ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

A mysterious printing error caused pages 174 and 246 to be deleted in volume 17, number 2 (Summer 1983). The missing pages are reproduced below in their entirety:

page 174:

...Finally, N. M. Baranov, having left the navy, had lost some of his influence. Although Baranov had found positions of considerable status open to him—first as a special agent of the Ministry of Internal Affairs abroad and then as governor of Kovno Guberniya, he had lost some of his clout as a naval critic. Even the tsarevich dismissed one of Baranov's latest projects for a cruiser war against England on behalf of Greek interests as "insane." Furthermore, the State Council found funds for expanded naval construction, thus ending the stagnation that had affected shipbuilding since the end of the war. That part of the Naval Ministry's budget crossed the ten-million ruble threshold for the first time.

All this changed when I. I. Grinev's bomb exploded at the feet of Alexander II on 1 March. The grand duke's critics assembled around the new tsar, Alexander III. One of the new emperor's first acts was to bring Baranov back from Kovno to take charge of the capital's security as Gradonachal'nik of St. Petersburg. During the panic and confusion that gripped the government following the assassination, conservative figures, particularly Pobedonostsev, repeated charges that the grand duke was involved in the terrorists' conspiracies. The arrest of the grand duke's unstable son, Nikolai, stimulated more rumors about the Marble Palace's ties to the People's Will.

Konstantin Nikolaevich found himself in an impossible situation. Griefstricken at his brother's death and conscious of the deep hostility toward him at the Anichkov Palace, his first instincts were to retire from service. On 20 March he shared these sentiments with E. A. Peretts. Peretts, like many others, suggested that the grand duke only consider resigning from the Naval Ministry but remain in the State Council, where his services were still needed and appreciated. On the same day D. A. Miliutin wrote in his journal that Konstantin Nikolaevich had already resigned. But this judgment was premature. On reflection, the grand duke could not bring himself to leave the navy. As he told Peretts, "I am too intimately linked to the navy." If he could not continue to serve in that post which his father, Nicholas I, had made his destiny fifty years before, he would retire completely from state service. He told Peretts that he dreaded the idea of going to Kronstadt as a private person.
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He masters all the literatures of the world; he understands each of them to the point
that he reflects it in his poetry, but so that the very spirit, the very innermost secrets
of foreign peculiarities pass into his poetry, as though he were himself an Englishman,
a Spaniard, a Muslim, or a citizen of the ancient world. . . . It is this, perhaps, that is
the principal peculiarity of the Russian idea.57

Pushkin appeared on all the lists that Dostoevskii made of great Russian writers. (Tur-
geniev disappeared from the lists after their quarrel.) In his 1877 eulogy of Nekrasov, he
quoted Gogol' on Pushkin and represented Pushkin as a sort of populist, who:

*found the great and longed-for way for us Russians and pointed it out.* This way was
nationality, bowing before the truth of the Russian people.58 “Pushkin was a great,
an extraordinary, phenomenon.” Pushkin was “not only a Russian man, but even the
first Russian man. . . .” He understood the Russian people and comprehended its pur-
pose in more depth and breadth than anyone else ever did . . . he bore witness to the
universal humanity and inclusiveness of the Russian spirit and thus, as it were, also
proclaimed the future destiny of Russia’s genius among the whole of humanity, as a
principle that unites, reconciles, and regenerates everything within itself. . . . Push-
kin’s love for the Russian people . . . was an all-embracing love, a love such as no one
displayed before him . . . He bowed before the people’s truth, he acknowledged the
people’s truth as his truth. . . . If Pushkin had lived longer, he would have left us ar-
tistic treasures for understanding the people that by his influence would certainly
have shortened the time of our whole intelligentsia—which up to the present day
raises itself so much above the people in the pride of its Europeanism—to the people’s
truth, the people’s strength and consciousness of the people’s destiny. . . . Pushkin,
by the breadth and depth of his Russian genius, is to this day like a sun over the
whole world-view of our intelligentsia.59

“The people’s truth” was, of course, Russian Orthodoxy. By this time, Dostoevskii
had in his major novels diagnosed the “superfluous man’s” restless search for ultimate
truth as a displacement of his repressed spiritual yearnings. His prescription for the intel-
ligentsia’s ills was conversion to the religion of the people. Summarizing his view of his
native literary tradition, Dostoevskii wrote in 1876 that Russian literature “ahead of our
whole intelligentsia—note this—bowed before the truth of our people and recognized the
people’s

57. Ibid., XIX, 114-15.
58. Ibid., XIX, 103; Dostoevskii, Khudozhestvennye proizvedeniia, XIII, 240, 285.
59. Dostoevskii, Khudozhestvennye proizvedeniia, XII, 350-54.