

LEO TOLSTOY'S IDEA OF MORALITY IN HIS SHORT STORIES CHARACTERS

Dian Laily Rachmawati

English Literature, Faculty of Language and Arts, Surabaya State University, di.lyrach@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini berjudul *Leo Tolstoy's Idea of Morality in his Short Stories Characters*. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengungkapkan ide moralitas melalui tokoh-tokoh dalam cerita pendek Leo Tolstoy dan bagaimana ide moralitas Leo Tolstoy digunakan untuk mengkritik masyarakat Rusia pada zamannya. Penelitian ini akan menjelaskan hubungan antara karya sastra dan masa penulisan karya sastra tersebut. Cerita-cerita pendek yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah *God Sees the Truth but Waits*; *Ivan the Fool*; *A Lost Opportunity*; and *After the Ball*. Sumber data diambil dari cerita pendek tersebut, sumber-sumber tertulis, dan berbagai macam sumber dari internet lainnya; dalam bentuk kutipan, komentar, dan percakapan yang menggambarkan ide moralitas dan bagaimana ide moral Tolstoy tersebut digunakan untuk mengkritik masyarakat Rusia pada zamannya. Analisis dari penelitian ini berdasarkan pada rumusan masalah sebagai berikut: "Bagaimanakah ide moralitas Leo Tolstoy tercermin dalam cerita-cerita pendeknya?" dan "Bagaimanakah ide moralitas Leo Tolstoy digunakan untuk mengkritik masyarakat Rusia pada zamannya?" Sementara itu, teori yang diterapkan untuk menjawab rumusan masalah pertama adalah ide moralitas milik Leo Tolstoy, tanpa-perlawanan, dan juga memasukkan nilai-nilai Kristiani untuk mendukung idenya. Kritik Biografi / Historis juga digunakan untuk mengungkapkan bagaimana ide moralitas Tolstoy digunakan untuk mengkritik masyarakat Rusia pada zamannya. Sementara, metodologi penelitian yang digunakan adalah pendekatan deskriptif-kualitatif.

Kata Kunci: kritik biografi, ide moralitas, kristiani, deskriptif-kualitatif, jurnal.

Abstract

This study entitles *Leo Tolstoy's Idea of Morality in his Short Stories Characters*. The purpose of this study is to reveal the idea of morality through Leo Tolstoy's short stories characters and how Tolstoy's idea of morality is used to criticize the Russian society in his time. This study will explain the correlation between works of literature and the writing time of the works of literature. The short stories used in this study are *God Sees the Truth but Waits*; *Ivan the Fool*; *A Lost Opportunity*; and *After the Ball*. The data sources are taken from the short stories mentioned, textual sources, and other sources from the internet; in the form of quotations, comments, and dialogs that represent the idea of morality and how Tolstoy's idea of morality is used to criticize the Russian society in his time. The analysis of this study is based on following statements of problem: "How is Leo Tolstoy's idea of morality reflected in his short stories characters?" and "How is Leo Tolstoy's idea of morality used to criticize the Russian society of his time?" Mean while, the theory applied to answer the first statement of problem is Tolstoy's idea of as zero resistance, and may include Christianity values to support his idea. Historical / Biographical Criticism is also used to reveal how Tolstoy's idea of morality is used to criticize the Russian society in his time. While the research methodology used is descriptive-qualitative approach.

Keywords: biographical criticism, idea of morality, christianity, descriptive-qualitative, journal.

INTRODUCTION

Literature is one of the signatures which are able to illustrate whether a society is civilized or not. Literature presents entertainment as well as clarity of a disguised intention. Authors usually unconsciously implement their thoughts and messages within their writings, since emotions, feelings, and personal thoughts are involved in the process of making literary works. In short, literature is influential art in the form of written texts that represents one's thoughts and feelings. Even so, work of literature still can be analyzed through its particular forms and structures.

Many great writers were born to represent their time and the society they belong to through their works. They

usually talk about current phenomena, customs, social life, and events with the intention of criticizing and/or delivering their thoughts towards the phenomena. Those works of literature are capable of indicating the condition and the way people live in a certain area and period of time.

One important writer of his time whose name still remains until today is Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910). Tolstoy was a Russian writer who is well known for his master piece novels, *Anna Karenina* and *War and Peace*. His idea of morality spread throughout the nation and made him the most influential writer of his time. His works have inspired many important figures, including Martin Luther King Jr., Mahatma Gandhi, and Fyodor Dostoevsky. Many moral values are implemented in his works of literature.

There are some of Tolstoy's selected short stories which are going to be discussed in a further discussion, with the underlining idea of morality in each short story as the consideration. Those short stories are *Good Sees the Truths but Waits*, *Ivan the Fool*, *A Lost Opportunity*, and *After the Ball*.

The short stories above were selected in relevance to the theme and the tone used in those short stories. Those four works are mainly about forgiving, letting go, hard-working, generosity, sincerity, and simplicity. Each story offers different story lines but still under the same theme: non-resistance. Uniquely, those four works of literature share the same name for their main characters which is "Ivan," even though each character in each story has different traits and behavior. It is interesting to find out why Tolstoy uses the name "Ivan" multiple times in some of his works. And again, to find out the reason, Tolstoy's biographical background is needed to complete the analysis.

In analyzing the short stories mentioned, it is important to find the resemblance among all short stories. In this case, the moral value presented by the main characters in each story and the reason behind the representation of Tolstoy's idea of morality will be the main focus in the study.

There are two statements of problem that will be the main discussion in this study. Both of the statements of problems will be analyzed using different theories. These statements of problems are: (1) How is Leo Tolstoy's idea of morality reflected in his short stories characters? (2) How is Leo Tolstoy's idea of morality used to criticize the Russian society of his time?

Morality is something essential in human life. Humans live within certain moral values and laws that manage their relationship with each other. For this reason, the purpose of this study aims: (1) To describe the reflection of Leo Tolstoy's idea of morality in his short stories characters. (2) To reveal how Leo Tolstoy's idea of morality is used to criticize the Russian society of his time.

The analysis of Leo Tolstoy's short stories is intended to help reader to have further understandings about the idea of morality and its impact on daily life. Besides, the relation between Russian historical background, Leo Tolstoy's biographical background, and his short stories will expectantly help the reader to find deeper acquaintance of how morality deeply influences people's lives and control the society.

The limitation of this study is mainly on the discussion of revealing the reflection of Tolstoy's idea of morality in each main character of his short stories. There are four main characters from four stories whose moral values inside their characteristics will be analyzed and identified. Besides the characterization, how Tolstoy's idea of morality is used to criticize Russian society at his time will also be analyzed. This study will be done by focusing on the main characters in Leo Tolstoy's short stories and also on Russian society at his time.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study uses library research method. Meanwhile, the approach used in the study is descriptive-qualitative approach. The main data sources of the study are taken from Leo Tolstoy's short stories, *God Sees the Truth but Waits* (1872), *Ivan the Fool* (1885), *A Lost Opportunity* (1889), and *After the Ball* (1911) translated by Margaret Wettlin; Russian history; and also Leo Tolstoy's biography. Other supported data sources will be taken from Tolstoy's other books that have strong relations with his idea of morality such as *Confession* and *My Religion*. Besides, additional data from other various sources, such as educational articles, supporting theories, classes, and interview will be also used to enrich the explanation and discussion in the study.

Data collections which are taken include quotations, phrases, dialogues, monologues that expose the idea, utterances, actions, and behaviors of the main characters inside the short stories related to the idea of moral philosophy. The methodology of quotation used in this study will mention the author's name, the year of publishing, and the page. Meanwhile, the quotations which is taken from the short stories will mention the author's name, chapter, and paragraph number. Besides the short stories, Leo Tolstoy's biography and ideas of morality—from any sources, will be used as well to support the reason Tolstoy involves his morality concept inside his short stories.

To portray the idea of morality through the short stories, Leo Tolstoy's idea of morality—which is non-resistance, will be used. In completing the analysis, Tolstoy's idea of morality will be supported by other moral philosophers such as Bertrand Russell, Henry Sidgwick, and G. Elisabeth M. Anscombe, also moral values based on the Christian perspective.

Meanwhile, to reveal how Tolstoy's idea of morality is used to criticize the Russian society at his time, Historical - Biographical Criticism is believed to be the best way to be used in the study. Through Tolstoy's biographical background as a Russian thinker, it is expected to find the resemblance between the life of the Russian society at his time and his works that will help in pointing out the criticism Tolstoy wants to deliver.

This study requires sequential steps which are started by reading the short stories comprehensively and deciding whether they are qualified to be used as materials of study. After reading the short stories, the next step is making some associated titles for the study based on the short stories and the statements of problem which are going to be discussed. The following step is making outline for this study. Collecting the data that contain quotations correlated to the statements of problems will be done after the outlining process is completed. Then separating the quotations from the analysis can be done as a further process.

The Idea of Morality

In mere society, morality happens to be understood as a tool to control the society based on what is good and bad. The term morality is also known as a tool that

controls the society and a device to tell people what to do and not to do. People are classified as immoral if they do not follow that invisible rule in a certain society. Morality tells people what is right and what is wrong.

According to Ruth Benedict in her book *Patterns of Culture*, “morality differs in every society, and is a convenient term for socially approved habits.” (Benedict, 1934) Different society in different area may adopt different moral definition since moral itself has close relation to culture and customs. People tend to do what is accepted and avoid what is unaccepted based on the culture and customs in the society.

Tolstoy himself states in his book *Confession*, that “... the arbiter of what is good and evil is not what people say and do, nor is it progress, but it is my heart and I.” (Tolstoy, 1983: 9) It means that only one’s conscience can tell what is wrong and right, or what to do and what to avoid. Tolstoy’s statement about the arbitrary of morality definition is based on his long searching of the understanding. Still in his book, *Confession*, Tolstoy also mentions that his philosophical ‘journey’ started from the pride for his profession as a writer, a poet, and a teacher as well. Tolstoy argues that those professions mentioned were the best professions in the world since he can teach and tell people what is right and wrong. (Tolstoy, 1983: 6)

Morality, actually, cannot be related to any religion. But since Christianity was brought to the Roman Empire, morality is heavily influenced by Christianity. All these Jesus’ teachings are actually crystallized in an occasion called “Sermon on the Mount.” And Tolstoy extract the teachings become a concept he called Non-Resistance. The concept of Non-Resistance suggest to love people as one loves oneself.

Historical / Biographical Criticism

There are some sets of theoretical approaches that can be used to analyze a work of literature. This study will use Historical-Biographical approach in analyzing some works of literature. Historical-Biographical Criticism is believed to be an effective approach to analyze works of literature. Biographical Criticism allows critics to relate the author’s life with his works. This approach can also be used to identify the condition of the society where the author lived in a certain period of time.

Biographical Criticism was firstly introduced by Samuel Johnson through his work, *Lives of the Poets* (1779-1781), in Renaissance period of time. (Wikipedia) Biographical criticism, also known as Historical Biographical Criticism, focuses on the author’s personal life, instead of focusing on the works themselves as a work of literature. Biographical Criticism points out that works of literature is the reflection of the author, which means that the author’s personality and personal life can be seen through his own works, since literary works represents the unconscious condition of the author.

To talk about morality, a culture from a certain society must be asserted. And to talk about Tolstoy’s biographical background, Russia must be mentioned as one of the important elements of this study. Tolstoy was

born in Yasnaya Polyana. He spent most of his time, and even had the process of religious revelation in the middle of Russian society and culture. It can be said that Russia is the main role in Tolstoy’s journey to finding his understanding of morality that is heavily based on Christianity. Tolstoy’s idea of morality, Russia, and Christianity are a unity that cannot be separated from Tolstoy’s life.

Tracing back the history, the Soviet Union—former Russia, was a super power country during the World War I. The Soviet Union was lead by a Czar, who at that current period of time was concerned more on international affairs. In the nineteenth century, Russia was facing a great deal of revolutions and movements. The French Revolution affected most European countries, including Russia. As the result, social conditions at that period of time were somewhat chaotic. Peasants—as a majority Russian social class, were also facing hardship because of that.

ANALYSIS

The Portrayal of the Idea of Morality

In general, morality can be described as a tool that maintains the relationship among human beings. Since morality tells people what to do and not to do, what is good and bad, and what is allowed and prohibited, it is clear that morality has the main role in managing behavior inside the society.

Leo Tolstoy, as a writer and a moralist, seems to agree that morality has tremendous influence inside the society. Morality can be found widely in his short stories and other works. But before going further, it is interesting to see the fact that the short stories used in this study have some significant similarities. First, Tolstoy chose morality as the theme of the chosen short stories and poured his own idea of morality, which is known as Non-Resistance, inside the stories. Tolstoy persuaded people to come back to Christianity and apply the moral values taught by Jesus. Furthermore, he wanted to demonstrate how to apply the teachings of Christianity devotedly inside the society.

Second, the main characters inside the chosen short stories share the same first name, which is Ivan. Actually, Ivan is a very common name in Russia. As a matter of fact, Ivan has become the name of four rulers in Russia. They were Ivan I Kalita, Ivan II Ivanovich, Ivan III Vasilyevich, Ivan IV Vasilyevich, Ivan V Alekseyevich Romanov, and Ivan VI Antonov. Two of them were very essential ruler in their times and they recorded significant changes in the history of Russia in each of their times. It is not surprising then, that the name Ivan has been widely used in Russia since long time ago.

God Sees the Truth but Waits (1872)

In very beginning of the story, Ivan Dmitrich Aksionov is portrayed as a rich, handsome, and joyful merchant who loves to sing. (Tolstoy: 1872, par. 1) He wants to attend a fair just out of the city. But his wife comes to him and asks him not to go for she has a bad

feeling about the journey. Aksionov tries to comfort her and keeps going. He even promises to bring present for his wife as he comes back home. This initial portrayal shows that Ivan is an optimistic man who tries to wipe out any negativity from his life and views his future in a positive manner. It is also said that Ivan gives up drinking as he married to his wife and does not like to stay up late. He is a diligent man who willingly wakes up earlier and goes to work before other merchants starts their journey. (Tolstoy: 1872, par. 8) Tolstoy put the value of being hard-worker in the beginning of the story. These positive traits of Ivan can be seen through the stories.

But it is really unfortunate for him since a troika with an officer and two soldiers come over him and accuse him for murdering a fellow merchant who is previously his roommate. Aksionov cannot defend himself since there is no witness who may release him from the false accusation. Aksionov is then brought to local jail and is sentenced for twenty six years for the crime he did not commit. But nobody believes him, not even his own wife. Aksionov is so disappointed and devastated since the person he loves does not believe him and questions the truth of the accusation. In this part of the story, Tolstoy started to put a conflict that will test the main character's traits.

There is nothing much Aksionov can do for his condition, so he gives up trying to send petition to Czar. At that moment, Aksionov's religious calling approaches him. Aksionov realizes that he cannot force people to believe him. Even though it is so hard for him to accept the truth, yet he starts to turn to God. He submits himself before God and let God decides where the life leads him to. Submission, in Christianity, is essential. It means turning to God and letting God decide what is best for oneself, and helping oneself to walk on the path of life God has chosen for him. In this case, Tolstoy tried to point out the importance of submission to God and rely on God than to mankind.

As the time by, Aksionov turns to be a calm man. In the story, it is explained that "... (Aksionov) walked slowly, spoke little, and never laughed, but he often prayed." (Tolstoy, 1872, par. 27) This change is partly because of his sadness since he is punished for something he did not do, and also because of his commitment to turn to God. Aksionov's joyfulness and glee traits gradually decrease. Living in jail teaches him to live in simplicity because the jail itself is a symbol of simplicity; no one can wear anything fancy inside the jail. However, being in the jail does not make Aksionov become lazy person. He still works hard to earn some money and use the money to buy some books for himself to read. Tolstoy wanted show his readers that tragedy is not that hard to get through, after all, when someone submits himself toward God. Aksionov gives up his life for God and he passes through his punishment without any worse grief. His commitment to submit himself to God has lessened the pain inside his heart that he can carry on his life without any condemnation.

As a matter of fact, Aksionov becomes a wise man whose advice is always needed by his fellow prisoners.

He is also respected by either his fellow-prisoners or the authority. In the story, Aksionov transforms himself into saint-like figure, to his fellow-prisoners. His grief does not make him a person who is full of apathy. He cares about his fellow prisoners and is generous enough to help those who are in need. He becomes the spokesman to help his fellow-prisoners in dealing with some situations. Through Aksionov's character, Tolstoy taught his readers about being generous even when oneself is not fortunate enough. Aksionov does not focus on his grief and chooses to carry on his life with God's guidance.

Unfortunately, the test for his commitment is yet to end. One day, new groups of prisoner arrive in Siberia, including a man in his sixty's, named Makar Semyonich. Semyonich is described as a sly criminal who does crimes yet never gets caught by the authority. He himself says that he is caught and sent to Siberia for false accusation even though he admits that he is, indeed, a criminal. Aksionov, personally, does not like to tell Semyonich about his story since telling how he gets into the prison may scratch the wounds he tries hard to let go. Aksionov does not blab nor blame anyone who has framed him and has caused him losing his twenty six years of life. From this depiction, Tolstoy tried to tell his readers that it is important to let go the past and move on the present life, no matter how hard life can be.

Having the conversations, Aksionov then comes to realize that Semyonich is actually the one who has framed him and has made him suffer from the punishment of twenty six years in jail. Of course, Aksionov is so enraged to know that; but this is when his true faith and commitment are challenged. According to Christianity, loving one's enemy is the right action one can take instead of taking revenge for their wrong doings. However, it is also human nature to be angered when one's pride is provoked, especially for Aksionov who has suffered for twenty six years and possibly has lost his family.

The first step one can do to apply the idea non-resistance is by suppressing one's anger. So, in dealing with the situation, Aksionov chooses to say no more words and gets away from Semyonich, even though his heart is full of anger for the rest of the night. (Tolstoy, 1872: par. 47) Aksionov tries hard to restrain his anger. Unfortunately, avoiding Semyonich does not calm him down. Worse, his anger results a chained-reaction that triggers his grief in remembrance of his family. He regrets his condition of being in jail for almost twenty six years. He also mourns for the possibility of his wife has passed away and his children have forgotten him. That fact is so devastating to Aksionov for he is ready to end his own life. (Tolstoy, 1872, par. 47) Aksionov almost gives up his life to see his rage is so great toward Semyonich.

Aksionov tries to pray before God. But even praying does not bring any peace inside his heart nor decreases his hatred toward Semyonich. It happens because Aksionov prays while his heart is still full of anger. His heart is contaminated already with his hard feelings for Semyonich. (Tolstoy, 1872, par. 48) Aksionov should put

aside his anger in order to be get connected to God and regain peace. To support the statement above, the Bible verses, Matthew 5: 23 – 25, clearly propose that one should not come to God before he cleans his heart and erases his anger toward other people. (Bible, NIV)

Up to this part of the story, Tolstoy clearly revealed the real challenge one must overcome in doing God's commandment to love one's enemies and do good to them. Tolstoy points out that in fulfilling God's commandment, one must put aside his free will—and even, in extreme case, the human nature itself. This is what Aksionov is trying to do. Aksionov tries really hard so that he will not be driven by his own emotions for eventually doing violence toward someone else. Tolstoy showed that Aksionov is currently applying the teaching of Non-Resistance which heavily suggests to 'turning good for evil,' instead of 'resisting evil'.

Greater internal conflict approaches Aksionov when he finds out Semyonich is digging a hole to escape from the prison. Yet, Aksionov walks away from him as if he does not see anything. Semyonich, not wanting to take any risk, comes to Ivan and threatens him not to tell anyone about the matter. To hear what Semyonich says to him, Aksionov's anger arises even stronger for the man. Again, Aksionov leaves Semyonich alone as he goes back to his bed.

Aksionov's mind is racing to think about Semyonich's threat and the temptation to tell the guard about what he has done. Aksionov sees the chance for him to take a revenge on Semyonich is widely open. Semyonich will be punished severely if the guard knows what he has done, and the punishment may pay all of Aksionov's sufferings. This is where the greatest internal conflict approaches him and tempts him even more to take revenge. The temptation to let Semyonich feel what he has felt for these twenty six years really comes to his mind. But the good side of him tries to bend the temptation by allowing him to restrain his ego. Aksionov, somehow, starts to question and doubt his own judgment toward Semyonich. Hence, he stops blaming Semyonich for what he has done.

The statement above really shows what Jesus said in the Bible about returning good for evil. The circumstance above sounds familiar with verses in Luke 6: 32 – 36. The verses question about one's intention in doing good deeds to people who also do good deeds to them. Jesus reminded his followers that returning evil with goodness is more important and nobler than doing good deeds to people they prefer. Again, Tolstoy wanted to teach the readers about his idea of non-resistance through his stories. Through Ivan Dmitrich Aksionov, Tolstoy points out the importance of not judging others no matter how bad they have done wrong to them. Finally, Aksionov denies any knowledge of the tunnel digger. Aksionov chooses to suppress his ego by doing so. He does not let his anger and rage take over his faith. He wins the battle between the good and evil inside his heart.

In return, Semyonich comes over him at night and weeps as he admits what he has done to Aksionov twenty six years ago. He also begs for Aksionov's forgiveness.

At first, Aksionov's ego strikes him again to see Semyonich comes over him and begs for forgiveness. He still measures how much pain Semyonich has caused him to bear and how much benefit he can get by forgiving him; he cannot go back to his family, anyway. Her wife may have died, and his children may have forgotten him. Aksionov realizes he has nowhere to go. But soon enough, Aksionov's heart melts as Semyonich weeps and sobs for forgiveness and mentions the name of God before him. He begs for forgiveness until three times before finally Ivan surrenders to God's will and forgives Semyonich.

In addition, Semyonich admits his intention to murder Aksionov, too, the night he killed the merchant. Aksionov is very surprised to hear that. Now he learns that he has escaped his own death the night when Semyonich killed his fellow-merchant. He learns that God still loves him by saving his life and inviting him to turn himself to God; to submit himself to God. Hadn't Semyonich put his knife into his bag, he might have not known God closer as he does during his life in prison. God touches his heart and calls for his attention through Semyonich. God sees the truth but waits, that is the title of the story. It is true, since God knows what Semyonich has done to Aksionov, yet God remains silent as He guides Aksionov to come to His light. Now Aksionov knows.

Forgiving Makar is the climax of Aksionov's faith and the best thing he can do other than taking revenge for his miserable wasted years. He forgives Semyonich. This proves that Tolstoy really wants to emphasize Jesus' teaching to forgive sincerely and not to condemn. Besides forgiving Semyonich sincerely, Aksionov is finally able to let go of everything; his heart does not hold for anything anymore. Aksionov has achieved a better thing in his life other than being free from jail. Peace is all over his heart and it can be said that Aksionov has just enter the Kingdom of God for he has nothing else in the world to desire. (Tolstoy, 1872: par. 68) It looks like a sad ending for Aksionov that he dies right after he forgives Semyonich. Yet, it truly is a happy ending for, eventually, Aksionov is able to have some peace in his heart, and the burden on his chest is carried away. He does not worry any longer since he is finally able to meet his God in purity.

Bill Puka in his article *The Golden Rule* consistently supports Tolstoy by stating that what Ivan has done is the form of "(loving) God *committedly*, then love thy neighbor as thyself, which raised the rule's status greatly." (Puka, 2010) Aksionov proves that to love God, he needs to act as God's will. And acting as God's willing can be done by forgiving and letting go. Aksionov does that and as a return, he discovers some peace at the end of his age. Tolstoy himself believes, by applying the idea of non-resistance, the Kingdom of God is not impossible to establish on earth.

Ivan the Fool (1885)

In this second short story, it is told that there lives a prosperous peasant who has three sons and one daughter.

The children are Simeon the soldier, Tarras Briukhan the merchant, Ivan the fool, and Milania the mute. These four children live in peace until Simeon and Tarras come to their father house and demand for their shares.

It seems that Tolstoy wanted to underline three social classes which roughly established the population in Russia in his time. The three social classes, which were popular during the reigns of Peter the Great and Catherine II, are described in Donald McKenzie Wallace's book *Russia*, as "... the merchants (kuptsi), the burghers in the narrower sense of the term (meshtchanye), and the artisans (tsekhoviye)." (Wallace, 1998) This circumstance resembles the characters in *Ivan the Fool* as follows: Simeon, the first son, as the burghers; Tarras Briukhan as the merchant; and Ivan the fool, as the artisan.

Simeon and Tarras-Briukhan are considered wealthy, but they are not grateful enough with what they have. On the other side, Ivan is the representation of the major population in Russia, which is peasant. While Milania, the only daughter, is portrayed as mute. This portrayal symbolizes the lack of woman's voice in the society during that time. Woman seems to have limited—or even the least opportunity to state her mind, especially when it comes to business or political issues. Woman is often portrayed as unequal to man. Even worse, woman's existence is sometimes denied in some cases.

In the beginning of the story, it is told that the old peasant's children live happily in their own estates and house. But Simeon, the soldier, does not feel satisfied with the wealth he has. His noble wife lives an extravagant life and that drains his wealth. One day, he comes over to his father's house and asks for one third of his father's wealth. His father does not grant his wish since Simeon does not help to collect the family possession. Simeon insists and makes his father leave the matter to Ivan's decision for Ivan is the one who works so hard for the family. Ivan then gives the share for Simeon without any hard feelings. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 1, par.7-9)

The same thing happens with Tarras-Briukhan, Ivan's another brother. Tarras also cannot satisfy his desires and always wants to have more and more. So he goes to his father, like Simeon previously did, and asks for his share. The old peasant's response is the same. He gives the decision to Ivan and Ivan grants Tarras' wish easily. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 1, par. 13-14)

Significant thing which can be seen from the first chapter of the story is that both Simeon and Tarras-Briukhan criticize Ivan for being fool and having small chance to get married to someone. For that reason, they think that Ivan does not deserve abundant possession since he will not have a family of his own to feed. This criticism is quite harsh, yet Ivan does not take it personally. In fact, Ivan does not seem to mind his brothers' harsh frankness. This scene resembles the verses in the Bible in Luke 12:13-34 about the Parable of the Rich Fool. These verses invite people to generosity without fear. Those verses invite people to share their possession with those who need it. It teaches people not

to be greedy and to help each other, for sharing with those who are in need will not make one poor. Ivan, in *Ivan the Fool*, apply this teaching. He helps his brothers even though they are both greedy and selfish. Ivan's figure is the antidote of his brothers' characters. He acts in opposite to his brothers' actions.

From the beginning of the story, Tolstoy started to point out the idea of not resisting evil. He inserted his thinking through Ivan's manner in dealing with the intimidating situation. Instead of criticizing them back, Ivan gives away two third of the family possession he has worked hard for to his brothers. He even gives it without any complaints and objections. This situation is also similar to verses in Luke 6:29-30.

The Bible suggests Christians to give whatever other people ask from them. This teaching points out the importance of being generous, even to those who mistreat them. (Holy Bible, 1984) Again, this moral teaching represents the idea of non-resistance by Tolstoy. Tolstoy wanted to tell his readers that one of the things someone can do to apply the idea of non-resistance is by being generous. In this case, Tolstoy inserted generosity inside Ivan's characteristic and this characteristic is quite consistent through out the story.

Ivan's generosity and sincerity prevent conflict inside his family and let them live in peace toward each other. This peaceful condition starts to irritate the Old Devil. He expects a quarrel between Ivan and his brothers but that does not happen. The Old Devil then summons his three Little Devils; plans to ruin the peace among them and put them in fights. From the depiction above, it is clear that Tolstoy wanted to emphasize that the devil's temptations to mislead mankind do exist. The devils will do anything to drive mankind committing sins.

The first Little Devil blows some pride and confidence inside Simeon. This pride and confidence brings him to Czar. He offers Czar "to conquer the whole world for him." (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 2, par. 11) Simeon thinks his army is strong enough to defeat the Viceroy of India, who is, apparently, helped by the Devil. The Czar entrusts Simeon with the commander-in-chief position to lead the invasion. Unfortunately he is defeated miserably. Simeon also losing his estate and almost losing his life for execution, if he does not run away toward his father's house for protection.

First of all, this depiction satirizes the Czars who concerned more on foreign political affairs such as territorial expansions through wars. An article entitled *A History of 19th and 20th Century of Russia* by Cathy Sam recorded that in early nineteenth century, Czar Alexander I (1802-1825) joined France to invade Napoleon. This invasion was won by the Russian and strengthened Russia's political position before the international political map. Unfortunately, the victory did not bring significant success inside the Russian people. The Russian people, who were mostly peasants, suffered from governmental and economical system inefficiency. This caused great instability inside the society. Moreover, the French Revolution which also happened in early 1800's worsened the condition. (Sam, 2008)

Back to the story, this depiction in the story shows that pride is the door of destruction. Simeon is too proud of himself but is betrayed by his own pride for his miserable loss in the battlefield. Simeon's failure in the warfare against the Indian ruler put him in a great trouble. He and his wife then run away to his father's house to escape the execution. His father allows him to stay if only Ivan allows him to stay. The same thing also happens to Tarras-Briukhan, Ivan's second brother.

The second Little Devil whispers greed to Tarras' ears. Soon, the greed turns him blinded. Tarras desires abundant amount of unimportant things and buys them all. Tarras spends all of the money he has to buy the goods. He even buys some things from borrowed money which eventually causes him great debt waiting to pay. This condition most probably satirizes the high-class society in Russia who spent their wealth to buy fancy clothes and accessories that made them stand-out among the major Russian peasants. The debt collectors start to force him to pay, but Tarras cannot pay the debt. He then comes to his father's house, also for protection, exactly like what Simeon has done. Tarras begs Ivan so Ivan may let him and his wife stay in the house. Ivan agrees his brother's request without much complaint, even when Simeon's and Tarras' wives ungratefully forbid Ivan to eat together with them in the dining room because of Ivan's ugly outfit and bad odor.

Instead of getting angry because of the treatments, Ivan does not mind them at all. Ivan chooses to leave and continue working. He does not seem to feel offended by his brothers' ungrateful attitudes toward him. This kind of insensitivity is a unique form of forgiving since Ivan does not hold any grudge at all for his brothers and their families. In fact, Ivan goes back to his work to provide his brothers' needs, such as building proper houses for them to live. This is a clear picture of 'returning good for evil.' Ivan builds houses for the selfish people who treat him unjustly and Ivan also provide their necessities regardless what they and their families have done to him. Once again, Ivan's generosity saves his family.

The first and the second Little Devils' successes are not followed by the third Little Devil. The third Little Devil has given up in putting Ivan down. He mourns for his failure as his two friends come over him. The third Little Devil makes Ivan get stomachache, hardens the soil for Ivan to plow, breaks the plow, and even allows his hands to get cut by Ivan's coulter for preventing Ivan to plow the land, yet Ivan refuses to give up and still continues working on the land. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 2, par. 15) This is a prove that Ivan, even though he is a fool, is a hard-working man. He refuses to give up achieving the goal he has set.

Somehow, Ivan catches the Little Devil and wants to kill him. But the devil begs for his mercy and asks Ivan to let him go. As a return, the devil gives Ivan a root to cure any disease, including his stomachache. Ivan takes the root and swallows it. Soon, his stomachache is cured. Ivan keeps his promise and let the devil go. He says: "Very well; you may go, and God bless you." As Ivan mentions the name of God, the Little Devil disappears

like a lightning beneath the earth and never returns. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 3, par. 14)

It is interesting to underline the fact that the little devils are supposed to make some troubles so that the three brothers will end up fighting. But, apparently, the little devil helps Ivan, in the end, to cure the stomachache he has caused. The little devil does that because he desperately wants to escape from Ivan. And again, Tolstoy wanted to emphasize the significance of Jesus' teaching as stated in Luke 6:27-28: ²⁷ "But I tell you who hear me: love your enemies. Do good to those who hate you, ²⁸ bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you." (Holy Bible: NIV, 1984) Ivan does them all. Ivan blesses the devil as he releases him. Yet, as his nature, the Little Devil runs in fright to hear Ivan mentions the name of God for him.

The third Little Devil runs for help from his comrades. The first little devil tries to find a way to fail Ivan but the first Little Devil is not as diligent as Ivan; he is not as hard-working as Ivan too. He fails to do his plan to rot everything since he falls asleep after he sets fire to warm himself up. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 4)

From this part of the story, Tolstoy presents a glimpse of evil's nature which is laziness. Instead of doing what he has planned, the little devil chooses to delay his plan for then falls asleep. Ivan notices the little devil existence when his pitchfork hits the devil's back. At first, Ivan exclaims in disgust to see another devil before him. He wants to kill him, as he wanted to do with the previous one, yet the little devil begs to set him free after giving Ivan a simple charm to create soldiers from straw. Again, as a fool, Ivan sets the first Little Devil free and blesses him. Hearing the name of God, the little devil blasts under the ground and never comes back. He flees as his comrade did.

Seeing his fellow-devils' failures, the second Little Devil comes to help as he has easily influenced Tarras. The second Little Devil finds Ivan cutting down the trees to build houses for his brothers. The little devil comes in Ivan's way and makes him exhausted. He is very happy as he thinks that Ivan will stop cutting down the trees. But then, Ivan stands up and strikes the tree very hard and succeeds to cut down the tree. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 6, par. 6) As the tree falls down, Ivan exclaims in disgust to find the second Little Devil on the tree. Just like his two other comrades, the last little devil begs for Ivan's mercy as Ivan wants to kills him. The devil gives Ivan the ability to turn the leaves of oak trees into pieces of gold. By the name of God, Ivan releases the Little Devil and all of them have failed miserably to tempt Ivan.

From the three Little Devils' efforts, it can be concluded that Ivan is very determined and will never give up on his misfortunes. Ivan keeps on trying and working hard to achieve the goals he has set, no matter how far he should go. His hard-working trait is really intriguing since none of the three little devils is able to beat Ivan's perseverance down. As a matter of fact, three of them end up giving Ivan things which will be useful later on.

Besides, the action of releasing the little devils is a symbolism of letting go other people's wrong doings. Instead of cursing and resisting what the devils do, Ivan chooses to give the little devils no harm and releases them by the name of God. Ivan blesses the little devils even though they have done bad things to him. This portrayal clearly resembles Tolstoy's idea of non-resistance. Tolstoy believes, instead of resisting evil, one should "love your enemy." This is what happens with Ivan when he knows what the devils try to do to him. He wants to destroy the devils, at first, but he does not do it and releases them all with compassion instead, moreover after he got useful things from the devils.

Through this story, other than being hard-worker, Tolstoy also highlighted the importance of fighting temptations. Tolstoy pointed out that the real way to resist evil is by resisting the temptations within human soul. Instead of physically fighting back the evil spirit (i.e. taking revenge), Tolstoy persuaded his readers to mentally fighting back the root of the temptations, which is inside human soul itself. By resisting the temptation, one will be able to control himself and will not be easily driven. By resisting the temptation, one will act selfless and will always think about his surroundings. If this kind of resistance can be done, no one will violate each other. Meaning, the harmony inside the society will be achieved and the Kingdom of God is not impossible to establish on earth.

Refusing to give up and keeping on trying are the antidotes of laziness. Ivan has proven it and he has succeeded. He refuses to give up and ruin his goals. His 'fool' nature brings him other amazing traits that save him from breakdown in the future. Ivan does not become tendentious since he is selfless. He does not think about himself like both of his brothers. Hatred and vengeance do not even exist in his life dictionary. He does everything with all of his heart and sincerity. These characteristics are the ones that both of his brothers have failed to achieve. Both of his brothers have given up on the devils' temptations. Simeon becomes proud and Tarras becomes greedy. Their pride and greed result the desire toward money and wealth; and the love of money are the roots of sin as stated in 1 Timothy 5:24.

Tolstoy was a realist. He tried to depict the characters inside his stories as plausible as possible. He really wanted to teach his reader through his stories so he used many of his stories to preach the people. This effort can be seen very easily through the characters inside his stories in general, and inside this particular story. Tolstoy wanted to warn his reader about the danger of being proud and greedy as stated in the Bible, in Proverbs 15: 27. It is said that ⁴²⁷ "A greedy man brings trouble to his family, but he who hates bribes will live." Also in and Proverbs 16: 5-6 that state: ⁴⁵ "The Lord detests all the proud of heart. ⁶ Be sure of this: They will not go unpunished." (Holy Bible: NIV, 1985)

Tolstoy also seemed to be an idealistic person since he inserted the Biblical message through Simeon and Tarras' characteristics. Tolstoy also 'punishes' Simeon and Tarras, at the end of the story, as the fulfillment of

the verses above. With proud and greed inside their hearts, Simeon and Tarras take much time to learn about being humble and selfless. Even worse, they have to learn those lessons in hard ways. The lessons do not end in their characteristics. Further, Tolstoy also portrayed other characteristics inside the society.

One day, Ivan holds a feast and invites his brothers. Yet, with their arrogance, they decline Ivan's invitation. Does not feel disappointed, Ivan then invites the whole peasants in the village. They enjoy the feast and drink alcoholic beverages. Now in this part, Tolstoy wanted to show the tendency of getting drunk inside the Russian society, at least during his time. As a matter of fact, vodka is one of Russian traditional beverages. Native Russians make their own vodka for daily consumption. But the tradition for producing massive amount of vodka has its bad effect. People tend to get drunk from vodka since vodka is daily consumption.

Realizing the tendency of getting drunk, Tolstoy inserted this phenomenon inside this story. In chapter six, it is told that "Ivan then gathered around him all the peasants in the village and with them drank beer until he became intoxicated." (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 6, par. 2) Tolstoy tried to portray the dark side of Ivan: he gets drunk and amuses himself to see people around him. Ivan turns pieces of wood into gold as the little devil has taught him. He throws the pieces of gold around him and people run to collect the gold. Tolstoy even portrayed that they "began to fight among themselves for the possession of the yellow objects, ... one old woman was nearly crushed to death." (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 6, par. 9) This portrayal shows how mundane possessions have easily become most people's center of attention.

Ivan laughs to see people fight for the gold as if he does not realize that the things he scatters are precious. From the scene, it can be seen clearly that Ivan does not have desire toward worldly possessions at all. His reaction is exactly the opposite from normal people's reaction. He sees the gold coins as nothing more than pieces of metal. Tolstoy put such a contrast situation inside this scene—Ivan with his naïve trait for throwing away the precious pieces of gold versus the people who fight over them, with the purpose of presenting a slice of reality from his era inside his story. If the pieces of gold are not enough, Ivan then produces marching soldiers from straw to entertain and to amaze the village.

The next day, Ivan's mysterious ability to produce the golden coins and the soldiers becomes the main topic of the conversations. Hearing the news, Simeon and Tarras are interested to use Ivan's power for their own benefits. Simeon comes over Ivan for the soldiers, while Tarras comes over him, of course, for the gold. As a matter of fact, Simeon and Tarras seem to 'wake' Ivan up and make him realize the fact that he can do merely anything with his soldiers and gold coins. Ivan is so surprised when his brothers tell him that. It is easily predicted that, eventually, Ivan gives his brothers what they want without thinking much for his own benefit. He even promises another 'service' for both of his brothers. (Tolstoy, 1885: Chapter 7, par. 10-18) This scenes show

how sincere Ivan is. He does not demand anything in return for every single thing he has done for other people, regardless the fact that those people are not grateful enough in receiving anything from him.

Unfortunately, Ivan does not keep his promise since he knows that both of his brothers violate people with their soldiers and gold coins. In this part, Tolstoy emphasized Ivan's caring nature. Ivan learns that Simeon uses his soldiers to conduct war and invade other kingdom and Tarras-Briukhan uses his gold ignorantly against the needy. Ivan cannot stand such meanness happens. This condition makes both of his brothers come to a conclusion. They will divide the soldiers and wealth into two and share them to each other. It can be said, then, that Ivan will never feel bad for giving his possessions to his brothers, as long as the possessions he gives away are not used to conduct malice or to burden other people.

One day, there is news that the Czar's daughter gets a disease which no one can cure. Hearing this, Ivan's parents persuade him to come to Czar and offer the root he has to cure the Czar's daughter. Ivan agrees immediately and arranges a journey to cure the Czar's daughter. However, right before he goes, a poor woman comes over him and asks for his kindness to cure her disease. Feeling pity for her, Ivan cures the woman with his root without prioritizing the Czar's daughter. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 8, par. 7-8) This depiction shows that Ivan treats everyone equally and he helps the one who comes first—or more helpless one. Ivan may get glorious reward if he refuses to help the poor woman and directly heads to the Czar's house, but his selfless trait erases that kind of thought from his mind. He helps the old woman instead. Ivan does those sincere actions with the least consideration of anything like reward or his own benefits.

Eventually, Ivan makes his journey to meet the Czar's daughter and manages to cure her. He then addresses Ivan as his son-in-law. Ivan inherits the Czar's palace and wealth and becomes the ruler of his people. It happens the same thing with his two brothers. Both of them finally overcome their own hardships and become rulers of their own kingdoms. These kingdoms depicted in the story are based on Russian Empire which consisted of small kingdoms ruled by princes and czars. Each kingdom had its own rules and regulations, even though they were all under the Russian Empire's flag.

Different from his brothers who really enjoy their current positions as rulers of their own people, Ivan feels empty and "lonely" as he becomes a king. Ivan leaves his royal robe and goes back to his farm. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 9, par. 3) Surrounded by wealth, Ivan does not feel any peace. He feels that something is missing from his life. He used to be a hard-working artisan, and sitting still as a king makes him unhappy. He does not feel secure as he does not need to work by his own hands to support his own life. At last, Ivan decides to abandon his royal robe and goes back to the field and becomes peasant as he used to do. Ivan chooses a simple life over a glamour life. This eccentric behavior of his results

controversy among the society. Those who consider themselves as 'wise people' leave the kingdom, while most of the people who are peasants remain in the kingdom. Ivan does not care for what people think about him and do behind his back. He really cherishes the present time and does his best to produce things. This traits makes Ivan's kingdom is fulfilled with peasants.

Through the depiction above, Tolstoy tried to put the idea of an ideal society through Ivan's kingdom. They live in simplicity yet prosperous life because everybody works hard to fulfill their necessities and helps other people generously. They do not have money to support their lives but the products they labor. They exchange goods and products as the result of the absence of money. In fact, the people in Ivan's kingdom does not seem to need money for without money, they still live in prosperity. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 9, par. 9) For the people in Ivan's kingdom, what matters is what is practically useful in daily life; goods and labor products are useful in daily life. From the explanation above, Tolstoy did not seem to be interested in wealth since he portrayed Ivan's kingdom as almost primitive society who do not know, or care in this particular case, about the presence of money.

Ivan's traits that refuses to live in luxury is in accordance to Tolstoy's private life. Gale Cengage supports the statement above by writing a statement in his article entitled *Tolstoy, Leo - Introduction*. He wrote that Tolstoy left his luxurious life and "devote himself to public service" and the like. (Cengage, 1999)

Tolstoy lived in a luxurious estate but he abandoned it. So does Ivan. He lives in a palace but he feels empty. He then takes off his imperial robe and goes back to farm. Tolstoy was from a respected family with high social class, but he chose to serve people around him, teach peasants' children and even live like one. So does Ivan. Ivan is the successor of a Czar, but he gives up that luxury and chooses to be part of his own people by being peasant. Tolstoy put the message of simplicity through Ivan and Ivan is the reflection of Tolstoy's own life.

From that scene, it can also be concluded that Tolstoy wanted his society to be morally restored by living in simplicity. He believed that living a simple life is one of the ways people can use to get closer to God. Worldly possessions can drift people away from God, since people tend to pay too much attention for their possessions and forget God. So, when one casts the love of money away, he will not have the desire to own worldly possessions, and will not have to worry about them. When one has no worry about their worldly possessions, of course, it will be easier for the person to focus on serving God and fulfilling God's commandments.

Getting tired of waiting the good results from the three Little Devils, the Old Devil plans to make his own move to make Ivan and both of his brothers fall apart. The Old Devil is so enraged to see each one of the brothers live peacefully in their own lives. The Old Devil does the same tricks to the three brothers as what the Little Devils did. He blows courage and pride to Simeon's

vein and grows greed to Tarras's heart. Both Simeon and Tarras fall into the same mistakes that bring them to their own ruin. Simeon and Tarras do not seem to learn from their mistakes and stop being proud and greedy. Power and wealth have blinded their eyes and deafened their ears so that they do not even remember how bad they were defeated by their own desires of worldly possessions. This scene symbolize how prone mankind is to the temptation of the evil spirit.

Having done tempting and ruining Simeon and Tarras-Bruikhan's lives, the Old Devil comes to Ivan kingdom and starts to persuade him to follow his mischievous path. At first, the Old Devil disguises himself as a General and suggests Ivan to strengthen his military service and tempts the people who willingly sign up for the position; first with vodka later with threats. Unfortunately both of them fail to make the people join the military service. Even, Ivan himself denies his support for the devil and grants his people's wish for not joining the military service, instead.

Seeing his first plan has failed, the Old Devil goes away from Ivan's kingdom and arranges a battle between Ivan's kingdom and Tarakanian kingdom. Tempted by the Old Devil, the Tarakanian ruler invaded Ivan's kingdom. But instead of resisting the attack and defending themselves, the people in Ivan's kingdom oddly offer hospitality to the Tarakanian soldiers. (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 11, par. 24)

This is strange since common logic that people have will provide resistance toward any attack that threatens their lives. Tolstoy was not tired of reminding his readers of being generous and loving their enemy as themselves. Even though this particular message about not-resisting the soldiers who seize the people's belongings is a hyperbole and not possible to be applied in real life, Tolstoy still highlighted the importance of not resisting evil. The people still show hospitality toward the soldiers. In result, many of the soldiers stop attacking the people and refuse to conduct any further invasion toward the people. This makes the Tarakanian ruler fail in achieving victory over Ivan's kingdom.

Having no success in military way, the Old Devil then disguises himself as a wealthy man who wants to teach Ivan and his people about what he calls "working with head." The Old Devil hires Ivan people to work with him and pay them with his golds. At first, the people are amused by the precious coins, but soon enough, when they have enough golds they refuse to work for the Old Devils. They do it because everybody in Ivan's kingdom has enough gold that no one wants to trade it with other things such as foods, grains, and other practical stuffs. The people in Ivan's kingdom do not realize the value of the gold since they earn things by their own hard-work or by trading their possessions with other people. They do not use golds as a mean of payment. They even treat it as nothing more than ornaments or toys.

The 'nobleman' soon becomes deserted since no one will accept his gold as an exchange for breads or fish for him to eat. The Old Devil who disguises himself as a nobleman does not work directly on the field to provide

his life. He does not do labor, he does not grow foods in the farm, he does not catch any fish, he does not want to ask for foods from people by the name of Jesus either. The Old Devil just relies on his gold to get anything he wants. The gold he formerly intended to crumble Ivan's kingdom has become a blunder for him.

In short, the people in Ivan's kingdom go toward him and tell him everything about the Old Devil. Ivan then decides to invite the Old Devil to a dinner. This is an interesting scene since there is a cultural thing which is applied inside Ivan's Kingdom. Milania, Ivan's mute sister, will prepare the meal for the people in his kingdom but let the ones who work the hardest take the first turn to eat, and the ones who works the least to get what is left. As a matter of fact, the Queen of the Kingdom agrees with what her sister in law does. She tells the Old Devil that he "must excuse (her) sister-in-law; she will not allow any one to sit at the table whose hands have not been hardened by toil, so (he) will have to wait until the dinner is over and then (he) can have what is left. With it (he) must be satisfied." (Tolstoy, 1885: chapter 12, par. 23) Regarding the statement above and other parts of the story, Tolstoy consistently urged his reader to be hard-workers. The message of hard-working dominates the story, even though there are other moral values in it.

Hearing what the Queen has said, the Old Devil is so enraged and says that the law is ridiculous. He then tells the people in Ivan's kingdom about 'working with head' instead of 'working with hands'. The Old Devil wants to tell the people that they should work smartly instead of work hard; they should use their brain and not their strength only. But as the nature of fools, the people in Ivan's kingdom do not understand what the Old Devil has said since what they understand is that they have to work hard for something they want to achieve.

At the end of the story, it is told that the Old Devil has failed to ruin Ivan's life and kingdom. He becomes weak because of hunger and falls from a balcony and hits his head on a pole. In short, Ivan soon finds out that the nobleman is another devil when the Old Devil disappears under the ground and leaves a dark hole on it. Since then, the people inside Ivan's kingdom live prosperously. In fact, Ivan feeds his two brothers and he still carries on the laws he has applied in his kingdom. Eventually, the people in Ivan's kingdom live happily ever after.

Again, the message of the story is clear. Tolstoy promoted the teaching of non-resistance through this story. Ivan never resists any evil deeds which are done to him. He returns the evil deeds with kindness and love, instead. He also never holds any grudge or any will to take revenge even though his brother has done wrong to him for multiple times. Tolstoy delivers the message that kindness will win over evil deeds. People cannot create peaceful environment when they resist evil with evil. Evil can only be stopped when people returning for evil. Tolstoy demonstrates the message through the condition of Ivan's kingdom at the end of this story. The people in Ivan's kingdom live happily ever after because they do not resist the Old Devil nor fight against him. Even so,

the Old Devil somehow surrenders to their 'foolishness' because of hunger and leaves them live in peace.

A Lost Opportunity (1889)

From all the stories which are discussed in this study, *A Lost Opportunity* may be special among all. It is due to the fact that this story is opened by the Bible verses, Matthew 8: 21-35. In general, the verses suggest Christians to forgive their enemies and do good deeds toward them. Unfortunately, it seems that Tolstoy wanted to present an ironic story line in delivering the message of the verses. The story line of *A Lost Opportunity* presents restless rivalry which ends up with great loss in both sides. Tolstoy wanted to teach his readers in a hard way. Instead of presenting the beauty of peace and harmony between each other, Tolstoy pointed out many unpleasant disadvantages one may get for treating other people badly.

Tolstoy started the story itself with the depiction of harmonious Russian peasant family. This was a normal depiction of Russian peasant family which is hardworking and family-oriented. Or apparently, this scene is the depiction of traditional Russian family Tolstoy dreamed of. Tolstoy showed up Ivan Scherbakoff's characteristics which is "prosperous, strong, and vigorous, and (is) considered the hardest worker in the whole village." (Tolstoy, 1889: par. 1) Ivan's family members are also depicted as hard workers and "intelligent and industrious." Again, as mentioned in this study earlier, Tolstoy wanted to point out the importance of being hard-worker. He put the value of earning things with one's own efforts and not relying on others in getting what one wants.

Scherbakoff's neighbor, named Gavryl, lives next door. Both of them do not seem to be good neighbors to each other. But the story says that they have lived quite peacefully since Scherbakoff's father and Gavryl's father were the heads of the households. Both families have their own necessities fulfilled, even when both Scherbakoff and Gavryl have their own lives and families. Neither of them feels hungry while the other one enjoy their content life. They support their own lives very well.

From the depiction above, it can be seen that Tolstoy created an image of perfect little families who live side by side in peace for a long time. It is quite hard to imagine that Ivan's family will fight over trivial matter—in this case, an egg, since they have sufficient lives. But that is how the story goes. Both families have their own trials and struggles to apply—or simply to understand by heart, the message of the Bible verses, Matthew 8:21-35; specifically, to understand the meaning of forgiving those who have done wrong to them and loving neighbors.

The conflict starts when Scherbakoff's daughter-in-law looks for her hen's egg in a yard, later to be known as Gavryl's yard. She asks about the egg to an old woman, possibly Gavryl's mother, whose answer really

enrages the young woman. Just in a second, a terrible quarrel happens. All women from both sides join and worsen the quarrelling. Each of them states their disappointments toward each other. And the quarrelling turns out to be a frightening fight between Scherbakoff and Gavryl. During the fight, Scherbakoff manages to tear out Gavryl's beard. But this confrontation is just the beginning of their suppressed rivalry.

From this part of the story, it can be seen that Tolstoy wanted to state that a huge fire can be lit up by the smallest spark. Severe conflict can be triggered by the slightest bad behavior. And a bad manner in answering simple question may end up in a regretful fight. Unfortunately, Tolstoy's depiction above is a realistic depiction of daily life that happened—and still happens, in many parts of Russia and the worldwide as well. It cannot be denied that such conflict is a common trigger of a bigger conflict happens in the whole world.

Yet, Tolstoy would not go away only with the image of reality during his era. He, unquestionably, put very strong sense of biblical values inside the story too. As a matter of fact, the biblical values are stated explicitly inside the story. The strong biblical values come from the old man in Scherbakoff's family, which is Scherbakoff's weak old father. He suggests his children and grandchildren "to return good for evil" and "show them how to speak better" when Gavryl's family members speak something bad about them. (Tolstoy, 1889: par. 39) These suggestions are definitely adopted from Luke 6:27-31 and Matthews 5:38-42. Those Bible verses strongly propose Christians to "return good for evil" by treating their enemies well instead of resisting them. This commandment is believed to be one of the ways to persuade evil people to come back to God's light without being one of their kinds. By not resisting what evil people do, it is expectedly that those evil people will realize that what they have done is wrong and will finally come to God's light on their own will.

The old man even warns them that the conflict may end up in regretful result if they chose to not be wise in dealing with it; like in paragraph 86. Unfortunately, considering their egocentric human nature, the suggestion is rejected by the members of the family. Even, the youngest member inside the family says that the old man is very old-fashioned for persuading them to not resist what Gavryl's family has done to them.

In short, the enmity between them two gets worse and worse each day. Even the youngest family members mock one another in offensive words only because they see their parents do the same things toward each other. Such activities soon become routine for years. As a result, the children do not see mocking and insulting other people as something illicit because no body inside their family tells them so. By that point, it is noticeable that Tolstoy also implemented the importance of basic education inside the family. Each one of them accuses one another and bring the matters before the *Mir* so that each of them can see either one punished. The *Mir* or known as village assembly is an official organization in every village in Russia. Every village has one village

assembly which deals with any matters among the villagers. The *Mir* is lead by respected elders inside the village, and the members are all of the heads of the families inside the village.

Unfortunately, even the *Mir* cannot stop Scherbakoff's and Gavryl's from becoming enemies. In contrary, it makes them hating each other even more. Gavryl is sentenced in such manner and the punishment enrages him. In other opportunity, Gavryl has Scherbakoff punished. It happens again and again toward each other. These punishments and fines do not leave their hatred alone. They act way worse toward each other. Both of them search for each other's mistake so each of them can see the other suffers from the sentence and punishment. They do whatever they can to have their neighbor punished. Tolstoy called their enmity as "mad dogs in their warfare." (Tolstoy, 1889: par. 52)

The judges in the law court try to reconcile them in such ways, but they do not seem to find a way to settle the matter in peace. Even the God's commandment to "love your neighbors as thyself" is disregarded. Rage blinds their eyes and hearts. All they want is nothing but to see either in a misery.

Scherbakoff's father does not tired of telling his sons to reconcile with their neighbors and preaches about what Jesus' teachings in dealing with those who mistreat them. For once he listens to his father's advice even though Scherbakoff still has no idea how to apply his father's suggestion. (Tolstoy, 1889: par. 81) But somehow, all of a sudden, Scherbakoff loses his intention to reconcile with Gavryl and let their enmity reach it's peak when Gavryl plans to take a vengeance for Scherbakoff by setting fire on his farmland.

Hearing this, Scherbakoff does not sit back. He guards his farmland one whole night and get himself ready for Gavryl's attack. He intentionally waits for Gavryl and finally he hears someone walks in his farmland. The darkness does not allow him to clearly see the person who set the fire, yet he is sure that the person is Gavryl. Instead of put out the small flame, Scherbakoff is blinded by his own desire to catch Gavryl up and beat him up. He pursues Gavryl and let the flame goes even bigger.

It can be said that the flame is the symbolism for their enmity. Gavryl sets the fire and Scherbakoff chooses to let the flame goes bigger instead of put it out. Gavryl's family starts the conflict and Scherbakoff's family makes it bigger. In this case, Tolstoy pointed out how anger, wrath, and hatred will destroy anything around them like the fire that consumes woods. Worse, the enmity between Scherbakoff's and Gavryl's families consumes their life for they enjoy nothing in life but seeing either in great misery.

Tolstoy portrayed the flame consuming the whole farmland and even other people's property. The flame grows beyond their capability to bare, so does their enmity. Almost half of the village is burnt to ashes. Both Scherbakoff and Gavryl barely save their belongings and possessions, and no one can stop the tragedy. The loss is so great that a lot of people have to suffer from grief

caused by the small conflict they have started. Neither of the two wins the conflict.

To see his family barely survives the fire, Scherbakoff finally learns a lesson that it is better to put out the small fire in the first place, instead of letting it grow stronger and make himself incapable of coping with the loss. Gavryl also seems to regret his action which causes great suffering, not only for his family but also for half of the village. Both Scherbakoff and Gavryl learn the lesson in a very hard way. Scherbakoff eventually weeps before his old father and admits his wrong doings. He chooses to not bring the case back to the law court. He does not betray Gavryl and let nobody knows who set the fire the night before. Since then, both families learn how to live peacefully side by side.

Judging from the story above, Tolstoy seemed to be a realistic person since he tried to portray everything the way it should be. Through this story, Tolstoy tried to portray realistic pictures of daily conflicts in the society and the way people should deal with them. So people can simply understand his non-resistance teaching. Tolstoy's basis of teaching, of course, is the Bible's verses from Sermon on the Mount which heavily points out the importance of establishing peace inside the society and "lov(ing) your neighbors as yourself."

Tolstoy's satire is relevant to the condition of Russia at that time. Russia in early seventeenth century was a great chaos, where Russian people could trust nobody. Possibly, Tolstoy also tried to point out his criticism through his story. Tolstoy apparently wanted to criticize the government for abandoning the state and put the people of Russia in great sorrow. The moral degradation inside the society happened because the Czar neglected the people. Disbelief became the basis of this conflict. They fought each other to defend their possession and to protect their belonging. People were afraid of losing their possessions because it was difficult to gain them. This kind of conflict should have been able to be prevented by the authority easily, if only the Czars had willingly spent more time in paying attention to his people instead of focusing his attention to international issues only.

After the Ball (1911)

Unlike other stories in this study, *After the Ball* shows the romantic side of Tolstoy. *After the Ball* tells a story of a man who falls in love with an elegant woman he knows in a party. His name is Ivan Vasilyevich and the woman he loves is Varenka B. The story begins with the speaker of the story telling the readers about his/her "respected friend" Ivan Vasilyevich. Being in the center of the attention, Ivan tells his love story to a crowd of young men in a small cafe.

Ivan begin with stating openly his deep admiration toward B. Ivan describes Varenka in great details as if he can still remember how beautiful the woman once was. It gives the readers an impression that Ivan once was deeply in love with the woman. Ivan also narrates how he seemed to lose his mind when love struck him. From the descriptions he states, it can be seen that young Ivan

Vasilyevich is a spiritfult and cheerful man who falls in love with a gay and a content woman too.

Yet, unlike young men who are currently listening to his story, Ivan expressed his admiration rather in an old-school way. Ivan does not see B as a property. He treats B with dignity, even when he had the chance to dance with her and could touch her waist. Ivan felt very overwhelmed as he got the chance. He could not even feel himself because of joy. When he was facing B, instead of thinking about sexual issues like young men most probably would do, Vasilyevich was busy with his own thoughts on his mind and joy that fulfilled his lungs. Ivan danced happily and then asked B to dance again after supper.

Up to this point, Tolstoy wanted to tell his readers that love is pure and not contaminated by lust. Love does not expose nudity, love appreciates the loved one as a whole person and beyond all, love is happiness. Vasilyevich does not think about sexual issues and physical attempts at all when he is close enough to reach B's waist. All that fills up Vasilyevich's mind is only the love itself, which is pure.

In the story, it is also described the figure of a colonel who is later known as B's father. The colonel's name is Pyotr Vladislavich. It shows that B's family is noble family. His father works for the state and has high position in the society. He is definitely respected and admired by other people for his social class. Vasilyevich himself is considered as a noble person since he is invited to the ball. That is the reason he dares to fall in love with B.

When the ball ends, Vasilyevich is still sunk in his own feeling and happiness. He even feels sorry for his younger brother for not knowing how he feels at that moment. Ivan cannot sleep because his mind is occupied by his own feelings and happiness. Vasilyevich then decides to take a walk around and he accidentally hears a military music is being played in the city hall, even before the sun rises. He comes closer and asks a blacksmith what is happening at that moment. The blacksmith tells him that the soldiers are punishing Tartar tribes who are caught up while trying to flee from Russia.

This scene is directing to the conflict between Russian Empire and Tartar tribe which refused to be Russified. Tartar tribe was a Muslim tribe who insisted to hold strongly on their faith, Islam, and refused to be baptized as Christian. On that era, the Czar had this obsession to Russify his motherland and made the people bowed down on Russian tradition and culture, including religion which was controlled by the Eastern Orthodox Church. Through the church, the Czar had the full control over his people. So, differences and diversity would definitely ruin the Czar's control over the people. This is why the Czar wanted to Russify the entire state and empire under his power.

The scene where Tartar people are punished in this story is Tolstoy's way in portraying the brutality during the Russification era. The Tartar people are punished because they refused to be Russified and to give up their current belief system, Islam. They get severe lashes on their back only because they are different. In the middle

of the execution, Vasilyevich sees familiar face among the crowd. Ivan soon realize that the cold-faced man who torture the Tartar people ruthlessly is the same respected colonel he met in the ball. The man is B's father whom Ivan sees as a warm-hearted and kind person during the ball. Yet, Vasilyevich's impression is proven wrong by that night's happening.

Not only destroying Vasilyevich's impression toward Pyotr Vladislavich, the happening and Pyotr's cruelty destroy Vasilyevich's happiness and vivid feeling that night. Vasilyevich is trembled in nerve as he walks back to his house. It can be assumed that he feels ashamed, sorry, angry, sad, and shocked all at once, after seeing the happening.

Tolstoy put the message of love toward each other not only through Vasilyevich's feeling toward B, but also, sadly and oppositely, through the merciless colonel. Pyotr does not have mercy toward the Tartar people which means the exact opposite of loving others as loving oneself. Pyotr does not have such feeling while Ivan is deeply in love with his daughter. That is such an irony of love.

Besides, torturing ruthlessly the Tartar people shows that Pyotr is surely not a forgiving person, at least as a colonel. He cold-heartedly punishes the Tartar people in public and does not seem to be affected by the brutal scene he is doing. The Tartar people are not even guilty for a real crime, such as stealing or murdering. They are guilty because they share different belief. They are guilty because they defend what they believe. They are guilty because the state says so. Such manner is a manner without dignity and that is the exact opposite to what Pyotr showed during the ball.

But, instead of judging the colonel negatively, Vasilyevich choses to contemplate and says that the colonel must have a strong reason behind his action. He just does not have any idea of his motive, for if he does, he will be able to tolerate the colonel's action toward the Tartar tribe. Further, Vasilyevich starts to limit his intensity of meeting B for seeing B's face always reminds him of Pyotr's cold-face as he torture the Tartar people that night. Vasilyevich cannot accept such treatment to mankind. He gradually avoid B until he completely stops meeting her. His action symbolizes that people must let go off things that is not good so that bad deeds will not contaminate their heart.

How Leo Tolstoy's Idea of Morality is Used to Criticize the Russian Society of His Time.

Since Historical - Biographical approach is used to analyze Leo Tolstoy literary works, it is important to take a look closer to Leo Tolstoy's personal life and times. Tolstoy was born by the name Leo Nikolaivich Tolstoy on August 28, 1828 at Yasnaya Polyana, the Volkonsky manor house on the road to Kieff in Russia. He was born in honored family in Russia. Her mother is Princess Marie Volkonsky and her father is Count Nicolas Tolstoy.

Ilya Tolstoy states how his father loved his parents so much. Through Ilya Tolstoy's memory about his

father, Leo Tolstoy indirectly had taught him and his other siblings about basic love and affection which is provided inside the family. It is no wonder then, that the character of Ivan in *Ivan the Fool* resembles Tolstoy's own character as a kind and loving person who will not hurt people or take advantage from them. This is one of clear portray one of Tolstoy's ideas of morality in his literary works.

Tolstoy's journey to France radically changed his religious point of view. Young Tolstoy was familiar to debauchery and evil deeds. Yet, his journey changed him into someone who was the opposite to he once had been. Tolstoy, then, went back to Russia after the death of his brother. He stayed in his family estate and started to devote himself in learning Christianity. He dedicated his time to teach peasants' children and to read the whole Bible. The more Tolstoy spent his time learning the Bible, the more empty he felt inside himself.

Through the long process of finding the true relationship between mankind and God, Tolstoy realized that the Greek Orthodox Church in his country, Russia, was altered far from the main teachings in Christianity. The Church did not teach what Jesus had taught the believers. In his book, *What I Believe*, Tolstoy clearly stated that the Greek Orthodox Church in his country was far deviated from the teaching of Christianity. He regretted the permissive action taken by the church at that time toward crimes and debaucheries. (Tolstoy, 1886: 2) This condition happened because the church was bound to the command of the Czars, instead. The Czars, whose main focus was expanding the country's area and power, used the power of the church to control the people. Through the church, the Czars could control the people by infiltrating their man-made laws into the Church's teachings and preachings that, certainly, had great advantages for their interests and businesses. The words of the Czars became the teaching of the church. As the results, the main teaching of Christianity, which Tolstoy summarized in Sermon on the Mount, were forsaken and the Russian society in his time became demoralized.

For this reason, too, Tolstoy condemned the Church and demanded the separation of the church from the state. Tolstoy did not believe in laws that were made by men. He even confronted any kind of man-made laws and institutions established by the state. Further, he claimed that the only law mankind should apply in order to achieve harmony was the Divine Law, which is the Gospels. According to Tolstoy, the Bible, in general, and the Sermon on the Mount, in particular, is the ultimate law to follow. Hence, there is no need for men to follow laws made by other men, since laws made by other men tend to be corrupted. (Tolstoy, 1886: 6) He also argued that most of the laws in his country which were made and regulated by men, "were not only contrary to (Jesus') commandment (of not resisting evil), but in direct opposition to the whole doctrine of Christ". (Tolstoy, 1886: 9) Tolstoy believed that when people live by Jesus' teachings and by the Gospels, the man-made laws would not exist, for Jesus taught his followers to love and do good deeds to people only. And to express that thought,

Tolstoy implemented his idea in many of his writings, especially those which are used in this study. He heavily highlighted the moral values in Christianity which urge to establish the Kingdom of God by forgiving and loving each other. Tolstoy wanted to bring back the true messages of Christianity.

To support the statement above, an article entitled *Russia: A Country Study* which was published in 1996 by the Library of Congress, Washington, states that Russian literature in the nineteenth century was a realistic picture of the society in that time; in all aspect of life. (Curtis, 1996) It clearly indicates that Tolstoy's works, which were written during the nineteenth century, were the representations of current condition of Russian society at that time. Tolstoy put realistic pictures of Russian society as a form of protest for the Church. Tolstoy had great ability in capturing what he had been through and put his analysis, thinking and ideas into his works. He can also be classified as a realist since all of his writings clearly expose real condition of his time with the intention to criticize or satirize the current situation that time. Peter the Great era dominated his works.

Tolstoy also claimed, in his book *Confession*, that as "artist and poet, (he) wrote and taught without (himself) knowing what." (Tolstoy, 1884: 6) Tolstoy admitted that through his writings, he spread his vision, among the Russian society, about purifying Christianity, turning to God, and fulfilling God's commandments. Other than spreading his religious views and visions, Tolstoy's writings were also forms of indirect invitation for the Russian society to participate in actualizing those visions of his. Tolstoy felt that the Greek Orthodox Church needed to reform its teaching, since the Church did not teach the values of Christianity and Jesus' teachings accordingly. The Church was under the control of the Czars and no longer represented the core teaching of Christianity.

Tolstoy himself, through a book entitled *Tolstoy*, written by Janko Lavrin claimed that Christianity, which was taught by the Greek Orthodox Church, was no longer the religion of Christianity. Christianity in Russia was infiltrated by what he called as 'dogmatism and mysticism.' Tolstoy consider that the deviation made by the Church transformed Christianity in Russia to be another religion; a religion which no longer held the values of Christianity. And for that reason, Tolstoy thought that he needed to purify the teaching of Christianity which focuses on practicing good deeds in real life between people and people; not only religious doctrines from the church to its followers. (Lavrin, 1946: 93)

Whether or not Tolstoy mocked the Church, he had a clear point that he wanted to take the teachings of Christianity back to its essence. Among the Russian society in his era, Tolstoy wanted to restore the main teaching of Christianity which is establishing the Kingdom of God on earth. Further, still in Lavrin's book, Tolstoy also emphasized the importance of obeying Jesus' teachings. He said: "the whole Christ's teaching consists in giving the Kingdom of God, i.e., peace to man

... Men need only trust in Christ's teaching and obey it, and there will be peace on earth." (Lavrin, 1946: 101) Tolstoy strongly urged the society to not only believe in Jesus, but also to do his teachings: providing peace on earth. It means that Christianity is not only the religion of doctrines, but also the religion of daily practices. Tolstoy underlined the importance of doing Jesus' teachings and fulfilling the God's commandments, in order to achieve the establishment of Kingdom of God on earth.

Those God's commandments, as Tolstoy believed, were summarized in Sermon on the Mount. He claimed that Jesus explicitly taught people to not resist evil and to love each other sincerely through the verses. The teaching of not resisting-evil is later well-known as the concept of zero-resistance which was incessantly promoted by Tolstoy in accordance to his endeavor to purify Christianity.

Despite his strong faith over Christianity and Jesus' teachings, apparently, Tolstoy did not believe in Jesus' divinity. The concept of Trinity also confused him. He wrote in his personal diaries "that the God who created the world in six days and who sent His son, and also His son himself, are not God, but that God is the one existing, incomparable good(.)" (Tolstoy, 1917: 461) He strongly objected the idea that Jesus is god and/or the son of god. The statement above implied that Jesus was only human who was sent on earth to fix mankind's morality. Jesus was only a human who gave his fellow-mankind clear examples of how to restore oneself to God only, and how to establish the Kingdom of God on earth by doing good things. He claimed that whoever believes in God is the son of God, not literally, but metaphorically. The son of God, in this case, does not mean that a man can inherit God's divine characteristics. Instead, a man can only be considered as a devoted believer and an obedient follower of God; like a son who is obedient toward his father. The explanation above means that anybody can be like Jesus, in fulfilling God's commandments, as a true believer and an obedient follower of God.

In advance, Tolstoy also wrote in his first diary that he only believed in infinite being who lives eternally and gives compensations for all of mankind's deeds on earth. He did not believe that Jesus' sacrifice during Crucifixion is the salvation for mankind. Tolstoy believed that one can enter the Kingdom of God, not only by having faith toward God, but also by doing good deeds toward each other. However, he did not refuse the belief of his ancestors, which is basically Jesus' teachings. (Tolstoy, 1917: 162)

Therefore, Tolstoy decided to have a full commitment and dedicate his life to live like Jesus. But, living like Jesus means total submission to God, leaving all mundane matters behind, and serving people for the rest of his life. He even wrote in his book the importance of living in simplicity as taught by Jesus in the Bible. He claimed that "Christ says to His disciples, 'Be poor, be ready to bear persecution, suffering, and even death, without resisting evil.' He prepared for suffering and death Himself without resisting evil(.)" (Tolstoy, 1886: 4) For that very reason, Seclusion became Tolstoy's final

decision for the rest of his life, especially when the Orthodox Church excommunicated him for his idea and thinking about the Christianity, in general, and the Orthodox Church in Russia, in particular.

Besides, distrust toward the laws of men in his country was also the reason he became an anarchist. He did not trust men to be the judges of the world. Tolstoy refused to be bound to any law other than the Bible and Jesus' teachings, even though the highest law in his country, during his time, was the Church under the control of the Czars. He had seen too many unjust acts, debauchery, and many other violence around him, which were done and/or permitted by the State. The power and control over the people gave the Czars many advantages to add, cut, alter, or even change the teaching of the Bible to suit their businesses or matters. The teaching of the Bible was no longer pure. So, Tolstoy abandoned all of his worldly life, including his wealth and family, in the search of the true meaning of life according to the values of Christianity.

Even though Tolstoy alienated himself from the world around him and devoted his life to achieve perfection of relationship with God, his writings, stories and ideas still inspired his followers. Tolstoy must have failed to reform the teaching of the Greek Orthodox Church in his country during his life, but a decade later, a revolution which was heavily influenced by his idea, zero-resistance, took place. This is a prove that, through his writings, Tolstoy intended to restore the Church from transgressions, to bring Christianity back to its essence, and to invite people to live by it: to live by Jesus' teachings. By all means, he did it; Tolstoy succeeded to open up people's minds and move Russian people to make a revolution.

Thank You

Thank you for Mr. Drs. Much. Khoiri, M.Si., for assisting, advising and supervising the study; for Mr. John Vincen for the interviews and detailed explanations about Christianity; also for those who had helped the study.

CONCLUSION

From the explanations above, it can be concluded that each story in this study consists of Tolstoy's idea of morality which is originated from the Bible and Jesus' teachings. It can be seen that the stories used in this study share some unique similarities. The first unique similarity is the using of the same name, which is Ivan, as the name of the main characters inside all short stories used in this study. The second unique similarity is the fact that all of the stories used in this study also share, more or less, the same main moral values. There are six main moral values which Tolstoy implemented inside the stories. Those six main moral values are concluded as forgiving, letting go, hard-working, generosity, sincerity, and simplicity. The third unique similarity in the stories is the fact that each main character from each story has internal conflict between good and evil. In the end, Tolstoy portrayed that goodness would always win over evil, or at least,

goodness has its own way to reveal itself.

In answering the second statement of problem, Tolstoy's works used in this study are, more or less, the pictures of Russian society in his time. Tolstoy used his stories as the examples as well as an invitation for Russian society to return to God and to fulfill God's commandments. Tolstoy devoted himself to read and to learn the whole Bible, especially the Sermon on the Mount that inspired him to 'purify' Christianity among his society. Tolstoy believed that the Greek Orthodox Church, which was fully controlled by the Czars, was altered far from the actual Jesus' teachings. The Church did not teach its believers to love others, to be non-judgmental, or to forgive and to love one's enemy. The Church, indirectly, suggested the people to do otherwise, since the state had full control over the Orthodox Church under the Czars' reign.

As their nature, the Czars wanted to expand their territories, to have control over their people, and more, to be the ruler as well as the gods on their own lands. As a result, the laws and the rules made by the Czars were often against humanity and the Divine Law. In fact, harming and executing the innocents, to expand their territories, etc., did not seem to be sins anymore. The Czars acted like gods because they had full control over the Church and anything that was related to religious matters. Unfortunately, the condition of the Russian society, which was mostly poor and uneducated peasants, was not improved. They were oppressed by the authority for ages, and it resulted revolt within Russian body.

These conditions were the reasons why Tolstoy eventually decided to do seclusion and became anarchist. He protested the church and wished that the church would be separated from the state, so that the church could teach the believers about Jesus' teachings, not what the Czars told them to. Tolstoy directly opposed the Church's authority and teachings, and caused himself to be exiled by the church. But Tolstoy did not give up on purifying Jesus' teachings. He kept inviting people to be submissive to God and to fulfill Jesus' teachings. He summed up his teaching into zero-resistance concept as his idea of morality, and to establish the Kingdom of God on earth.

Tolstoy's works used in this study are also forms of hope that peace and the Kingdom of God are not impossible to establish on earth, or in Russia particularly, if the society apply Jesus' teachings in their daily lives. Through his writings and literary works, Tolstoy emphasized the importance of fulfilling God's commandments through Jesus' teachings, especially the Sermon on the Mount as the heart of the Bible and the core of moral values in Christianity. He taught people and invited people to be good and devoted Christians. Through his writings and literary works, too, Tolstoy successfully gather Tolstoyans all over Russia which ignited the revolution movement in Russia a decade later.

REFERENCES

Ade, Isaac Olaofe and Oyeniyi Okunoye. 2008. *Eng 111*:

An introduction to literature and Literary Criticism. Victoria Island: National Open University of Nigeria.

Alexander, Archibald B. D. 2007. *Project Gutenberg's: Christianity and Ethics A Handbook of Christian Ethics*. Gutenberg.net

Anscombe, G. M. Elisabeth. 1958. *Modern Moral Philosophy*. *Philosophy* 33, 1-16.

Apitzsch, Ursula & Irini Siouti. 2007. *Biographical Analysis as an Interdisciplinary Research Perspective in the Field of Migration Studies*. Frankfurt: Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universitat

Baring, Maurice. 2010. *Project Gutenberg's: An Outline of Russian Literature*. London: William and Norgate. Gutenberg.net

Benedict, Ruth. 1934. *Patterns of Culture*.

Bennet, A. and N. Royle. 2004. *An Introduction of Literature, Criticism, and Theory* (3rd Edition ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Besant, Annie. 2005. *Project Gutenberg's: The Basis of Morality*. Jonathan Ingram, David Garcia and the Online Distributed Proofreading Team. Gutenberg.net

Chippendale, Paul. 2001. *On Values, Ethics, Moral, and Principles*.

Curtis, Glenn E. (Ed.). 1996. *Russia: A Country Study*. Washington: GPO for the Library of Congress. Retrieved: -- 17 October 2012 8.17 p.m. <http://countrystudies.us/russia/43.htm>

Fergusson, William. 24 Nov 2003. *Biography: Leo Tolstoy (Russia, 1828-1910)*. Historical Boys' Clothing. Retrieved 22 Sept, 2012 from <http://histclo.com/bio/t/bio-tol.html>

Foster, TM. 24 Aug, 2007. *Overview of Literary Criticism: Ideas on How to Find Topics for Your Research Paper*. YahooVoices. Retrieved 10 Feb, 2013 from <http://voices.yahoo.com/overview-literary-criticism-ideas-find-503962.html>

Gammel, Stefan. no year. *Ethics and Morality*. Technical University Darmstadt

Garipey, Jennifer (Ed.). 1999. *Tolstoy, Leo - Introduction*. Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism. Vol. 79. Gale Cengage, 1999. eNotes.com. Retrieved 13 Oct, 2012 from <http://www.enotes.com/leo-tolstoy-criticism/tolstoy-leo/introduction>

Gillenwater, Reanne. 5 Oct, 2006. *Russian Social and Politic Life of the 1800's*. Yahoo Voices. Retrieved: 17 Oct, 2012 from <http://voices.yahoo.com/russian-social-political-life-1800s-87588.html>

Gitelson, Celia. *Biography, American History through Literature*. Janet Gabler-Hover and Robert Sattelmeyer (Ed.). Vol. 1. Gale Cengage. 2006. eNotes. Retrieved 22 Oct, 2012 from <http://www.enotes.com/biography-reference/>

- Guseinov, Abdusalam A. 2006. *Tolstoy's Theory of non-Violence*. Philosophynow. Retrieved Feb 9, 2013 from http://philosophynow.org/issues/54/Tolstoys_Theory_of_Nonviolence>
- Haarman, Susan. no year. *Absolute Terror: Ivan the Terrible*. Retrieved 26 Sep, 2013 from academic.mu.edu/meissnerd/ivan-terrible.htm
- Hornby, A.S. Gatenby, E.V., and H. Wakefield. 1962. *Oxford: The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English (2nd Edition ed.)*. London: Oxford University Press.
- International Bible Society. 1984. *Holy Bible: New International Version*. Michigan: The Zondervan Corporation
- Jones, Roger. 24 Sept, 2012. *Moral Philosophy*. Philosopher. Retrieved 10 Feb, 2013 from <http://www.philosopher.org.uk/moral.htm>
- Lavrin, Janko. 1946. *Tolstoy*. New York: McMillan Co.
- Lewis, Peter. 3 May, 2012. *Domestic war and very little peace: Tolstoy's youthful debauchery horrified his wife - and their marriage became pure murder*. Mail Online. Retrieved: 20 October, 2012 from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/home/books/article-2139065/Domestic-war-little-peace-Tolstoys-youthful-debauchery-horrified-wife--marriage-pure-murder-TOLSTOY-BY-A-N-WILSON.html>
- Liukkonen, Petri & Pessonon, Ari. 2008. *Lev Tolstoy - in full Lev Nikolayevich, Count Tolstoy*. Kirjasto.sci.fi. Retrieved 23 Sep, 2012 from <http://www.kirjasto.sci.fi/ltolstoi.htm>
- Maritain, J. no year. *Moral Philosophy*. Touro Institute.
- No author. 2008. *Leo Tolstoy's Biography*. Lev-Tolstoy. Retrieved: 23 Sept, 2012 from <http://www.lev-tolstoy.com/tolstoy-biography.php>
- No author. 2012. *Leo Tolstoy*. Biography. Retrieved Sep 22, 2012 from <http://www.biography.com/people/leo-tolstoy-9508518>
- No author. 2012. *Leo Tolstoy Biography*. Lifestyle. Retrieved: 13 Oct, 2012 from <http://lifestyle.iloveindia.com/lounge/leo-tolstoy-biography-10775.html>
- No author. 2013. *European Missionaries and the Spread of Christianity, 1500-1750*. California: TCI Mountain View. Teacher's Curriculum Institute. Retrieved 24 March 2013 from <http://teachergenius.teachoci.com/european-missionaries-and-the-spread-of-christianity-1500-1750/>
- No author. 3 Jan, 2011. Barry, Ellen & Kishkovsky, Sophia. *For Tolstoy and Russia, Still No Happy Ending*. NY Times. Retrieved 20 Oct, 2012 from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/04/books/04tolstoy.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- No author. 13 Oct, 2012. *Biography of Leo Tolstoy | List of Works, Study Guides & Essays*. Grade Saver. Retrieved 13 Oct, 2012 from <http://www.gradesaver.com/author/leo-tolstoy/>
- No author. no year. *A History of Russia 19th Century*. History World. Retrieved 10 Feb, 2012 from <http://www.historyworld.net/wrldhis/PlainTextHistorie.s.asp?groupid=2389&HistoryID=ac14>rack=pthc>
- No author. no Year. *All about Russia*. Tripod. Retrieved 17 Oct, 2012 from <http://khorkina.tripod.com/russia.htm>
- No author. no year. *Prominent Russians: Ivan III the Great*. Russiapedia. Retrieved 26 Sep, 2013 from www.russiapedia.com/prominent-russians/the-ryurikovich-dynasty/ivan-iii-the-great/
- Nurijand, Joseph. 29 Dec, 2007. *19th Century Russia*. Socyberty. Retrieved 10 Feb, 2013 from <http://socyberty.com/history/19th-century-russia/>
- Puka, Bill. 16 Sept, 2010. *The Golden Rule*. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Retrieved 10 Feb, 2013 from <http://www.iep.utm.edu/goldrule/>
- Rachles, J. 2003. *The Elements of Moral Philosophy (4th Edition ed.)*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Company, Inc.
- Retnaningdyah, Pratiwi. 2010. Reading V Lecture
- Ries, Nancy. no year. *Cultures of Russia*. Every Culture. Retrieved 18 Oct, 2012 from <http://www.everyculture.com/No-Sa/Russia.html>
- Roberts & Jacobs. no year. *Literature: An Introduction to Reading and Writing*. People. Retrieved 19 Oct, 2012 from <http://people.sinclair.edu/maryclifford/literature/literature.pdf>
- Sam, Cathy. 7 May, 2008. *A History of 19th and 20th Century of Russia*. Wetpaint.com. Retrieved 10 Feb, 2012 from <http://russianmodernism.wetpaint.com/page/A+History+of+19th+and+20th+Century+Russia>
- Scaruffi, Piero. 1999. *A Time-line of Russia*. Scaruffi. Retrieved 8 Jan, 2013 from <http://www.scaruffi.com/politics/russians.html>
- Susanto, Dwi. 2012. *Pengantar Teori Sastra*. Yogyakarta: CAPS
- Tolstoy, Ilya. 1997. *Project Gutenberg's: Reminiscence of Leo Tolstoy by His Son, Count Ilya Tolstoy*. Translated: George Calderon. Omaha: Judith Boss. Gutenberg.net
- Tolstoy, Leo. 1983. *Confession*. Translated: David Patterson. New York: WW. Norton & Company
- Tolstoy, Leo. 1886. *What I Believe*. Translated: Constantine Popoff. New York: William S. Gottsberger Publisher

Townsend, James. 1998. *Grace in the Arts: The Theology of Leo Tolstoy*. Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society 11, 20. Elgin, IL: Cook Communications. Faith Alone. Retrieved 30 March 2013 from <http://www.faithalone.org/journal/1998i/townsend.htm>
1/

Vincen, John. 2012. Interview



UNESA
Universitas Negeri Surabaya