 'phalanx of more or less untalented writers' (p. 59) and all their works, which exposes the charlatanism of the 'experimental' method, ridicules its application in *Les Rougon-Macquart*, and discovers in the 'new realism' nothing but the proof of an old truth: 'With a sufficient degree of effrontery, it is possible to exploit the coarse sensual instincts of the crowd and enjoy complete success' (p. 123). Against Zola's attack on idealism it champions the literature of true realism, which recognizes humans as moral beings rather than animals or genetically programmed automata,

²⁰ Three separate Russian translations of the novel appeared in almost simultaneous serializations (in *Novosti*, *Novoe vremia*, and *Slovo*) from late 1879 until mid-1880.

²¹ N. Shchedrin [M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin], 'Za rubezhom, 4', *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1881:1), i, 228–78 (p. 272).

²² V. Basardin [L. I. Mechnikov], 'Noveshii Nana-turalizm (Po povodu poslednego romana E. Zoli)', *Delo* (1880:3), 36–65; (1880:5), 71–107.

²³ E. Markov, 'Étiudy o frantsuzskom romane. 1. Kul't ploti', *Russkaia rech'* (1881:6), 270–97 (pp. 289–90).

²⁴ [N. K. Mikhailovskii], 'Nana: Roman v 2-kh ch. Zoli', *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1880:5), ii, 35–38 (p. 38). See also N. M. [Mikhailovskii], 'Zapiski sovremennika: 4. O pornografii', *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1881:5), ii, 109–22.

²⁵ S. Temlinskii [V. A. Gringmut], *Zolaizm v Rossii: kriticheskii etiud* (Moscow: izdanie A. Lang, 1880); 2nd edn: *Zolaizm: kriticheskii etiud* (Moscow: izdanie A. Lang, 1881). I have been unable to see the first publication in *Krugozor* (1880), 9–17; page references are to the second edition. Little of the public response to which the author refers here (p. 8) found reflection in the periodic press.

aspires to represent the whole of life and not only its 'darker side', distinguishes between the truth of 'great, general, universal reality' and 'trivial, particular, random fact' (p. 145), and accepts the moral and ethical function of art in the service of 'justice, legality, honesty, philanthropy — in a word, of morality' (p. 141).

What distinguishes this remarkable tract, however, is not its critique of *zolaizm* as literary theory or practice; as far as that is concerned, it adds little to the now familiar terms of the dispute. It is rather in his ideological analysis that Temlinskii strikes out in a direction that is all his own, warning of the dangers of a heresy whose unmasking is a matter of 'civic duty' (p. 168). For *zolaizm* here is seen as a weapon in the hands of 'the Petersburg cabal' (p. 10), the '“liberal” journalists' and heirs to the nihilism of Chernyshevskii, Dobroliubov, and Pisarev (pp. 161–64) who are bent on subverting the strength and unity of the nation by depriving the too impressionable intelligentsia of the mental and moral pabulum necessary for victory in the struggle with evil (pp. 155–56). Like those Russian critics who denounce him in the name of the social ideals of the 1860s, Zola is part of the campaign waged by ignorance, cynicism, and the false doctrine of progress against morality, noble idealism, and art (p. 167). So the Frenchman (albeit for reasons very different from those proposed by Shelgunov) takes his place in the camp of Russian radicalism, and *zolaizm* becomes the instrument of a conspiracy against the very foundations of the state, in the nihilist challenge to the ascendancy of official nationality.

Taking a less idiosyncratic view of the contemporary significance of French Naturalism at the end of 1884, Koropchevskii noted the striking paradox in Russian attitudes to the phenomenon: 'Our journals print the latest Naturalist novels as soon as they appear, while at the same time in their critical review sections they write about Naturalism with obvious disapproval; almost with disgust.'²⁶ While Russian readers fell upon *Pot-Bouille* (1882) and the novels that followed it as enthusiastically as they had greeted *Nana*, the critics of the liberal journals continued to attack the excesses of *zolaizm*. N. K. Mikhailovskii (who had dismissed Temlinskii's pamphlet as 'utter rubbish', but discovered in it 'several just observations' on Zola himself)²⁷ deprecated the novelist's continuing pursuit of sexual 'piquancies' and the moral and ideological void he saw at the heart of his 'method'.²⁸ Others of like mind contrasted the 'physiological and pathological' realism of the French school with the 'true realism' of Tolstoi's *Death of Ivan Il'ich*²⁹ or the 'formulae' and 'daguerreotypes' of Zola's novels with the 'living poetry' of *War and Peace*.³⁰ From the other side of the battle-lines, Boborykin and Koropchevskii continued to argue the case of naturalism against what they represented as the wilful misunderstanding of the civic-utilitarian critics,³¹ while the 'experimental' novelist Ieronim Iasinskii, writing under the provocative pseudonym 'Maksim Belinskii', defiantly proclaimed the 'strong and

²⁶ D. Koropchevskii, 'Naturalizm i ego sovremennoe znachenie. Kriticheskii etiid', *Iziaschnaia literatura* (1884:12), 15–32 (p. 16).

²⁷ S. Temlinskii, *Zolaizm. Kriticheskii etiid*. M. 1880', *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1881:4), ii, 230–31.

²⁸ [N. K. Mikhailovskii], 'Emil' Zolia. "Pobul", *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1882:10), ii, 239–42; 'Otchego pogibli mechty', *Severnyi vestnik* (1887:10), 124–42.

²⁹ [N. A.] 'Iz obshchestvennoi khroniki. Smert' Ivana Il'icha kak sobytie dnia i kak obrazets istinnogo realizma', *Vestnik Evropy* (1886:7), 453–57 (p. 454).

³⁰ L. Lisovskii, 'Tri osnovnykh tipa sovremennogo romana (Zolia, Giugo i Tolstoi)', *Russkoe bogatstvo* (1887:10), 83–116 (p. 115).

³¹ Boborykin, 'Predislovie', in P. Aleksis, 'Emil' Zolia (Biograficheskii ocherk)', *Nabliudatel'* (1882:11), 153–54; Koropchevskii, 'Naturalizm i ego sovremennoe znachenie. Kriticheskii etiid', *Iziaschnaia literatura* (1884:12), 15–32.

fruitful' influence of his French master and his method of analysing life 'with no attempt to embellish reality or impose any ideals on anyone'.³² With a foot in both camps, the literary historian A. N. Veselovskii regretted the coarseness of *Nana*, but sought to reclaim the novel for critical realism as an 'honourable and patriotic' portrayal of 'the disastrous influence of Bonapartism on morality'.³³

In these polemics, of course, it was very often fears for the health of Russian literature in a decade of disillusion and repression that gave point and urgency to the sometimes ritual exchanges between the advocates and opponents of *zolaizm*. The perception of a culture in crisis, the notion of the great tradition of Russian realism giving way to despondency, moral indifference, and the ideological vacuum of *bezydeimost'* as its greatest practitioners passed away or (like Tolstoi) fell silent, are common motifs in the literary-critical discourse of the 1880s, and dismay at the pernicious influence of French Naturalism is often implicit in contemporary attempts to diagnose and prescribe for the malaise of the times: for example, in Gleb Uspenskii's 1886 review of new Russian fiction, with its uninspiring portraits of characters bereft of 'any principles of social obligation'³⁴ or in D. V. Grigorovich's celebrated letter to Chekhov (also 1886), in which he urged the young writer to forsake all 'touches of cynicism' and develop his art in the direction of 'truthfulness and realism'.³⁵ Indeed, much of the critical response to Chekhov over the next decade, notably from N. K. Mikhailovskii and other advocates of a 'committed' literature, was framed in terms that recalled the earlier attacks on *zolaizm*,³⁶ while Chekhov's own oft-quoted attempts to define and defend his own view of an 'objective' art ('a writer must be as objective as a chemist')³⁷ are sometimes similarly reminiscent of Zola himself.³⁸ By the late 1880s, therefore, it might be argued that the *zolaizm* debate in its most essential aspects had been absorbed into the mainstream of Russian cultural life.

Zola's apotheosis as an international literary celebrity, signalled by the publication of Paul Alexis's biography (translated into Russian in 1882),³⁹ brought some signs of gradual change in the prevailing attitudes of Russian criticism. In the autumn of 1882, for example, Arsen'ev began the most comprehensive of his studies of the novelist by rejecting the partisan extremes of Zolaists and anti-Zolaists alike and aspiring to an impartiality and independence all too little in evidence elsewhere.⁴⁰ Dismissing the routine objections to the immorality of *Nana* or *Pot-Bouille*, he went as far as to endorse the main premise of the experimental novel, if only to demonstrate how far Zola fell short of his own theoretical ideal:

³² 'Emil' Zolia i ego novyi roman', *Nabliudatel'* (1885), ii, 56–68 (p. 61).

³³ 'Nana, par E. Zola', *Kriticheskoe obozrenie* (1880:7), 313–24 (p. 316).

³⁴ 'Pis'ma s dorogi', *Russkie vedomosti*, 18 May 1886, p. 1.

³⁵ Letter dated 25 March 1886, quoted in N. I. Gitovich, *Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva A. P. Chekhova* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1955), pp. 128–29.

³⁶ See especially Mikhailovskii's article 'Ob otsakh i detiakh i o g. Chekhove', *Russkie vedomosti* (1890), 104.

³⁷ Letter to M. V. Kiseleva, 14 January 1887, in *Sobranie sochinenii v XII tomakh* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1960–64), xi (1963), 111.

³⁸ In particular, Donald Rayfield draws attention to echoes in Chekhov's remarks on Zola's preface to the second edition of *Thérèse Raquin* ('Chekhov and the Literary Tradition', in *A Chekhov Companion*, ed. by Toby W. Clyman (Westport, CT, and London: Greenwood Press, 1985), pp. 47–48).

³⁹ *Emile Zola: notes d'un ami* (Paris: Charpentier, 1882). The Russian translation (with a preface by Boborykin) appeared in the St Petersburg monthly *Nabliudatel'* (1882:11, 12).

⁴⁰ 'Sovremennyy roman v ego predstaviteliakh, VIII: Emil' Zola', *Vestnik Evropy* (1882:8), 643–96. Page references are to this edition.

Literature, like science, can penetrate everywhere, can concern itself with anything, on one condition: its attitude to the subjects it takes, so to speak, from the public domain must indeed be a scientific one: serious in its essential nature and rigorously restrained in its form (p. 652)

With his lack of any 'sense of proportion' (p. 656), his penchant for the profusion of superfluous detail, his gratuitous offences against 'aesthetic feeling' (p. 658), and his bravado in provoking his critics to ever more extreme expressions of outrage, Zola is unfit for his self-assigned role of natural historian, while his art, with its delight in exuberant description and extravagant comparisons, is fundamentally at odds with the doctrine of forensic objectivity he professes (pp. 667–68). Such inconsistencies, however, are less damaging than the 'lack of warmth' (p. 692) and 'growing indifferentism' (p. 695) he has cultivated in the name of objective art and at the cost of 'moral isolation' from 'the concerns of the minority and the sufferings of the mass' (p. 695). If Arsen'ev here can only reiterate the usual strictures of the 'civic' camp, even to the extent of exalting the example of Nekrasov, 'our bard of "vengeance and sorrow"' (p. 696), he was quick in his reviews of the successive volumes of the Rougon-Macquart series to welcome 'a decided turn for the better in Zola's art',⁴¹ signs not only of a new restraint but of a departure from the 'extremes of Naturalism', from 'the unnecessary accumulation of filth and the surfeit of detailed descriptions':

The zeal of theory has been moderated by practice, and the legislators themselves take the lead in breaking the laws. Like any force, Naturalism has had a widespread influence, and its best creations have acquired the significance of exemplars that are studied far beyond the boundaries of French literature. This is an inescapable and an altogether legitimate fact.

('Frantsuzskii roman', p. 314)

Such recognition of Zola's place in the history of the novel, even of his contribution to literary realism, despite the choruses of outrage that continued to greet the appearance in Russia of the remaining volumes in the series (notably *Germinal* (1885), *La Terre* (1887), and *La Bête humaine* (1890)) was not to be seriously challenged.⁴²

The challenge to *zolaizm* came in another form from a different quarter. The defection of the five Naturalists in protest against the excesses of *La Terre* was immediately reported in the Russian press and seized on as a sign of the times.⁴³ By 1891 the decline of Naturalism had become a common topic,⁴⁴ especially in discussions of the new decadent tendencies in French culture. For one Russian observer, the emergence of 'neurotic poetry' and 'anti-materialism' was the inevitable reaction to Naturalism and its denial of the truth and higher purpose of

⁴¹ 'Frantsuzskii roman v 1884 g', *Vestnik Evropy* (1884:11), 293–314 (p. 306). See also 'Novye romany Dode i Zolia', *Vestnik Evropy* (1883:6), 673–93.

⁴² See, for instance, [V. R. Zotov], 'Ocherki inostrannoi literatury. Pornograficheskii element frantsuzskoi belletristiki', *Nabliudatel'* (1887:10), 'Sovremennoe obozrenie', pp. 1–5; A. Suvorin, 'Zemlia. Roman Zoly', *Novoe vremia*, 1887, 30 December/11 January, p. 2; V. Chuiko, 'Emil' Zola', *Syn otechestva* (1887:169), 1.

⁴³ A Russian translation of the letter published in *Le Figaro* by Bonnetain, Rosny, Descaves, Marguerite, and Guiches appeared almost immediately (*Russkie vedomosti*, 20 August 1887, p. 3; see also F. Bulgakov, 'S togo berega', *Novoe vremia*, 20 August 1887, p. 2, and [V. R. Zotov] 'Ocherki inostrannoi literatury'. See also 'Emil' Zolia', *Vestnik inostrannoi literatury: illustrirovannoe prilozhenie* (1895:11), 281–96 (p. 290).

⁴⁴ For example, N. K. Mikhailovskii, 'Pis'ma o raznykh raznostiakh', *Russkie vedomosti*, 6 January 1890, pp. 1–3 (p. 2); F. Bulgakov, 'Smert' naturalizma i nervoznaia poeziia. Otkhodnaia naturalizmu i iskaniiia novoi "formuly" tvorchestva' *Novoe vremia*, 18 July 1891, p. 2.

art;⁴⁵ for another, Decadence was more directly the 'sorry consequence' of *zolaizm*: 'If Zola pledged to adhere exclusively to base reality, the Decadents have so taken against reality of any kind that as a result their poetry has turned into hallucination.'⁴⁶

From their very different perspective, the Russian exponents of Decadence saw in Naturalism the antithesis of the 'new' art, with its emphasis on 'the transformation of physical life into its spiritual counterpart'⁴⁷. So N. M. Minskii (N. M. Vilenkin) inveighed against 'the French artists and thinkers' who 'triumphantly assemble their documents of human vulgarity and folly, and in so calumniating mankind spew forth their abuse at the Divine', denying immortality and the higher purpose of Creation.⁴⁸ Two years later, his colleague A. Volynskii (A. L. Flekser), in an extended review of *La Débâcle* (1892), contrasted the materialist and mechanistic *Weltanschauung* of Naturalism with the metaphysical philosophy and symbolist aesthetics of the new idealism.⁴⁹

As his Russian critics continued to speculate on the decline of Naturalism, Zola himself seemed to many of them intent on dissociating himself from it. Mikhailovskii discerned in some of his pronouncements an awareness that the French public was weary of the experimental novel, with its 'comfortable indifference, its exquisite debauchery of thought and feeling', turning instead to the moral fictions of Daudet and Bourget, or even to the more serious naturalism of the Russian school so recently discovered by de Vogüé.⁵⁰ When Zola addressed the Association Générale des Étudiants in May 1893, defending science from *fin de siècle* mysticism and preaching the gospel of work, he did indeed seem to have abandoned the objectivity of the natural historian. Translated (and repudiated) by Tolstoi in his pamphlet *Nedelanie*,⁵¹ his speech reached a wide Russian audience, who learned that the 'aged dyed-in-the-wool positivist' (p. 178) now repented of his 'sectarian' belief that art should confine itself to 'proven truths' and commended those 'newcomers' opening up new horizons 'by recovering the unknown and the mysterious' (p. 179). A desire to follow their example seemed to lie behind the *Trois Villes* trilogy to which Zola turned after completing the last of the Rougon-Macquart novels in 1893. The first rumours of the project were enough to persuade Mikhailovskii that the Frenchman, with his usual 'armour-plated egotism, braggadocio and lack of principle', had changed direction in order to take his place at the head of the new movement

⁴⁵ Bulgakov, 'Smert' naturalizma', p. 2; 'Protiv materializma v literature', *Novoe vremia*, 7 November 1891, p. 2. For a similar view, see L. A. Pogodin, 'Simvolizm, 1. Iv. Ivanov, "O budushchem khudozhestvennogo tvorchestva,"' kak istoricheskoe iavlenie', *Vestnik inostrannoï literatury* (1898:10), 3–19.

⁴⁶ Iv. Ivanov, 'O budushchem khudozhestvennogo tvorchestva', *Artist* (1893:31), 138.

⁴⁷ Vladimir Solov'ev, 'Obshchii smysl iskusstva' (1890, in *Sobranie sochinenii* (St Petersburg: Prosveshchenie, 1911–14), vi, 84.

⁴⁸ *Pri svete sovesti. Mysli i mechty o tseli zhizni* (St Petersburg: n.p., 1890), p. 61.

⁴⁹ 'Literaturnye zametki: La débâcle par Émile Zola', *Severnii vestnik* (1892:12), ii, 97–134.

⁵⁰ 'Pis'ma o raznykh raznostiakh', p. 1. Mikhailovskii's comments here were prompted in part by a newspaper interview (unfortunately unidentified) in which Zola had referred to Eugène Melchior de Vogüé's *Le roman russe* (Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1886).

⁵¹ 'Nedelanie', *Severnii vestnik* (1893:9) quoted from L. N. Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 90 vols, ed. by V. G. Chertkov (Moscow: GIZ, 1935–58; repr., Vaduz: Kraus, 1972), Series 1, xxviii, 173–201. Page references are to this edition. The original text of Zola's speech is to be found in the *Œuvres complètes* II (1968), 677–83. On the 'polemic' between Tolstoi and Zola, see for example L. E. Obolenskii, 'Po povodu spora E. Zolia i L. N. Tolstogo. Sovremennye idealy (nauka, trud, liubov)', *Novosti i birzhevaia gazeta*, 3 November 1893, p. 2; M. Protopopov, 'Pis'ma o literature. Pis'mo sed'moe', *Russkaia mysl'* (1893:12), 210–28.

against Naturalism.⁵² Reviewing the trilogy after the publication of the final volume some years later, Arsen'ev noted the 'strange irony of fate' whereby Zola, under the influence of a religious faith in science, had now demonstrated the inadequacy of his own creed of an art free from philosophy and idealism: the forensic scientist had become a visionary 'glimpsing through the surrounding gloom the glimmer of a distant light'.⁵³ If, as another reviewer put it, Zola remained naive when it came to questions of faith, he was no longer to be accused of lacking in ideals.⁵⁴ In *Fécondité* and the other 'gospels' that followed it, Russian reviewers discovered 'Naturalism in the service of Utopia'⁵⁵ and Zola in a role more usually associated with Tolstoi, that of a prophet preaching positive ideals and prescribing for the ills of his country.⁵⁶ Over the same decade, Russian criticism, in the writings of the Marxist Plekhanov and the liberal Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, seemed to move away from earlier misunderstandings towards an acknowledgement of the merits of scientific aesthetics and even of the experimental method itself.⁵⁷

It was, however, Zola's involvement in the Dreyfus case in 1897–98 that contributed most to the general reappraisal of *zolaizm* in Russia, and in particular to a change in the attitude of the radical intelligentsia to the sometime advocate of 'Nana-turalism'. While Suvorin's *Novoe vremia* and other organs of the Right warned of a Zionist conspiracy and impugned the motives of the 'Naturalist-pornographer',⁵⁸ public opinion rallied in support of the novelist in his defence of truth and justice.⁵⁹ On the appearance of *J'accuse* early in 1898, the monthly *Russkaia mysl'* confidently proclaimed: 'The whole of the independent and right-thinking press of the West and Russia stands on the side of Zola',⁶⁰ while *Russkoe bogatstvo* added its authority to the words of Tolstoi:

I am far from being a great admirer of Zola as a writer [. . .] and so I can judge his action with a greater degree of calm [. . .]. In Zola's action one can see the noble and beautiful idea of striking a blow against the chauvinism and anti-Semitism prevalent in certain circles [. . .]. In publishing his letter, Zola has done all that he could and all that he should have done.⁶¹

Even before Zola's death in 1902, therefore, the debate over *zolaizm* as a false doctrine alien and hostile to the Russian literary tradition was largely forgotten. There were only faint echoes of it in the many obituaries that honoured his memory as 'writer and citizen', praised his progression from unprincipled indifferentism to idealism and civic engagement, or paid tribute (in Mikhailovskii's terms) to his

⁵² 'Literatura i zhizn, *Russkaia mysl'* (1893:4), 176–208 (p. 190).

⁵³ 'Tri novykh frantsuzskikh romana', *Delo: sbornik literaturno-nauchnykh izdaniy moskovskim otdeleniem Obshchestva dlia usileniia sredstv Sanktpeterburgskogo Zhenskogo Meditsinskogo Instituta* (Moscow: Tipo-litografiia A. V. Vasil'eva, 1899), pp. 45–58 (p. 57).

⁵⁴ [N. A. Kolosov], *Religiozno-publitsisticheskie romany Emilia Zoli 'Lurd', 'Rim' i 'Parizh' pered sudom pravoslavnogo chitatelia Sviaschennika N. A. Kolosova* (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1899), p. 65.

⁵⁵ N. K. [N. E. Kudrin: that is, N. S. Rusanov] 'Naturalizm na sluzhbe u Utopii', in *Ocherki sovremennoi Frantsii* (St Petersburg: *Russkoe bogatstvo*, 1902), pp. 319–35.

⁵⁶ Z. Vengerova, 'Émile Zola', *Vestnik Evropy* (1903:9), 211–41 (p. 240).

⁵⁷ This argument is developed in Duncan, 'Echoes', pp. 15–17.

⁵⁸ [A. P. Piatkovskii], 'Literaturnye i obshchestvennye zametki', *Nabludatel'* (1898:2), 42–46 (pp. 42, 43); see also 'Kniaz' Tenerifskii' [A. P. Piatkovskii?], 'Po belu svetu (zametki i nabliudeniia)' *Nabludatel'* (1899:6), 57–58; A. Suvorin, 'Malen'kie pis'ma', *Novoe vremia*, 17 November 1897, p. 2.

⁵⁹ For instance, *Mir Bozhii* (1898:2), ii, 30–33; I. Iakovlev, 'Parizhskaia zhizn', *Novoe vremia*, 5 December 1897, pp. 2–3.

⁶⁰ V. Gol'tsev, 'Inostrannoe obozrenie', *Russkaia mysl'* (1898:2), 199–201 (p. 201).

⁶¹ N. K. [N. S. Rusanov], *Russkoe bogatstvo* (1898:2), 119. Tolstoi's words are quoted from an (untraced) interview with a journalist from the newspaper *Le Courier*.

defence of both objective and moral truth;⁶² there was a general if not always explicit consensus that his conduct in the Dreyfus affair had redeemed his past sins (E. P., 'Emil' Zolia', p. 179). The ironies and contradictions inherent in such a 'rehabilitation' were not lost on the more perceptive commentators who suggested that the 'positive ideals' of his last years seemed out of character with Zola's whole 'literary physiognomy' (Vengerova, p. 211), or that the 'moralist and prophet' of the four 'gospels' seemed a less convincing a figure than the 'warrior and scourge' of *Le roman expérimental*.⁶³ To others it seemed that the demands of Naturalism, when divested of their former militant paradoxicality, differed little from those of humane Russian realism,⁶⁴ and that Zola had ended by reconciling its approach to reality with the idealism he had so long resisted, becoming, indeed, 'a symbol of the fact that humanity craves the ideal' (p.150). The 'Decadent' Minskii mourned the passing of the old Zola he had condemned twelve years before, 'the Naturalist, the enemy of ideals, the abuser of persons and the fanatic of formal truth' (Minskii, p. 257), while finding in his implacable hatred of bourgeois culture the mystical core of his life and work and declaring him to be not merely a symbol but a symbolist in spite of himself (p. 256).

The obituarist who claimed Zola as 'almost our own Russian writer'⁶⁵ was therefore overstating the case no more than Mikhailovskii had done (albeit in a somewhat different spirit) a quarter of a century before, when he announced that 'Zola has become a half-Russian writer'.⁶⁶ No foreign writer before or since became so much, and so multifariously, part of the Russian literary process. The question of his influence on Russian literature therefore goes much further than the arguments that might be made for its specific manifestations in the works of writers such as Boborykin or Iasinskii, Chekhov or Artsybashev,⁶⁷ or of critics such as Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii or Plekhanov. Similarly, the Russian debate on *zolaizm* must be seen as more than a reflection, often a muted one, of the polemics that raged around Zola in France and elsewhere.⁶⁸ It was essentially a Russian debate about Russian culture, in which over almost three decades the French novelist was invoked for their various and often contradictory purposes by most of the protagonists in turn. Few particular cases illustrate so well Boris Eikhenbaum's insights into the nature of interliterary influences in general:

⁶² See E. P., 'Emil' Zolia', *Obrazovanie* (1902:10), ii. 168–80 (p. 171); Arsen'ev, 'E. Zolia', *Vestnik Evropy* (1902:10), 835–37; [P. Antropov], 'Bessmertnyi (Pamiati E. Zolia)', *Novosti i birzhevaia gazeta*, 17 September 1902, p. 2; also (among many others) E. Anichkov, 'Emil' Zola', *Mir Bozhii* (1903:5), 49–69.

⁶³ N. Minskii, 'Zola i eksperimentalnyi roman', *Mir iskusstva* (1902:9–10), 249–57 (p. 257); Vengerova, p. 240.

⁶⁴ N. E. Kudrin [N. S. Rusanov], 'Emil' Zolia (Literaturno-biograficheskii ocherk)', *Russkoe bogatstvo* (1902:10), ii, 99–150 (p. 142).

⁶⁵ N. A., 'Literatura i pechat'. Smert' Emilia Zoli', *Vestnik inostrannoi literatury* (1902:10), p. 330.

⁶⁶ [Mikhailovskii], 'Pis'ma o pravde i nepravde, *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1877:12), 6 p. 320.

⁶⁷ See, for example, Ewa Slawecka, 'Miejscze teorii estetycznykh Emilia Zoli', pp. 47–52; E. M. Pul'khitodova, 'Naturalizm v Rossii', *Kratkaia literaturnaia entsiklopedia*, 8 vols (Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia, 1962–75), v (1968), cols 134–35.

⁶⁸ The most recent general account of contemporary reactions to Zola is to be found in Frederick Brown,

Zola: A Life (London: Macmillan, 1995). British responses in particular were more extreme than those in Russia, and present an interesting contrast: Zola's novels were denounced in the House of Commons more than once (Brown, *Zola*, p. 575; see also Philip Walker, *Zola* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), p. 21) and his English publisher Vizetelly was bankrupted as a result of the prosecution brought against him by the National Vigilance Association following the appearance of *La Terre* in English translation in 1887 (Brown, p. 575).

A foreign author cannot by himself form any new tendency, since each literature develops in its own way, on the basis of its own traditions. Entering another literature, the foreign author is transformed, and gives it, not what he actually has or what is typical of him in his own literature, but rather what is demanded of him.⁶⁹

What was demanded of Zola by Russian literature, and what he gave to it, varied with the perceptions of change and crisis characteristic of Russian literary and intellectual life in the transitional decades between the decline of the realist tradition and the efflorescence of modernism. Championed by advocates of a new scientific and positivist aesthetics, he was to be denounced as a harbinger of the decadence of 'art for art's sake'; reviled by the defenders of the Romantic realism of Russia's own natural school, he would be recognized as a critical realist unmasking the hypocrisy and corruption of contemporary society; accused of indifferentism and immorality, he was blamed for the decline of social ideals in intellectual life before being hailed as the very model of the committed artist speaking out against entrenched prejudice and social injustice; scourge of the new mysticism and prophet of a new idealism, he was finally claimed as one of their own by symbolists and neo-realists alike. His role, in short, was to crystallize and focus the interplay of opinion and assumption, argument and counter-argument, orthodoxy and heresy that is the literary movement itself, and so at different times both to challenge the Russian realist tradition and to reaffirm it.

With the ascendancy of socialist realism in the Soviet period, that tradition once more seemed immutable and unassailable. Drawing on many of the same intellectual sources as *zolaizm*, and sharing many of the assumptions of *Le roman expérimental*, the ideologues of the revolutionary aesthetics were more directly heirs to the radical civic idealism of the Russian past, and as little inclined as their nineteenth-century predecessors to cede theoretical ground to Naturalism. It is therefore all the more interesting to note that Russian literature was still making its particular demands on Zola more than half a century after his death. In the entries on Naturalism in a new history of foreign literature in 1956 and in the *Shorter Literary Encyclopaedia* (1969), and in the controversies to which they gave rise,⁷⁰ the echoes of the original *zolaizm* debate ring clear: attacks on 'reactionary', 'decadent', and 'formalist' naturalism in the name of 'healthy' 'true' realism; condemnation of the 'vulgar sociology' implicit in the dominant literary orthodoxy, or of the ideological naivety of those who would question it; dismay at the 'cynicism' and 'lack of ideas' of the Zolaistes, and special pleading for their leader as an artist whose practice transcended the limitations of his theories. These same echoes reverberate in more recent attempts to reassess Russian naturalism and reclaim at least some of its

⁶⁹ Boris Eikhenbaum, *Lermontov: opyt istoriko-literaturnoi otsenki* (Leningrad: GIZ, 1924; repr. Munich: Fink, 1967), p. 28. Eikhenbaum is discussing the phenomenon of Byronism in Russia.

⁷⁰ See the chapter on Zola by L. Andreev in *Kurs lektsii po istorii zarubezhnykh literatur XX veka*, ed. by L. G. Andreev and R. M. Samarin, 2 vols (Moscow: izdatel'stvo MGU, 1956) 1, 131–59; the review of it by T. Motyleva, 'Tak li nado izuchat' zarubezhnuiu literaturu?', *Inostrannaia literatura* (1956:9), 209–18 (especially pp. 212–3), and the reply by L. Andreev, Z. Grazhdanskaia, and E. Tsybenko, 'Za delovoe i ob'ektivnoe obsuzhdenie problem literaturovedeniia', *Inostrannaia literatura* (1956:12), 189–95; the entry 'Naturalizm v Rossii' by E. M. Pul'khritudova in *Kratkaia literaturnaia entsiklopediia*, v, and the review of it by I. Astakhov and A. Volkov, 'V krivom zerkale literaturnoi entsiklopedii', *Oktiabr'* (1969:2), 202–14 (especially p. 203).

achievement for the canon of classical critical realism.⁷¹ Transformed once more, Zola and *zolaizm* found their place in a new phase of the Russian cultural debate.

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

JOHN MCNAIR

⁷¹ See, for example, V. Kuleshov, 'Nereshennye voprosy izucheniia russkoi literatury XIX-XX veka', *Voprosy literatury* (1982:8), 50-74; V. Keldysh, 'Priobreteniia i zadachi (O nekotorykh problemakh russkogo literaturnogo protsessa XIX-nachala XX stoletii i ikh izuchenii', *Voprosy literatury* (1983:2), 136-155; L. A. Iezuitova, 'O "naturalisticheskoi" romane v russkoi literature kontsa XIX-nachala XX veka', in *Problemy poetiki russkogo realizma XIX veka* (Leningrad: izdatel'stvo LGU, 1984), pp. 228-64. For a more recent reassessment of Russian naturalism, see G. K. Shchennikov, 'Russkii naturalizm i ego uroki', *Russkaia literatura* (1992:2), 11-27.