

“Similar to Feverish Delirium”: The Fantastic Worlds of Battle as Tolstoy’s Criticism of War in *War and Peace*

Natalya Sukhonos

When we pick up Leo Tolstoy’s *War and Peace*, we expect to read a historical novel of epic proportions that will educate us about the Napoleonic Wars in 1805-12 Russia. We probably don’t expect to plunge into a young Russian officer’s confused stream of consciousness monologue as he rushes into battle and cannot find his whereabouts. We also don’t expect another officer to revel in a quaint little world of his own making where his cannon becomes a pipe during an attack. After all, writing replete with stream of consciousness, hallucinations, and delirium was made famous by the Modernist experiments of James Joyce and Virginia Woolf in the early twentieth century. So why do these warped, distorted states of mind become fixtures of battle in Tolstoy’s novel?

Battles in *War and Peace* are so fascinating because they open a window into Tolstoy’s philosophy, his psychological outlook, and of course, his ethics. Often, Tolstoy describes battles in terms of dream visions, hallucinations, or a character’s frenzied inner experience through stream of consciousness precisely because he wants to present war in an unfamiliar, radically different light. In an attempt to shift our perception, Tolstoy wants to defamiliarize us with conventional portrayals of war and battle. This is how Soviet critic Boris Eikhenbaum describes Tolstoy’s strategy:

...lyudi umirayut sovsem ne tak, kak prinyato ob etom pisat’. Ne takova priroda, kak yee izobrazhayut, ne takova voyna, ne takov Kavkaz, ne tak vyrazhaetsya khrabrost’, ne tak lyudi lyubyat, ne tak zhivut i dumayut, ne tak, nakonets, umirayut—vot obshchiy istochnik vsej Tolstovskoy sistemy. Blizitsya samoe rokovoe i vmeste s tem neizbezhnoe dlya Tolstogo «ne to»—ne takovo iskusstvo, kak ob nem pishut i dumayut. V etom smysle Tolstoy, deystvitel’no, kanonizator

krizisa—oblichitel'nye, razrushitel'nye sily skryty pocti v kazhdom yego prieme. (130)¹

With his technique of negating convention, with saying “not so” to traditional depictions of death, war, and bravery, Tolstoy wreaks havoc through his aesthetics and worldview.

The writer’s estranged portrayal of war also relates to his philosophical belief that we humans cannot exert full control over our own lives and the lives of others. According to Gary Saul Morson, “battle is characterized both by vigorous attempts to impose order and by the sudden collapse of order” (98). No matter how hard the generals try to predict the course of battle, they fail. Therefore, the best way to describe such chaos on the battlefield is through chaotic language.

In a curious way, the battle and the self become mirrors of each other for Tolstoy; while battles are described by frenzied individuals, we can also see how the mind itself parallels the chaos of battle for Tolstoy.² This is particularly evident in the passage about Nikolai Rostov’s wound bringing about a dream vision. As inner perceptions bleed into the physical details of battle in Tolstoy’s descriptions, we also see the importance of perception in his writing.³

Finally, Tolstoy describes the chaos of war in such an estranged way because of his passionate hatred of violence and his lifelong faith in pacifism. It is perhaps Tolstoy’s ethical stance—and its aesthetic execution—that unites him so much with twentieth-century Modernists; the fragmented, distorted language depicting a character’s inner world is also fit to describe the trauma of war. Language has to become twisted to describe a twisted reality and the twisted psyches that ensue, and Tolstoy knew this.

This article will argue that Tolstoy uses stream of consciousness or dreamlike visions to defamiliarize the reader with factual, historical, or glorified depictions of war. The following examples give concrete proof of the estranged vision of war: Nikolai Rostov’s confusion as he is first wounded; the warped toylike fantastic world Captain Tushin creates in response to the feverish excitement of battle; Nikolai’s wound bringing about a dream vision; Petya’s

musical fugue that precedes his death. After closely reading these episodes, we will see that surreal visions and shifts in consciousness put forth Tolstoy's humanistic message about war's true horror.

Nikolai Rostov's Wound: "Racing On While Staying In Place"

We'll start with a counterintuitive example. It's curious that Tolstoy chooses to dispel the heroism of war by describing Nikolai Rostov, Russian nobleman and hussar who is actually excited to get to the front line, "sensing that the time had come at last to experience the delight of an attack, of which he had heard so much from his hussar comrades" (188). But as he charges at no one in particular and loses his place in the battalion, he feels "as in a dream, that he was racing on with an unnatural speed and at the same time was staying in place" (188). Note that he experiences this dreamlike feeling exactly as he feels warm blood under him, his horse is killed, and he is wounded. When he becomes utterly confused as to where the rest of the battalion is, the narrator relates his thoughts in a flurry of expression: "He must be one of ours taken prisoner.... Yes. Can it be they'll take me, too? What men are these?...Who are they? Why are they running? Can it be they're running to me? Can it be? And why? To kill me? *Me*, whom everybody loves so?" (189). Nikolai Rostov's confused flurry of thoughts is significant because it's the first use of stream of consciousness in *War and Peace*.

In literary criticism, stream of consciousness refers to the device that depicts the myriad thoughts and feelings that pass through the mind of a particular character; it's characterized by associative leaps in thought. (In Rostov's case, the character goes from Frenchmen running out of fear for their lives to thoughts about his loved ones.) According to R. F. Christian, Tolstoy's narrative style often combines inner observations with details of the outside world: "It is typical of Tolstoy's style of writing to juxtapose a minute record of external detail with the thoughts it evokes in the observer's mind, exterior narrative shading into interior monologue" (37). Thus, in Rostov's retreat we see the chaos of a young officer's inner turmoil mirroring the chaos of battle. Rostov doesn't know where he is and

why the French are running towards him, and we can attribute his confusion to inexperience on the battlefield. But what's surprising about Tolstoy's presentation of war is that the French soldiers know even less why and where they are running; their plan of action is about as clear and organized as Rostov's thoughts.

While chaotic thoughts mirror the chaos of battle, the chaos of battle also reveals Tolstoy's nearly modern way of envisioning the workings of the mind. Stream of consciousness is often employed by twentieth-century writers to depict human thought as a mish-mash of disjointed fragments, and Tolstoy certainly used it in this way in the Rostov episode. Disjointed, fragmented writing lines up closely with Tolstoy's views on the self: "the myriad accidents, habits, and memories that compose, shape, and alter [the self] from moment to moment fit no pattern and can never be duplicated" (Morson 211). Even more fascinating, though, is the way in which Tolstoy yokes the aesthetic and psychological dimensions of stream of consciousness with an urgently ethical purpose. Of course, the literary technique adroitly matches the restless nature of thoughts arising; the disjointed quality of Rostov's impressions perfectly captures the character's anxiety and horror as he tries and fails to figure out why there are people on the battlefield out to kill him. The aesthetic accomplishment of stream of consciousness is also an ethical one as it catalyzes in its readers the realization of the absurdity of war.

Yet Tolstoy goes even further in his critique. In the Rostov episode, the character is reacting—with anxiety, fear, and incomprehension—to something actually happening to him (the charge of the enemy). But what happens when a character reacts to war with the throes of delirium?

Tushin: Creating a Fantastic World as a Result of Trauma

Tolstoy chooses to describe the famous battle of Schögraben through the actions of Captain Tushin. According to Rick McPeak, Tushin is a very "unlikely commander": he's a "diminutive officer among gigantic troops" with "bootless feet" who is "gentle and

philosophical” (105). Yet he is also fiercely individualistic and enterprising: “In the absence of any orders, Captain Tushin directs cannon barrages that start fires in the village of Schögraben. As the conflict grows more intense and his battery suffers more casualties, Captain Tushin...grows more animated” (McPeak 105).³ When Russian infantry regiments are surrounded and cut off by the French, Tushin’s battery is forgotten and must retreat as soon as possible. Yet Tushin achieves a nearly heroic status when he sets fire to the village and defends his artillery batteries during intense enemy fire. But the way in which he does this is curious and disturbing, and may make us question whether or not this is true heroism after all.

The narrator focuses on Tushin here through the method of free indirect discourse, where third-person narration intermingles with a character’s own thoughts. We see Tushin becoming more and more animated with childlike joy when he sees that the French are attacking. In fact, Tolstoy bluntly tells us that though Tushin is a great officer, “he was in a state similar to feverish delirium or to that of a drunken man” (192). What follows is a surprising insight into Tushin’s strangely warped sense of reality. From the sights and sounds of war,

there was established in his head a fantastic world of his own, which made up his pleasure at the moment. In his imagination, the enemy’s cannon were not cannon but pipes, from which an invisible smoker released an occasional puff of smoke...The French looked like ants around their guns. A handsome man and a drunkard, the number one at the second gun was known in his world as *uncle*...The sound of musket fire at the foot of a hill...seemed to him like someone’s breathing. (193).

Initially, we might find Tushin’s fantastic world amusing—but only until we realize that it is the result of deep-seated trauma, a kind of manic sense of unreality that only war and its raw violence can inflict upon a normal human being. According to McPeak, “these coping mechanisms dehumanize the enemy and desensitize Tushin and his troops to their own extraordinarily precarious position”

(106). McPeak even argues that his “emotional response following hostilities resembles what we now call post-traumatic stress” (113).

If Tushin set fire to a village and saved his regiment’s artillery because of his manic, stress-induced vision of battle, it’s curious that he is also seen as heroic both by Tolstoy’s critics and also important observers within the novel. Christian, for instance, argues that “the sympathetic Captain Tushin is also a man of independent mind, a nonconformist, a ‘Tolstoyan’ character” (151). Indeed, this view is shared by Prince Andrei who sees Tushin defy the order to retreat and set fire to a village instead. In fact, when Tushin is reprimanded by Prince Bagration for leaving some artillery behind, Andrei jumps to his defense: “And if Your Excellency will allow me to voice my opinion...we owe the success of the day most of all to the operation of this battery and the heroic endurance of Captain Tushin and his company” (199). While it’s possible to see Tushin as an unlikely hero who embraces spontaneity and independence on the battlefield, when we look back at the passage describing his frantic attack we see something else altogether.⁵

Notice how Tushin takes frightening aspects of war and makes them into something quaint, diminutive, almost charming. Cannons are pipes releasing a puff of smoke, the French are little ants, the enemy soldier operating a cannon is an uncle, and musket fire is someone’s breathing. In this domesticated vision of battle, everything is tiny, insubstantial, almost comical. Why does Tushin transform war into something quaint?

In fact, Tushin might be acting as a child here. Psychologist Jerome Singer writes that, through toys and games, children often miniaturize their anxieties into a world they can manipulate and control. Through dolls and toy soldiers, they can act out their fears.⁶ In a way, Tushin is doing the same on the battlefield—he is transforming the fearful elements of battle into something he can control. That said, a careful reading of the passage still reveals that the only way violence can be controlled is in a delusional vision of Tushin’s own making. Thus, Tolstoy resorts to Tushin’s delirious vision to critique the chaos of wartime violence and to show the emotional consequences of being involved in such violence.

Through the defamiliarizing lens of Tolstoy's art, we see inner chaos as a mirror of the chaos on the battlefield.

Rostov's Wound as a Dream Vision

While Tushin's offensive, an example of violent action, is presented through the lens of feverish delirium, Tolstoy also describes the results of violence—physical and psychological pain—in a dreamlike way. At the end of part II, Nikolai Rostov's wound is also described in terms of Rostov's disorientation and inner turmoil:

Sleep drew him irresistibly, red circles were dancing before his eyes, and the impressions of these voices and those faces and a feeling of loneliness merged with the feeling of pain. It was they, these soldiers, wounded and not wounded—it was they who crushed and weighed down and twisted the sinews and burned the flesh of his racked arm and shoulder. (200)

Of course, the soldiers twisting the sinews of his arm is an extended metaphor for the oppressive nature of war. Through an impressionistic blending of Rostov's physical sensations—sleep and pain—with the figures of soldiers, Tolstoy is able to show the full extent of wartime trauma. As Justin Weir argues, "...in *War and Peace*, Tolstoy demonstrates how unnatural, undignified, and disconnected it is for a person to act violently toward another human being" (182).

In his brief interval of dreamlike oblivion, Rostov sees his family and a few soldiers whom he despises—they, too, crush and pull on his arm. Why is pain a medley of unrelated details of home and front, war and peace? This strange—indeed, estranged—imagery expresses Tolstoy's deep-seated belief in the interconnectedness of all things and the way that an individual's fate is intermingled with that of others in myriad invisible ways. In addition, the image of family and soldiers crushing his arm also speaks to Tolstoy's skepticism about untangling causes and effects, events and their consequences. Images of Rostov's family paradoxically flank those of his enemies because, in Tolstoy's world, friend and foe can both contribute to violence—and inversely, are both capable of redemption, respect,

and love. In the dynamic world of Tolstoy's novel, everything and everyone is constantly moving and changing, in word and in deed, consciousness and external reality, and perhaps, this is why dream visions are so fitting in conveying the whirling motion of *War and Peace*.

Death Preceded by a Musical Fugue

Tolstoy also exposes the horror of war through a defamiliarizing dreamlike narrative that precedes the death of Petya, the Rostovs' idealistic fifteen-year-old son. Right before he charges at a Frenchman and is mercilessly killed, Petya participates in a beautiful musical composition. I'm going to quote it extensively because the very description of this composition unfolds like a music symphony:

He looked at the sky. The sky was as magical as the earth.... Petya began to close his eyes and rock... "Ozhik, zhik, ozhik, zhik," whistled the saber being sharpened. And suddenly Petya heard a harmonious chorus of music, playing some unknown, solemnly sweet hymn... The melody grew, passing from one instrument to another. What is known as a fugue was going on, though Petya had not the slightest idea of what a fugue was. Each instrument, now resembling a violin, now trumpets—but better and clearer than violins and trumpets—each instrument played its own part and, before finishing its motif, merged with another, starting out almost the same, and with a third, and with a fourth, and they all merged into one and scattered again, and merged again, now solemn and churchly, now brightly brilliant and victorious...

He closed his eyes. And on all sides, as if from far away, sounds trembled, began to harmonize, scattered, merged, and again all joined in the same sweet and solemn hymn...He attempted to control this huge chorus of instruments. "Softer, softer now, fade away." And the sounds obeyed him. "Fuller now, merrier. More, more joyful..." Petya felt frightened and joyful hearkening to their uncommon beauty." (Tolstoy 1055)

Petya's vision of instruments coming together in a musical fugue at his command comes to him in a dream vision. But what's particularly poignant about this vision is that it precedes Petya's sudden death

as he's cut down by a French officer while he tries to embody the heroic military ideal. The “ozhik, ozhik” sound in the passage above reflects a Russian soldier sharpening his saber—a real-world sound bleeding into his dream—but it can also be a sinister foreboding of death. Yet the other elements of Petya's vision provide an ironic contrast to his grim demise.

For instance, “the magic kingdom in which everything was possible” (Tolstoy 1055) turns to a chaotic battle where nothing can be discerned or understood. Joy turns to confusion, sorrow, and disorientation. A fugue of different instruments and their voices becomes the sound of “thudding hoofs and shouts” (1057). And of course, most importantly, Petya's magisterial control over all the instruments, the ways in which they enter and exit the fugue, leads to the young boy's total loss of control on the battlefield, his inability to listen to his commander who tells him to go around and evade the French, and eventually his death.

Is the fugue in Petya's head really Tolstoy's sardonic critique of our desire to assert control over our fate and circumstances? I think this would be a simplistic reading, or at least, an incomplete one. Yes, Tolstoy might be criticizing Petya's ardor for control but the beautiful, poetic language in the passage, which stands out in the surrounding chapters that are more observational, allows us to see Petya's fugue as a poignant comment on this young soul's thirst for harmony. Orchestrating a fugue is not just gripping control—it's a way to organize the voices of the world into something more beautiful. Unlike Tushin, Rostov tries to achieve a childish, contrived harmony not through violence but in his dreams, and this is tragic when we see what is to come.

Dream visions, stream of consciousness, delirium—Tolstoy's descriptions of battle are so fascinating because the chaotic narrative of the violent external world mirrors a shift in consciousness in characters affected by such violence. Nikolai Rostov expresses his confusion in battle through chaotic stream of consciousness; Tushin desensitizes himself from violence through transforming elements of violence into an elaborate miniature world; Nikolai feels that everyone around him is causing the pain in his wound. by everyone

around him; and Petya dreams up a musical fugue right before his death. In Tolstoy's visceral world, where emotions develop their own language, the writing can no longer merely express violence—it must enact it through stylistic distortion and defamiliarization.

Tolstoy's Deformation of Language as a Proto-Modernist Experiment?

Tolstoy's conscious deformation of language, his experimentation with narrative techniques, and his interest in alternate states of consciousness to describe violence all bear parallels to Modernist writing techniques practiced by James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, T. S. Eliot, Wilfred Owen, and others. Of course, these writers were profoundly affected by the Great War (World War I), which shook staunchly held ideals like the nation state, patriotism, and the heroism of war through the unprecedented violence and destruction of gas warfare. According to Trudi Tate, "Twenty years after the event, Woolf remembers the First World War as a time of darkness and silence in which no one, including the combatants, knew what was going on nor why they were involved" (1). Woolf's vision of the War as chaotic and confusing parallels Tolstoy's belief that control is merely an illusion in the field of battle. In *Mrs. Dalloway*, Woolf vividly describes the trauma of a soldier, Septimus Smith, who brings the violence of war into peacetime London:

And there the motor car stood, with drawn blinds, and upon them a curious pattern like a tree, Septimus thought, and this gradual drawing together of everything to one centre before his eyes, as if some horror had come almost to the surface and was about to burst into flames, terrified him. The world wavered and quivered and threatened to burst into flames. It is I who am blocking the way, he thought. (15)

The "gradual drawing together of everything to one centre" may remind us of Tolstoy's Nikolai Rostov, who sees both soldiers and family members contributing to his wound by pulling on his arm.

Similar to Woolf in their frenetic movement and flame imagery, Joyce's descriptions of war may also parallel Tolstoy's because of the Russian writer's penchant for constant movement

and transformation.⁷ Thus, Fairhall argues that the “Circe” chapter in *Ulysses* “is filled with ironies, disjunctions, jerky energy, and hallucinatory violence and transformations” (212). In the Nestor episode, we witness a premonition of an apocalypse: “I hear the ruin of all space, shattered glass and toppling masonry, and time one livid final flame” (165). Many of Tolstoy’s characters, especially Pierre as he tours the battlefield, also experience war as a panoply of chaos.

But at the center of Tolstoy’s novel as well as Modernism is the question of whether or not writing can become a gateway to visceral experience. According to Sarah Cole, literature “has always offered an exemplary forum for making violence knowable...” (MacKay 37). Importantly, both Tolstoy and the Modernists are using literary experimentation to express wartime violence while undermining our ability to understand it fully—and ultimately denouncing such violence. Ironically, though, Tolstoy’s interest in experimentation stems from his deep distrust of narrative and its ability to transmit lived experience:

For Tolstoy, this divergence between actual experience and reported experience is “inevitable,” because narrative, by its nature, distorts what it seeks to represent. By describing as orderly what was not orderly, by tying together isolated events as parts of a larger whole, and by assuming an overall perspective where none was possible, narrative accounts create coherent stories that fundamentally misrepresent events. (Morson 108)

Therefore, in describing violence through a dream state or a fantastical world, Tolstoy does violence not only to conventional representations of war. In a more fundamental way, the writer also does violence to *representation*.

Strangely, Tolstoy may thus be a precursor to Gertrude Stein, Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, or T. S. Eliot, though his experiments predate the Modernists by at least fifty years.⁸ Yet it is not an accident that his literary experimentation centers around his critique of war. More than anything, it is the violence of war that allows us to see “the divergence between actual experience and reported experience” (Morson 108) and the subtle ways in which external

chaos mirrors internal turmoil. And it is definitely the process of confronting the violence of war that made Tolstoy rebel against all theories of coherence, all attempts at systematic thought:

[Tolstoy's] work attacks all models of human behavior, all "theories of history" (or psychology) which purport to show that, behind the multiplicity of apparently accidental or random facts of historical life, there is really a set of rules, a system, or a pattern that can explain everything...According to Tolstoy, the essential fact about human events is their incommensurability with systems, their development according to genuinely (not just apparently) random factors (Morson 84-85).

There's no hidden "reason" for Nikolai's wound or for his initial confusion. There's no redeeming explanation of Tushin's manic actions. And there's certainly no cause or motive behind Petya's death.

Of course, a philosophical distrust of systems falls short of explaining Tolstoy's depictions of violence. Although Tolstoy served in the Crimean War and was fascinated with war as a subject for his narratives, he was a lifelong pacifist. It's well known that his thoughts on nonviolence influenced Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. In Tolstoy's novel, violence could only be represented as external, unsystematic chaos and inner delirium because this was Tolstoy's ethical stance on war in any guise.

In his 1922 masterpiece *The Waste Land*, T. S. Eliot writes:

What is that sound high in the air
Murmur of maternal lamentation
Who are those hooded hordes swarming
Over endless plains, stumbling in cracked earth
Ringed by the flat horizon only
What is the city over the mountains
Cracks and reforms and bursts in the violet air
Falling towers
Jerusalem Athens Alexandria
Vienna London
Unreal. (33).

Giving humanity to the “hooded hordes swarming” in his battle scenes, Tolstoy did not live to see “cracks and reforms and bursts in the violet air” (Eliot 33). But along with T. S. Eliot, he agreed that violence, which splits human hearts and minds and rends our bodies into “corpses that have begun to sprout,” (Eliot 9) is, indeed, “unreal” (Eliot 33). As violence is becoming even more disembodied, even more “unreal” in the age of drone warfare, we can view Tolstoy’s work as an urgent attempt to make us pay attention to individual pain or suffering, the stuff usually ignored by historians and politicians.

Notes

1. People die in a totally different way from the way death is usually described. Nature is not the same as it’s represented, war is not, the Caucasus are not, bravery is not expressed in this way, people love, live, think, and of course die in a totally different way—this is the main source of Tolstoy’s system. We’re nearing Tolstoy’s fatal and inevitable “not so”—art is not the way it’s usually represented. In this way, Tolstoy is really the canonizer of crisis—its revealing, destructive forces are present in almost every one of his techniques. (Translation mine.)
2. “Thoughts develop either by interaction with stimuli from the outside, or by their own inner dynamic, or by interaction with other thoughts. This representation of the mind as containing essentially chaotic elements resembles Tolstoy’s descriptions of the chaos of battle” (Morson 200).
3. See Slivitskaya.
4. Such a focus on Tushin is part and parcel of Tolstoy’s philosophy of history: “The process of understanding history begins not with the exposition of ‘great’ men’s deeds. Tushin and other ‘unobtrusive individuals’ are the true representatives of the Russian nation” (Christian 161).
5. It’s true that Tushin also exhibits benevolence and goodwill by first noticing Nikolai Rostov’s wound. Yet his kind attention to Rostov does not overshadow the violent action of burning down an entire village.
6. “... early imaginative play of children can be understood as an effort of the growing organism to deal with the large objects and

people around it by gradually reducing negative effects produced by extremely novel content through reshaping such material to manageable sizes that can be explored and manipulated by the child” (Singer 190).

7. “The sense of movement, interaction, and change—and by contrast, continuity—is always present in *War and Peace*” (Christian 129).
8. *War and Peace* came out in 1869, which is fifty-one years prior to the first of the Modernist publications, Joyce’s *Ulysses* (in 1922).

Works Cited

- Christian, R. F. *Tolstoy: A Critical Introduction*. University Press, 2009.
- Eikhenbaum, Boris. *Molodoi Tolstoi*. Grzhebin Publishing, p. 130. www.feb-web.ru/feb/tolstoy/critics/emt/emt-001-.htm?cmd=p. Accessed July 10, 2017.
- Eliot, T. S. *The Waste Land*. FQ Publishing, 2015.
- Fairhall, James. *James Joyce and the Question of History*. Cambridge UP, 1999.
- MacKay, Marina. *Modernism, War, and Violence*. Bloomsbury, 2017.
- McPeak, Rick. “Benevolence on the Battlefield.” *Critical Insights: War and Peace*. Salem, 2014, pp. 109–23.
- Morson, Gary Saul. *Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in “War and Peace.”* Scholar Press, 1988.
- Pellegrini, A. P. *The Future of Play Theory*. State U of New York P, 1995.
- Singer, Jerome. “Imaginative Play” in *The Future of Play Theory: A Multidisciplinary Inquiry into the Contributions of Brian Sutton-Smith*. Edited by Anthony D. Pellegrini. State U of New York P, 1995.
- Slivitskaya, Olga Vladimirovna. “The Poetic Nature of *War and Peace*.” *Critical Insights: War and Peace*. Salem, 2014, pp. 119–34.
- Tate, Trudi. *Modernism, History and the First World War*. Humanities E-Books, 2013.
- Tolstoy, Leo, et al. *War and Peace*. Vintage, 2017.
- Weir, Justin. *Leo Tolstoy and the Alibi of Narrative*. Yale UP, 2011.
- Woolf, Virginia. *Mrs. Dalloway*. Harvest Book, 1990.