

Is Thomas Mann Half the Man of Leo Tolstoy?

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

September 11, 2024

Leo Tolstoy and Thomas Mann are two literary giants whose works have shaped the intellectual and moral landscape of their respective eras. However, the question of whether Mann can be considered "half the man" of Tolstoy, as posed in this paper's title, delves into more than a comparison of their literary accomplishments. It challenges readers to consider the fullness of each writer's engagement with life's profound moral and existential questions. Tolstoy's radical personal transformation, his rejection of wealth and power, and his commitment to Christian pacifism offered him a holistic worldview that combined spiritual conviction with social critique. Mann, in contrast, embraced the ambiguities of modernity, offering intellectual and philosophical reflections on the complexities of human life without the moral or religious certainty that defined Tolstoy's later years. This paper explores how these differences shaped their perspectives on art, morality, and society, ultimately questioning whether Tolstoy's spiritual and moral rigor makes him a "fuller" figure compared to Mann's more secular and intellectual approach.

Keywords: Leo Tolstoy, Thomas Mann, moral transformation, secular humanism, Christian pacifism, art and morality, intellectualism, religious conviction, literary comparison, societal critique.

I. Introduction

A. Provocative Question

Open with the title's bold and provocative question: "*Is Thomas Mann Half the Man of Leo Tolstoy?*" This question serves as more than just an attention-grabber; it invites readers to explore a nuanced comparison between two of the most influential literary figures in modern history. In posing this question, the aim is not to diminish Mann's literary achievements or intellectual legacy, but to critically examine the differences between these two towering figures in how they approached life's biggest questions: morality, spirituality, and human purpose.

The phrase "half the man" provokes thought by introducing the idea that completeness, in a philosophical or existential sense, might involve more than intellectual rigor—it might also demand a deep engagement with spiritual and moral transformation. **Tolstoy**, through his religious awakening and moral convictions, presents an example of an individual who sought to align every aspect of his life with a higher ethical and spiritual calling. His complete rejection of worldly wealth, his advocacy for nonviolence, and his radical Christian teachings make him appear as a figure striving for a kind of spiritual wholeness.

Mann, in contrast, approached life and art from a predominantly secular intellectual perspective, deeply influenced by Nietzschean philosophy and modernism. He immersed himself in the complexities and ambiguities of human nature, exploring moral dilemmas without offering religious solutions. His detachment from organized religion and his preference for philosophical inquiry, rather than spiritual certainty, suggest a more fragmented or unresolved engagement with questions of existence.

The dichotomy between **Tolstoy's religious depth** and **Mann's secular intellectualism** forms the core of this paper's inquiry. While both authors reflect on human suffering, societal decay, and the moral responsibilities of individuals, Tolstoy does so from the standpoint of someone who has found spiritual redemption, while Mann remains more of a cultural critic and observer, distanced from the transformative moral conviction that shaped Tolstoy's later life.

Thus, this paper asks: can the pursuit of intellectual clarity and artistic brilliance, as seen in Mann, ever match the moral completeness that Tolstoy sought through

his religious transformation? Is Mann "half the man" of Tolstoy in terms of moral and spiritual depth, or is their comparison inherently more complex?

B. Thesis Statement

Both **Thomas Mann** and **Leo Tolstoy** occupy significant places in world literature, each offering profound insights into the human condition. However, while Mann's secular intellectualism reflects the uncertainties and complexities of modern life, **Tolstoy's religious transformation** and deep moral clarity arguably make him a more holistic figure—someone who not only analyzed human existence but also sought to live in total alignment with his ethical and spiritual beliefs.

In contrast, Mann's work, while deeply intellectual and nuanced, is rooted in a more detached philosophical stance, exploring moral and existential ambiguities without fully embracing a guiding moral framework or spiritual certainty. This leaves Mann's portrayal of life and art more fragmented and unresolved when compared to Tolstoy's cohesive spiritual worldview.

This paper argues that Tolstoy's journey from aristocratic writer to moral and religious prophet positions him as a fuller, more complete figure in the existential and moral sense, whereas Mann's more skeptical and intellectual approach to life's questions leaves him lacking the same level of holistic engagement. While Mann's artistic achievements are undeniable, the comparison with Tolstoy reveals a potential spiritual and moral gap.

C. Scope of the Paper

To explore the claim that **Thomas Mann** might be "half the man" of **Leo Tolstoy**, this paper will delve into several key areas of comparison. These areas reflect not only the public personas of these writers but also the inner philosophies that guided their lives and shaped their literary works:

1. Philosophical and Religious Foundations:

- The paper will begin by contrasting **Tolstoy's religious journey**, particularly his Christian pacifism, with **Mann's secular humanism**.

Tolstoy's eventual rejection of the Russian Orthodox Church in favor of a personal, radical Christian ethic, and Mann's intellectual skepticism of organized religion will be analyzed to reveal their differing worldviews.

2. **Art and the Role of the Artist:**

- Both writers had distinct views on the role of the artist in society. Tolstoy's belief in **art as a moral tool** that should serve humanity contrasts with Mann's more nuanced and sometimes ambiguous stance on art as a reflection of life's complexities. This section will examine how each viewed the purpose and responsibility of literature and how their personal beliefs informed their artistic visions.

3. **Personal Lives and Moral Commitments:**

- The paper will then explore the **personal lives** of Mann and Tolstoy, particularly how their private choices reflected their public moral philosophies. Tolstoy's radical embrace of asceticism, pacifism, and anti-materialism will be contrasted with Mann's relatively conventional lifestyle, showing how each writer's personal choices either reinforced or contradicted their intellectual or spiritual ideals.

4. **Political Engagement and Social Criticism:**

- Both authors engaged deeply with the political issues of their times, but they did so in radically different ways. **Tolstoy's radical opposition** to the Russian state, war, and institutional religion will be examined alongside **Mann's public intellectualism**, particularly his opposition to fascism and his role in the German exile community. This section will show how their moral and spiritual views shaped their responses to societal crises.

5. **Literary Legacy and Influence:**

- Finally, the paper will explore the **literary legacies** of Mann and Tolstoy. How have their differing approaches to life—Tolstoy's moral certainty and Mann's intellectual ambiguity—affected their influence

on future generations? How do modern readers and scholars view their contributions in light of these differing worldviews?

By examining these areas, the paper will argue that Tolstoy's commitment to spiritual and moral transformation, alongside his literary genius, makes him a more "complete" figure in terms of human experience, while Mann's intellectual and philosophical detachment reflects a more fragmented, though equally valuable, vision of modernity.

II. Biographical Backgrounds and Early Influences

A. Tolstoy's Life and Beliefs

1. Early Aristocratic Life and Military Service:

Leo Tolstoy was born into Russian nobility in 1828 at his family's estate, **Yasnaya Polyana**, a privileged upbringing that gave him access to the education, resources, and connections of the Russian aristocracy. His early years were marked by the wealth and comforts of aristocratic life, though he was also acutely aware of the rigid social hierarchies and widespread inequality in Russian society.

Tolstoy initially led a life typical of his class, indulging in gambling, drinking, and other vices associated with young aristocrats. His time in the Russian military during the **Crimean War** (1853–1856) would have a profound influence on his later writings, particularly his views on the horrors and futility of war. His experiences as an officer in the Caucasus and at the siege of Sevastopol were critical in shaping his later pacifism and disdain for the violence and brutality of human conflict. His war stories, such as *Sevastopol Sketches*, brought him literary fame, but they also laid the foundation for his later philosophical and religious reorientation.

2. Spiritual Crisis and Embrace of Christian Pacifism:

By the 1870s, Tolstoy experienced a profound **spiritual crisis**. Despite his literary success with monumental works like *War and Peace* (1869) and *Anna Karenina* (1877), Tolstoy felt disillusioned by the emptiness of the aristocratic lifestyle and began questioning the meaning of life, death, and morality. His internal struggle led him to reject the privileges of his noble upbringing and seek spiritual answers, primarily through a deep engagement with the teachings of Jesus Christ.

This period culminated in Tolstoy's conversion to a form of **Christian anarchism** and pacifism, rejecting the Russian Orthodox Church, which he viewed as corrupt and complicit in state violence. Tolstoy's religious writings, particularly ***The Kingdom of God Is Within You (1894)***, became foundational texts for nonviolent movements. In this work, Tolstoy advocated for **simplicity, nonviolence, and moral reform**, critiquing the institutions of the state and organized religion for perpetuating injustice. His philosophy emphasized living in accordance with the teachings of Jesus, particularly the Sermon on the Mount, which he saw as a call to pacifism, humility, and universal love.

Tolstoy's religious transformation was not merely philosophical—it was deeply personal and manifested in his day-to-day life. He sought to live in simplicity, distancing himself from material wealth, and promoting the ethical treatment of others, particularly the poor. He gave up his aristocratic privileges, dressed in peasant clothes, and worked alongside the peasants on his estate. This commitment to radical moral reform set him apart not only from his peers but also from many literary contemporaries, making him both a moral leader and a controversial figure in Russian society.

B. Mann's Life and Beliefs

1. Bourgeois Upbringing and Intellectual Life:

Born in **1875** into a well-to-do family in Lübeck, Germany, **Thomas Mann** grew up in a solidly middle-class, bourgeois environment. His family's wealth and cultural standing provided him with a strong intellectual foundation and access to higher education. However, unlike Tolstoy's aristocratic roots, Mann's upbringing was rooted more in the **cultural and intellectual traditions** of German society than in the privileges of nobility.

Mann's early life reflected the values of the German bourgeoisie—discipline, cultural engagement, and a respect for tradition—but his literary ambitions eventually led him to explore themes of decadence, cultural decay, and the complexities of modernity. His first major success, ***Buddenbrooks (1901)***, chronicled the decline of a bourgeois family, mirroring the growing sense of cultural fragmentation and uncertainty in early 20th-century Europe. This novel,

reflecting his own background, foreshadowed Mann's lifelong interest in the tensions between tradition and change, order and chaos.

As Mann matured, the cultural and political upheavals of Europe deeply affected him. The **First World War**, the rise of **Nazism**, and the devastation of **World War II** forced Mann to confront the moral responsibilities of the artist and intellectual in a collapsing world. These experiences led him to leave Germany in the 1930s, living in exile in the United States during the Nazi regime. Mann's life as an exile shaped his later works, in which he became more overtly political, particularly in his critiques of fascism and totalitarianism.

2. Philosophical Influences (Nietzsche, Schopenhauer) and Secular Worldview:

Unlike Tolstoy's religious convictions, Mann's intellectual foundation was heavily influenced by the **secular philosophical currents** of his time, particularly the works of **Friedrich Nietzsche** and **Arthur Schopenhauer**. Nietzsche's critique of traditional morality, his concept of the **Übermensch (Overman)**, and his exploration of the tension between the Apollonian (order) and Dionysian (chaos) forces in life left a profound imprint on Mann's writing.

Nietzsche's philosophy of rejecting Christian moral values and embracing life's inherent struggles resonated deeply with Mann, particularly as he grappled with the cultural and intellectual uncertainties of modern Europe. In works like *The Magic Mountain* (1924), Mann explored themes of disease, decay, and the search for meaning in a world increasingly detached from religious belief and traditional values. His novels often portray characters struggling with the Nietzschean dialectic—torn between rationality, self-discipline, and order on one side, and chaos, desire, and irrationality on the other.

Schopenhauer also left his mark on Mann, particularly his ideas about **pessimism, the will to life, and the role of art** in transcending the suffering inherent in existence. Schopenhauer's pessimistic view of life as driven by an endless, irrational will influenced Mann's exploration of human suffering and desire, often reflected in the darker, more existential aspects of his work.

Unlike Tolstoy, who found answers in religious faith, Mann remained skeptical of religious solutions to the human condition. Instead, he was committed to exploring the **ambiguities of human existence** through art and intellectual inquiry. His secular worldview placed art and reason at the center of his

understanding of life, rejecting the certainties offered by religion while embracing the complexities and contradictions of modernity.

Mann's **secular humanism** was a response to the rapidly changing world of early 20th-century Europe. The political and moral crises he witnessed—particularly the rise of fascism and the failure of traditional moral structures—left Mann with a more **detached, intellectual approach** to moral questions. His commitment to art as a means of exploring moral ambiguity and societal decay positioned him as a cultural critic of modernity rather than a moral prophet, as Tolstoy had become.

In sum, **Tolstoy** and **Mann** represent two distinct trajectories in their engagement with the moral and spiritual questions of their time. **Tolstoy's life** was marked by a profound religious transformation and a commitment to living out his moral convictions in a radical way, embracing simplicity, pacifism, and spiritual reform. **Mann**, on the other hand, engaged with the complexities of modernity from a secular intellectual perspective, exploring human suffering, moral ambiguity, and the decline of traditional values without the same religious certainty or personal transformation. These differing backgrounds and influences set the stage for their contrasting approaches to art, society, and morality, which will be further explored in the rest of the paper.

III. The Role of Religion and Spirituality

A. Tolstoy's Religious Transformation

1. Tolstoy's Rejection of Organized Religion in Favor of a Personal, Radical Christian Ethic:

By the late 1870s, **Leo Tolstoy** experienced a profound religious awakening that dramatically altered the course of his life and work. Having grown increasingly disillusioned with his aristocratic lifestyle and the superficial moral framework of society, Tolstoy began to question the purpose of his existence and sought answers beyond material wealth, fame, and literary success. This internal crisis, fueled by a deepening awareness of human suffering and mortality, led Tolstoy to reject the doctrines of the **Russian Orthodox Church** in favor of a **personal, radical Christian ethic**.

Tolstoy's critique of organized religion was grounded in his belief that the Church had become corrupted by its alignment with the state and its failure to live up to the teachings of Jesus Christ. He viewed the Church as complicit in justifying war, inequality, and moral hypocrisy, particularly through its rituals and doctrines, which he believed had drifted far from the simple, nonviolent teachings of Christ. As a result, Tolstoy rejected the institutionalized authority of the Church, seeking a purer, more direct relationship with the divine through his interpretation of the **Gospels**.

2. Views on Nonviolence, Pacifism, and Moral Responsibility:

Central to Tolstoy's spiritual transformation was his **commitment to nonviolence** and **pacifism**, which he saw as essential to living a truly Christian life. Drawing from the **Sermon on the Mount**, Tolstoy interpreted Christ's call to "turn the other cheek" as a mandate for complete nonviolence, both in personal conduct and in opposition to state violence. He extended this principle to reject all forms of war and conflict, advocating for **absolute pacifism** in a world increasingly dominated by militarism and nationalism.

Tolstoy's **moral responsibility** extended beyond the individual to society at large. He saw it as the duty of every Christian to oppose not just personal violence but also the violence of governments and institutions. This ethical stance became the foundation for his **Christian anarchism**, a belief system that rejected both the authority of the state and the church. Tolstoy argued that true Christianity required not just internal spiritual purity but a radical commitment to social justice, simplicity, and nonviolent resistance to oppression.

Tolstoy's radical views on pacifism and moral responsibility made him a controversial figure in both Russia and abroad. His advocacy for **civil disobedience** and nonviolent resistance later influenced leaders like **Mahatma Gandhi** and **Martin Luther King Jr.**, both of whom drew inspiration from Tolstoy's writings on nonviolence. Despite facing censure from the Russian Orthodox Church, which excommunicated him in 1901, Tolstoy continued to promote his vision of a morally transformed society based on Christian love and nonviolence.

3. The Role of *The Kingdom of God Is Within You* in Shaping His Spiritual Philosophy:

Tolstoy's religious and philosophical beliefs were most fully articulated in his

seminal work, *The Kingdom of God Is Within You* (1894). This book, which Tolstoy considered his most important, encapsulated his views on Christianity as a guide to moral and social reform. In it, he argued that the true essence of Christianity lies not in the external rituals of the Church but in the internal spiritual transformation of individuals who live according to Christ's teachings of love, forgiveness, and nonviolence.

In *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*, Tolstoy critiqued the state and institutionalized religion for their failure to embody the principles of the Gospels. He proposed that each person has the capacity to realize the "kingdom of God" within themselves by living a life of **compassion, humility, and pacifism**. This work solidified Tolstoy's role as both a moral philosopher and a social reformer, advocating for a form of **Christian anarchism** where individuals, guided by their conscience and the teachings of Christ, would reject all forms of state authority, war, and violence.

This book had a profound impact not only on Tolstoy's followers but also on social movements around the world, laying the philosophical groundwork for nonviolent resistance movements of the 20th century. In it, Tolstoy called for a radical reevaluation of society's values and institutions, urging individuals to live in accordance with the principles of **universal love** and **nonviolent resistance** to evil.

B. Mann's Secular Humanism

1. Mann's Secular Intellectualism and Focus on Reason, Culture, and Art Over Religious Faith:

Unlike Tolstoy, **Thomas Mann** did not undergo a dramatic religious transformation but instead adopted a more secular, intellectual approach to life's moral and existential questions. Mann's engagement with religion was less about personal faith and more about understanding its cultural, social, and psychological impact on humanity. For Mann, the answers to life's complexities lay not in religious dogma or spiritual transformation but in **reason, culture, and art**.

Mann's worldview was deeply influenced by **secular humanism**, which placed a high value on human intellect, creativity, and moral responsibility. Rather than

turning to religion for answers, Mann sought to explore the **ambiguities of the human condition** through literature. His works often present characters who grapple with the **moral uncertainties** and **existential dilemmas** of modern life, reflecting Mann's belief that intellectual inquiry and cultural engagement are the best tools for understanding human nature.

In his public life, Mann remained critical of both **religious extremism** and **totalitarian ideologies**, positioning himself as a defender of **democratic values**, **rationalism**, and **individual freedom**. While he was not hostile to religion per se, Mann viewed organized religion with skepticism, particularly when it interfered with intellectual freedom or aligned itself with political power.

2. Engagement with Philosophical Debates About Morality, Good and Evil, and the Human Condition:

Mann's intellectual journey was shaped by his engagement with **philosophical debates** about **morality, good and evil**, and the **human condition**. Unlike Tolstoy, who found moral certainty in Christian pacifism, Mann approached these issues with a sense of ambiguity and **moral complexity**. His novels are filled with characters who confront deep philosophical and moral dilemmas, often without clear resolutions.

Central to Mann's exploration of morality was the **Nietzschean tension** between **Apollonian order** and **Dionysian chaos**, reflecting his belief that human nature is inherently divided between reason and irrationality, discipline and desire. This dialectic is particularly evident in his works, which often portray individuals torn between the pursuit of intellectual clarity and the pull of base, instinctual forces. Mann's view of **good and evil** was not framed in religious terms but was instead seen as part of the eternal human struggle between these competing forces.

For Mann, **art** was the vehicle through which these moral and philosophical questions could be explored. He believed that **literature** had a unique role in revealing the complexities of life, capturing the nuances of human experience that religious dogma or philosophical certainty often failed to address. His **secular worldview** placed literature at the center of moral inquiry, viewing the artist as a figure capable of engaging with the deepest questions of existence without the need for religious faith.

3. How *Doctor Faustus* and *The Magic Mountain* Reflect the Tension Between Spirituality and Rationality:

Two of Mann's most significant works, *Doctor Faustus* and *The Magic Mountain*, illustrate the **tension between spirituality and rationality** that defines much of his writing. In both novels, Mann explores the existential crisis of modernity, where the certainties of religion have eroded, leaving individuals to grapple with the complexities of **moral ambiguity** and **cultural decay**.

In *The Magic Mountain* (1924), the protagonist, **Hans Castorp**, spends seven years in a Swiss sanatorium, where he encounters a range of characters representing different philosophical, spiritual, and political ideologies. The novel is a meditation on the **cultural and moral malaise** of pre-World War I Europe, as Castorp becomes caught between the **rationalism** of the humanist Settembrini and the **nihilistic spirituality** of the Jesuit Naphta. Mann uses the novel to reflect on the uncertainty of spiritual and philosophical beliefs in the modern world, where individuals are increasingly alienated from traditional sources of meaning.

In *Doctor Faustus* (1947), Mann delves even deeper into the spiritual crisis of modernity. The novel tells the story of **Adrian Leverkühn**, a composer who makes a Faustian bargain with the devil in exchange for artistic genius, mirroring Germany's own descent into **moral and cultural ruin** during the Nazi era. Mann uses the myth of Faust to explore the dangers of **intellectual hubris**, **cultural nihilism**, and the loss of spiritual grounding in the modern world. The tension between spirituality and rationality is central to the novel, as Leverkühn's artistic brilliance is achieved at the cost of his moral and spiritual integrity.

Through these works, Mann explores the **spiritual vacuum** left by the decline of traditional religious belief, while also questioning whether rationality and culture alone are sufficient to fill the void. His secular humanism is not a rejection of spirituality but an acknowledgment of the **ambiguity and complexity** of human existence in the absence of religious certainty.

IV. Views on the Role of Art and the Artist

A. Tolstoy's Vision of Art as a Moral Tool

1. Tolstoy's Belief in Art's Moral and Spiritual Duty to Improve Humanity:

For **Leo Tolstoy**, art was not simply a form of entertainment or aesthetic expression; he believed that art carried a **profound moral and spiritual responsibility**. Throughout his life, especially in his later years, Tolstoy increasingly viewed art as a **tool for moral instruction** and **spiritual improvement**. In his view, the purpose of art was to elevate humanity, promote ethical behavior, and encourage a deeper connection to Christian virtues.

Tolstoy's earlier works, such as *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*, already contained strong moral themes, but as he underwent his spiritual transformation, his outlook on art shifted even more dramatically. He became critical of art that existed purely for the sake of beauty or personal expression, believing that such art was **self-indulgent** and disconnected from the real needs of society. For Tolstoy, the highest form of art was that which promoted **simplicity, truth, and moral goodness**, especially in line with Christian teachings.

He argued that art should be accessible to the common people and not just the elite, rejecting the notion that art was only for the intellectual or cultural aristocracy. Art, in Tolstoy's vision, was meant to **uplift the soul** and **connect people to universal moral truths**, particularly the teachings of **Jesus Christ**. This conviction placed Tolstoy in opposition to much of the art of his time, which he felt glorified individualism, materialism, and violence rather than encouraging moral growth.

2. Tolstoy's Rejection of Aestheticism and Embrace of Didactic Art:

In his later years, Tolstoy became a vocal critic of **aestheticism**, the idea that art should exist solely for the sake of beauty or artistic pleasure. He believed that this view of art was not only elitist but also **ethically bankrupt**, as it failed to address the deeper moral and spiritual needs of society. In his seminal essay *What Is Art?* (1897), Tolstoy outlined his rejection of aestheticism and proposed a radically different vision for what art should be.

In *What Is Art?*, Tolstoy argued that true art is **didactic**—it should teach, inspire, and promote **moral virtue**. He saw art's purpose as aligned with **Christian values**

and emphasized that good art must convey a sense of **compassion, love, and unity** among people. According to Tolstoy, the measure of good art was its ability to **communicate universal truths** and foster a sense of **brotherhood**. He harshly criticized the art of his time, including many of his contemporaries, for being detached from the moral improvement of society.

Tolstoy's later works, such as *Resurrection*, reflect this **didactic approach**, focusing heavily on moral and ethical themes while rejecting the complex character psychology and narrative style of his earlier masterpieces. He embraced a simpler, more direct style of storytelling that aligned with his Christian ethical principles. This shift in his approach to art caused him to distance himself from the literary elite and many of his own earlier works, which he felt did not adequately serve the moral purpose he later came to value.

For Tolstoy, art was not an end in itself but a **means to an end**—the end being the moral and spiritual betterment of humanity. He believed that art had the power to **change lives**, but only if it was rooted in **truth** and **moral clarity**. This belief placed him in stark contrast to many modernist writers and artists who celebrated ambiguity, aestheticism, and art for its own sake.

B. Mann's Intellectual Approach to Art

1. Mann's Ambiguous and Nuanced View of Art:

Unlike Tolstoy, **Thomas Mann** held a more **ambiguous** and **nuanced** view of art. For Mann, art was not primarily a moral tool, but rather a **complex vehicle** for exploring the **intellectual, moral, and existential dilemmas** of the human condition. While Mann did not reject the idea that art could have moral implications, he believed that art's primary function was to reflect life's **ambiguities** and **contradictions**, rather than to offer clear ethical lessons or promote a specific moral agenda.

Mann was deeply influenced by **modernism** and the philosophical currents of his time, particularly the ideas of **Nietzsche** and **Schopenhauer**, both of whom viewed life as a struggle between competing forces—reason and chaos, desire and self-discipline, individualism and social responsibility. Mann's understanding of art was shaped by this philosophical framework, and as a result, his novels

often feature characters caught in **moral gray areas**, where simple answers are elusive, and the complexity of life is reflected in the complexity of the narrative.

In contrast to Tolstoy's belief in art's **didactic role**, Mann viewed art as a **mirror to reality**, one that should not shy away from depicting life's darker, more troubling aspects. He saw art as a space to explore **intellectual ideas**, **moral paradoxes**, and **psychological depth**, even if it meant leaving readers with more questions than answers. This approach reflects Mann's belief that art's role was not to simplify the human experience but to **illuminate its complexity**.

2. Art as a Reflection of Societal and Moral Concerns:

Despite Mann's resistance to the idea of art as purely moral instruction, he did believe that art was inherently tied to **societal and moral concerns**. Mann's novels are filled with critiques of **decadence**, **cultural decay**, and the moral ambiguities of **modernity**. He often explored the ways in which art itself could become complicit in the moral crises of society, particularly when it failed to engage with the larger social and political issues of its time.

In his novel **Doctor Faustus** (1947), for example, Mann uses the story of a composer, **Adrian Leverkühn**, who makes a Faustian bargain to achieve artistic greatness, as an allegory for the moral and cultural collapse of **Germany** during the **Nazi era**. Through this novel, Mann grapples with the question of whether art can exist independently of the **moral failures** of society, ultimately suggesting that art cannot remain separate from the larger social and political forces shaping the world. In this way, Mann acknowledged the **moral responsibility** of the artist, but he did so in a more complex and ambiguous manner than Tolstoy.

In **The Magic Mountain** (1924), Mann similarly explores the tension between **spirituality** and **rationality**, using the sanatorium as a microcosm of European society on the brink of **World War I**. The novel presents various philosophical and ideological positions, from **humanism** to **nihilism**, without resolving the debate in favor of one view. This reflects Mann's belief that art's purpose was to **represent** rather than to **resolve** the intellectual and moral conflicts of the modern world.

3. Art as an Exploration of Life's Ambiguities:

One of the central tenets of Mann's approach to art was that it should serve as a platform for exploring the **ambiguities of human life**. Unlike Tolstoy, who sought moral clarity and simplicity, Mann was comfortable with **complexity** and

uncertainty. His characters often struggle with inner conflicts that reflect broader existential and cultural crises, and Mann does not offer easy resolutions to these struggles.

Mann's view of **good and evil**, for example, was far more nuanced than Tolstoy's. He saw these forces as intertwined, often inseparable, and part of the same human experience. In works like *Death in Venice* (1912), Mann explores the **conflict between desire and discipline**, showing how the pursuit of beauty and artistic inspiration can lead to both personal fulfillment and destruction. The protagonist, **Gustav von Aschenbach**, is a character caught between the Apollonian (order, rationality) and Dionysian (chaos, passion) forces of life, a theme that runs through much of Mann's work.

Mann believed that art should reflect the **contradictions of existence**—the tension between the individual and society, between intellect and instinct, between order and chaos. This approach stands in stark contrast to Tolstoy's didactic vision of art as a force for moral improvement. For Mann, art's value lay in its ability to **depict life as it is**, in all its **complexity, confusion, and contradiction**.

In conclusion, **Tolstoy** and **Mann** represent two fundamentally different approaches to the role of art and the artist. **Tolstoy** believed in art's **moral duty** to **improve humanity**, using it as a tool for **moral instruction** and spiritual enlightenment, especially through Christian virtues. **Mann**, by contrast, viewed art as a platform for exploring the **ambiguities of human existence**, reflecting life's **intellectual, moral, and existential complexities** without offering clear resolutions. Where Tolstoy sought **moral clarity**, Mann embraced **moral ambiguity**, positioning art as a space for intellectual and philosophical exploration rather than didactic moral teaching.

V. Personal Lives and Public Engagements

A. Tolstoy's Personal Asceticism

1. Tolstoy's Personal Transformation: Rejection of Wealth, Aristocratic Privilege, and Material Comforts:

Leo Tolstoy's personal life underwent a dramatic transformation following his **spiritual crisis** in the 1870s. Having lived a life of luxury, privilege, and indulgence as a member of the Russian aristocracy, Tolstoy began to question the meaning of his wealth and position in society. His growing discomfort with the **moral contradictions** of his privileged status, combined with his newfound Christian beliefs, led him to reject many of the trappings of aristocratic life.

Tolstoy came to see **wealth** and **material comforts** as barriers to spiritual fulfillment and moral integrity. He was particularly critical of the **inequality** that his own wealth symbolized in a society where peasants toiled in poverty. In his later years, Tolstoy embraced **poverty and simplicity** as moral ideals, advocating for a life of **humility** and **service** to others. He believed that by rejecting material wealth and living a simple life, one could better follow the teachings of Jesus, particularly the principles of **compassion, nonviolence, and love** for one's fellow human beings.

This rejection of wealth was not merely theoretical—Tolstoy made significant changes to his lifestyle. He renounced his copyrights on his later works, including *Resurrection*, and gave away much of his wealth. His desire to live in harmony with his Christian beliefs drove him to work alongside the **peasants** on his estate, adopting a simpler lifestyle that stood in stark contrast to the aristocratic norms of his class.

2. Efforts to Live by His Beliefs: Simplicity and Asceticism:

Tolstoy's personal transformation went beyond rejecting material wealth; he sought to **embody the principles of Christian asceticism** in every aspect of his life. He simplified his diet, avoided luxuries, and dressed in peasant clothing. His estate, **Yasnaya Polyana**, became a reflection of his beliefs, where he lived as close as possible to the simple, rural lifestyle he idealized.

He also embraced **manual labor**, working in the fields alongside the peasants, which was a significant break from his aristocratic upbringing. Tolstoy saw manual

labor as a way to live more authentically and in solidarity with the lower classes. His rejection of aristocratic privilege extended to his family life as well, leading to tensions with his wife, **Sofia**, who did not share his radical views on wealth and simplicity.

Tolstoy's efforts to live by his beliefs made him a symbol of moral integrity and social justice. His **Christian anarchism**, which rejected the authority of both church and state, extended to a rejection of institutional power in general. He called for people to follow their **conscience** and **live by Christ's teachings**, advocating for **nonviolent resistance** to injustice and **civil disobedience**. This radical transformation of his personal life was part of a broader rejection of **worldly values**, including materialism, power, and violence.

Tolstoy's personal asceticism and commitment to his moral principles gained him many followers, particularly among the **Tolstoyans**, who sought to live according to his Christian ethics. His personal example also inspired future leaders of **nonviolent resistance movements**, such as **Mahatma Gandhi** and **Martin Luther King Jr.**. In this sense, Tolstoy's personal life was deeply intertwined with his public engagements, as he sought to live out the ideals he preached.

B. Mann's Public Intellectualism

1. Mann's Conventional Lifestyle: Maintaining Wealth and Privilege:

In contrast to Tolstoy, **Thomas Mann** lived a more **conventional life** in terms of his personal wealth and social status. Born into a bourgeois family, Mann continued to enjoy the benefits of his class throughout his life. He maintained his position as a respected and wealthy intellectual, even as he engaged with complex moral and philosophical debates in his work. Unlike Tolstoy, Mann did not feel the need to reject his material comforts or privilege in order to pursue his intellectual or moral goals.

While Mann often explored themes of **decadence**, **cultural decline**, and **moral decay** in his novels, his personal lifestyle did not reflect the same asceticism or radical moral transformation that Tolstoy embraced. He continued to live in comfort, enjoying the privileges of his position as a famous author, even as he criticized the moral failures of European society. Mann was not drawn to the kind

of personal sacrifices that Tolstoy made in the name of spiritual and moral integrity.

Mann's approach to life and art was more **intellectual** than personal. He saw his role as a public intellectual as being one of **engagement with ideas**, rather than a personal embodiment of moral or spiritual principles. For Mann, it was enough to engage with the moral and philosophical complexities of life through his writing, without radically altering his lifestyle.

2. Mann's Activism Against Fascism and Role as a Public Intellectual in Exile:

Despite his more conventional personal lifestyle, **Thomas Mann** played a significant role as a **public intellectual** during one of the most tumultuous periods in European history. His experiences with the political crises of **20th-century Europe**, particularly the rise of **Nazism**, shaped his public engagement and activism. Mann was an outspoken critic of the **fascist regime** in Germany and used his platform as a renowned author to speak out against **authoritarianism**, **nationalism**, and **cultural decay**.

Mann's **public intellectualism** reached its peak during his years in **exile**, when he fled Germany after the rise of the Nazi regime. During his time in the **United States**, Mann became one of the most prominent German intellectuals in exile, continuing to write and give speeches that denounced fascism and defended democratic values. His work, both in fiction and non-fiction, reflected his deep concern for the moral and cultural crisis facing Europe.

Mann's activism was particularly notable in his **radio broadcasts** to Germany during **World War II**, in which he denounced the Nazi regime and urged Germans to resist its influence. These broadcasts, along with his essays and public speeches, positioned Mann as one of the leading **anti-fascist intellectuals** of his time. While he did not undergo the kind of personal transformation that Tolstoy experienced, Mann nonetheless used his **intellectual influence** to challenge the moral failures of his society and promote **democratic values**.

3. Engagement with Intellectual and Moral Debates Without Radical Personal Transformation:

Mann's engagement with moral and political issues was characterized by his intellectual approach. Rather than embodying the values he espoused in his personal life, Mann used his **literature** and public platform to explore the

intellectual complexities of moral and political dilemmas. His novels, such as *Doctor Faustus* and *The Magic Mountain*, are filled with **philosophical debates** and **moral paradoxes**, reflecting his belief that the role of the artist was to **challenge society's assumptions** and **provoke intellectual reflection**.

While Mann was deeply engaged in public debates, he did not undergo the same radical **personal transformation** that characterized Tolstoy's later life. His activism and intellectual work were rooted in his **commitment to reason** and **democratic principles**, rather than a personal moral or spiritual transformation. For Mann, the intellectual and artistic exploration of life's complexities was enough to contribute to the moral improvement of society.

In this sense, Mann's public engagement was marked by a **balance between intellectualism and moral responsibility**. He believed that art and literature had the power to shape public opinion and influence political outcomes, but he did not feel the need to live out the same kind of personal asceticism that Tolstoy embraced. His activism against fascism and totalitarianism was a reflection of his belief in the importance of **democratic values** and **individual freedom**, but it was rooted in an **intellectual commitment** rather than a personal moral crusade.

In conclusion, **Tolstoy** and **Mann** took very different approaches to their personal lives and public engagements. Tolstoy's radical personal transformation and commitment to **Christian asceticism** set him apart as a moral leader, while Mann's more conventional lifestyle and **intellectual activism** positioned him as a public intellectual who engaged with the **moral crises** of his time without the same level of personal sacrifice. While both men made significant contributions to the moral and intellectual debates of their eras, Tolstoy's personal asceticism and Mann's public intellectualism reflect two distinct paths toward **moral engagement** and **social influence**.

VI. Engagement with Society and Politics

A. Tolstoy's Radicalism and Rebellion

1. Tolstoy's Opposition to the State, War, and the Russian Orthodox Church:

Leo Tolstoy's later life was marked by a radical shift in his relationship with society and politics, largely due to his rejection of the **state**, **war**, and **organized religion**. After his spiritual transformation in the 1870s, Tolstoy developed a philosophy of **Christian anarchism**, which rejected both state authority and institutional religion, particularly the **Russian Orthodox Church**. He believed that both the state and the church were inherently corrupt and incapable of promoting genuine Christian values such as love, compassion, and nonviolence.

Tolstoy's opposition to the **state** was rooted in his belief that governments perpetuated violence, injustice, and inequality. He saw the state as an inherently oppressive institution that relied on force and coercion to maintain power, particularly through its control of the military and its enforcement of laws that upheld the interests of the ruling elite. Tolstoy was deeply critical of the state's role in perpetuating **war**, which he viewed as the ultimate expression of violence and evil. His commitment to **pacifism** was unwavering, and he called for Christians to refuse to participate in wars or support governments that waged them.

Tolstoy's rejection of the **Russian Orthodox Church** was equally radical. He believed that the church had become an extension of the state, using its influence to justify war, inequality, and the exploitation of the poor. Tolstoy argued that the church had strayed far from the teachings of **Jesus Christ**, particularly the principles of **nonviolence**, **humility**, and **love for all people**. In his later writings, he advocated for a return to a simpler, purer form of Christianity, free from the hierarchical structures and dogmas of organized religion. This radical stance led to his **excommunication** from the Russian Orthodox Church in 1901.

Tolstoy's form of **Christian anarchism** was based on the idea that true Christianity required individuals to reject all forms of institutional power and live according to their conscience and the teachings of Christ. He believed that by following the **Sermon on the Mount**, particularly the call to "turn the other cheek" and "love your enemies," individuals could create a just and peaceful society without the need for governments or organized religions.

2. Tolstoy as a Moral Critic of Russian Society:

Tolstoy's radicalism extended to his critique of **Russian society**, particularly the **aristocracy** and its role in maintaining social inequality and injustice. As a member of the Russian nobility himself, Tolstoy had firsthand experience of the privileges and excesses of the aristocracy. However, his spiritual awakening led him to **renounce his aristocratic status** and become one of its fiercest critics.

Tolstoy saw the Russian aristocracy as morally bankrupt, living lives of luxury and excess while the majority of the population, particularly the peasants, lived in poverty and suffering. He believed that the aristocracy's wealth was built on the exploitation of the lower classes and that their way of life was fundamentally incompatible with Christian values. In works such as *Resurrection* (1899), Tolstoy exposed the moral hypocrisy of the aristocracy and called for a radical restructuring of society based on **equality** and **justice**.

In addition to his critique of the aristocracy, Tolstoy was a vocal critic of **organized religion**, particularly the Russian Orthodox Church. He believed that the church had betrayed its spiritual mission by aligning itself with the state and the wealthy elite. In his later writings, Tolstoy advocated for a return to the **ethical teachings of Jesus**, which he believed had been corrupted by centuries of religious dogma and institutional power.

Tolstoy's moral critique of Russian society, the state, and the church made him a **controversial figure** in his own time. While many admired his moral clarity and commitment to nonviolence, others saw him as a dangerous radical who threatened the established social order. His ideas on **Christian anarchism**, **nonviolence**, and **social justice** would later influence movements for **nonviolent resistance** around the world, including **Gandhi's struggle for Indian independence** and the **American civil rights movement**.

B. Mann's Opposition to Fascism

1. Mann's Moral Opposition to the Rise of Nazism and Fascism:

As **fascism** began to rise in Germany in the 1930s, **Thomas Mann** became one of its most prominent intellectual opponents. Mann's opposition to **Nazism** was deeply rooted in his commitment to **humanism**, **democracy**, and **cultural**

integrity. He viewed the rise of fascism not just as a political threat but as a **moral and cultural catastrophe**, one that represented the decay of European civilization and the triumph of **barbarism** over **reason** and **ethical values**.

Mann's **moral opposition** to Nazism was evident in his speeches, essays, and radio broadcasts during the 1930s and 1940s. He saw fascism as an **attack on humanity itself**, a force that sought to destroy the values of freedom, equality, and intellectual inquiry that had defined European culture for centuries. His critique of fascism was not only political but also cultural—he believed that fascism represented the **collapse of intellectual and moral integrity**, as it promoted **irrationality**, **racism**, and **violence** over the pursuit of truth and justice.

Mann's novel **Doctor Faustus** (1947) is perhaps his most direct response to the moral and cultural crisis of fascism. In the novel, the protagonist, Adrian Leverkühn, makes a Faustian pact in exchange for artistic greatness, which serves as an allegory for Germany's own moral and cultural downfall under Nazism. Through this story, Mann explores the **dangers of intellectual hubris**, the temptation of **cultural nihilism**, and the moral compromises that lead to societal destruction. The novel serves as both a critique of **Nazi Germany** and a reflection on the deeper cultural and moral forces that allowed fascism to rise.

2. Mann's Intellectual Leadership in the German Exile Community:

With the rise of Hitler, Mann was forced into **exile** in 1933, first in Switzerland and later in the **United States**. In exile, Mann became a leading figure in the **German émigré community**, a group of intellectuals, artists, and political dissidents who had fled Nazi Germany. As one of the most prominent voices among the exiles, Mann took on the role of **intellectual leader**, using his platform to rally opposition to the Nazi regime and promote democratic values.

During his time in exile, Mann gave numerous speeches and radio broadcasts in which he condemned the Nazi regime and called for the German people to resist fascism. His broadcasts, titled *Deutsche Hörer! (German Listeners!)*, were transmitted into Germany during the war and served as a powerful counter-narrative to Nazi propaganda. In these broadcasts, Mann spoke directly to the German people, urging them to reject Hitler and take responsibility for the moral and cultural crisis that had overtaken their country.

Mann's **intellectual leadership** extended beyond his opposition to Nazism. He became an advocate for **democracy** and **human rights**, viewing the defeat of fascism as part of a broader struggle for the survival of **European civilization**. His work during the war years reflected his belief that **artists** and **intellectuals** had a responsibility to **address societal issues** and engage in the moral and political struggles of their time. Mann rejected the notion of art as a purely aesthetic or personal endeavor, insisting that the **artist's role** was to **challenge injustice** and **promote moral and political renewal**.

3. Belief in the Artist's Responsibility to Address Societal Issues:

For Mann, the rise of fascism and the crisis of European culture reinforced his belief in the **responsibility of the artist** to engage with the **moral dilemmas** of their time. He argued that art could not exist in isolation from the **political realities** of the world. As a public intellectual, Mann saw it as his duty to use his influence and his art to **combat injustice**, particularly in the face of **totalitarianism** and **cultural decay**.

In his essays and speeches, Mann often spoke of the artist's role as a **moral leader**, one who had the ability to shape public consciousness and inspire **ethical reflection**. He believed that the **triumph of fascism** represented not only a political failure but also a **failure of cultural responsibility**, as intellectuals, artists, and scholars had not done enough to **defend democratic values** and resist the forces of authoritarianism.

Mann's belief in the **artist's responsibility** was a central theme throughout his career. He saw literature as a powerful tool for **social critique** and **moral exploration**, and he believed that artists had a duty to **confront the darker forces** of human nature, including the tendencies toward **violence**, **intolerance**, and **irrationality** that had given rise to fascism. His work, particularly during the war years, was a testament to his conviction that **art and politics** were inseparable and that the **artist's voice** was essential in the fight for **justice and human dignity**.

In conclusion, both **Tolstoy** and **Mann** engaged deeply with the political and social issues of their time, but they did so in radically different ways. **Tolstoy's Christian anarchism** and **radical critique of the state and church** reflected his belief in the **moral duty** to live according to **nonviolent principles**, while **Mann's opposition to**

fascism and his **intellectual leadership in exile** reflected his belief in the **artist's responsibility** to confront societal crises and **promote democratic values**. Both men used their art and their public influence to challenge the **moral failures** of their societies, though their approaches were shaped by their distinct philosophies and life experiences.

VIII. Conclusion

A. Readdressing the Provocative Question

The provocative question posed in the title—*"Is Thomas Mann Half the Man of Leo Tolstoy?"*—demands reflection on the deeper philosophical and personal dimensions that defined each writer. To consider whether Mann can be seen as "half the man" in comparison to Tolstoy is not to suggest an inferiority in Mann's achievements or intellect, but rather to explore the **fullness** of their respective engagements with life's most profound questions.

Leo Tolstoy underwent a **radical religious and moral transformation** that informed every aspect of his later life. His rejection of wealth, aristocratic privilege, and material comforts in favor of **Christian simplicity** and **nonviolent resistance** gave him a sense of **moral clarity** and **spiritual purpose** that was, in his view, a more authentic way to live. Tolstoy believed that **living according to Christ's teachings**—particularly the principles of **love, humility, and pacifism**—offered a **fuller understanding of life's meaning**. His commitment to **moral rigor** and **religious certainty** provided him with a **holistic worldview** that encompassed not just personal ethics but a broader vision of social justice, which was reflected in his advocacy for **Christian anarchism** and his critique of the Russian aristocracy and state.

In contrast, **Thomas Mann's intellectualism** led him to a **secular humanism** that embraced the **ambiguities and contradictions** of modern life. Mann was a profound observer of the **moral complexities** of existence, but he did not seek the kind of **spiritual certainty** that defined Tolstoy's later years. Instead, Mann was content to explore **intellectual and philosophical questions** through his art, focusing on the **tensions** between **order and chaos, reason and desire, and morality and nihilism**. His novels, such as *Doctor Faustus* and *The Magic*

Mountain, reflect his belief that life's most pressing questions do not have simple or clear answers, and that the role of the artist is to engage with these **moral ambiguities** rather than resolve them.

Thus, when viewed through the lens of **spiritual transformation and moral certainty**, Tolstoy presents a **fuller** view of life—one in which personal ethics, religious conviction, and social engagement are inseparably linked. In comparison, Mann's **secular approach**, while intellectually rich and deeply reflective, might be seen as **more fragmented or incomplete** in that it does not offer a unifying moral framework to guide human behavior or societal change. However, it is this very **ambiguity** that makes Mann's work so resonant with the complexities of modernity, where certainty is often elusive, and human life is characterized by contradictions.

B. Final Thoughts on the Value of Both Perspectives

While Tolstoy's commitment to **moral and religious clarity** offers a **more holistic approach** to life's deepest questions, it is important to acknowledge the **value of both perspectives**. Tolstoy's vision is deeply rooted in a belief that **truth and morality are absolute**, and that living in accordance with these principles can lead to **spiritual fulfillment** and **social harmony**. His unwavering faith in **Christian values** and his dedication to living a life of **simplicity** and **nonviolence** made him a moral beacon in a world rife with inequality, injustice, and violence. Tolstoy's perspective offers a **profoundly idealistic** vision of what human life can and should be, grounded in **universal love** and **ethical integrity**.

On the other hand, Mann's intellectualism and embrace of **moral complexity** speak to the realities of a world where **certainty is rare**, and where individuals must navigate **contradictions and uncertainties** in both personal and social life. Mann's works reflect the **modern human condition**, with all its challenges, contradictions, and crises. His **exploration of moral ambiguity** and **existential dilemmas** allows for a more **nuanced** understanding of life's complexity, making his perspective especially relevant in an era marked by **cultural fragmentation** and the loss of traditional sources of meaning.

Both Tolstoy and Mann offer **valuable insights** into the **human condition**, but they do so from **opposite ends of the spectrum**. Where Tolstoy offers a **unifying moral vision**, Mann provides an **intellectual exploration** of life's uncertainties.

Neither perspective is inherently superior, as both address different aspects of what it means to be human. **Tolstoy's moral clarity** and **Mann's philosophical depth** each offer something unique, and together they present a fuller picture of the **moral, spiritual, and intellectual challenges** that define human existence.

In conclusion, while Tolstoy may offer a **more holistic** approach to life, driven by his **moral transformation** and **religious conviction**, Mann's engagement with the **ambiguities of modern life** provides a necessary counterbalance, reminding us that the search for meaning often requires us to embrace **doubt** and **uncertainty**. Both writers, in their own way, grappled with the deepest questions of existence, and their contributions continue to shape our understanding of **morality, society**, and the **role of art** in addressing the **human condition**.

References

1. **Tolstoy, Leo.** *War and Peace*. Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, Vintage Classics, 2007.
2. **Tolstoy, Leo.** *Anna Karenina*. Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, Penguin Classics, 2002.
3. **Tolstoy, Leo.** *The Kingdom of God Is Within You*. Translated by Constance Garnett, University of Nebraska Press, 1984.
4. **Tolstoy, Leo.** *What Is Art?*. Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, Penguin Classics, 1995.
5. **Mann, Thomas.** *The Magic Mountain*. Translated by John E. Woods, Vintage International, 1995.
6. **Mann, Thomas.** *Doctor Faustus: The Life of the German Composer Adrian Leverkühn as Told by a Friend*. Translated by John E. Woods, Vintage, 1999.
7. **Mann, Thomas.** *Death in Venice and Other Tales*. Translated by Joachim Neugroschel, Penguin Classics, 1999.
8. Berman, Russell A. *The Burden of Modernity: The Rhetoric of Cultural Discourse in German Writers, 1890–1930*. Harvard University Press, 1989.
9. Christian, R. F. *Tolstoy's Letters*. Vol. 1, 1828–1879, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.
10. Gleason, Abbott. *Tolstoy: A Biography*. W. W. Norton & Company, 1988.
11. Heller, Erich. *Thomas Mann: The Ironic German*. Secker & Warburg, 1958.
12. McLean, Hugh. *In Quest of Tolstoy*. Academic Studies Press, 2008.
13. Morson, Gary Saul. *Anna Karenina in Our Time: Seeing More Wisely*. Yale University Press, 2007.
14. Paxton, Robert O. *The Anatomy of Fascism*. Vintage, 2005.
15. Steiner, George. *Tolstoy or Dostoevsky: An Essay in the Old Criticism*. Faber & Faber, 1959.

16. Tihanov, Galin. *The Master and the Slave: Lukács, Bakhtin, and the Ideas of Their Time*. Clarendon Press, 2000.

17. Wat, Alexander. *My Century: The Odyssey of a Polish Intellectual*. Translated by Richard Lourie, New York Review Books, 2003.

