

LUDMILA ULITSKAYA

AND THE ART OF TOLERANCE

ELIZABETH A. SKOMP

and

BENJAMIN M. SUTCLIFFE

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS

Theirs is the special courage of the outcasts. And I don't go looking for them, our life is full of them."⁷⁶ Only the humble characters in Ulitskaya's prose and plays avoid the contamination of working with the state. Despite the stigma attached to compromise, this solution was a common element of Stagnation-era culture. In this respect Ulitskaya is influenced by the *shestidesiatniki*; problems of ethical equivocation are central to the works of Solzhenitsyn and Trifonov and to their ambivalent image of the intelligentsia. For Ulitskaya, who identifies closely with this generation, flexible morality as a survival strategy is ethically flawed and doomed to failure.⁷⁷

Ulitskaya maintains that compromise also arises from consumer forces that have replaced Communist ideology, especially in relation to the press. The adulteration of free speech in an effort to continue publishing is a particularly insidious manifestation; though it has not yet spread to prose fiction, Ulitskaya sees this possibility on the horizon. She maintains that today's Russian writers are not compelled by state censorship to modify their aesthetic aims—these barriers are absent largely because Russian authorities do not consider literature important enough to restrict. By contrast, commercial pressures are a greater threat to artistic integrity. This posited link between compromise and consumerism underscores one of the contradictions of Ulitskaya's writing, which strives to maintain its prized sincerity despite profitability. Likewise, while her body of writing has developed by modeling and defending tolerance, such *tolerantnost'* has its limits, and at times they undermine Ulitskaya's calls for inclusion and acceptance.⁷⁸

From Orthodoxy to Orthopraxis: Living Rightly and Gathering Difference

Morality and compromise exist alongside another crucial opposition: dogma and practice. Daniel Stein, the protagonist whose views are closest to Ulitskaya's own, asserts that Rome is not the mother of the Church but merely a sister; it is no better than the numerous other branches of Christianity. This is congruent with the monk's suspicion of religious bureaucracy, which opposes the simplicity and ecumenical egalitarianism at the heart of his faith. Rome as mother is problematic in a more specific way. In the novel the papal hierarchy, which ultimately bans the monk from mass, stands in for a system closer to home: the Russian Orthodox Church. Although Ulitskaya herself is a convert, for

her Orthodoxy exemplifies the dangers of caesaropapism, drawing ever closer to the state. It is no coincidence that she became a Christian in the 1960s, a time when this faith was persecuted. Her memoir describes attending services in a house that evoked the humble secret sanctuaries of the first years of Christianity: "My experience began in a church that could be called a catacomb. It was a church in the home of Father Andrei Sergeenko, where around two dozen people gathered, and the service itself occurred in a room in his home on the outskirts of the city of Aleksandrov, where [the priest] lived until his death. It was a community whose spirit suggested that of early Christianity."⁷⁹ Father Andrei Sergeenko provided Ulitskaya with a church that was both simple and far removed from the current machinations between high-ranking Orthodox clergy and Putin's state. In both the Soviet and Roman contexts, the true faithful were marginalized and victimized by unjust rulers. For Ulitskaya, Christianity—like the intelligentsia—must speak the truth, defend the weak, and oppose the powerful.

Medea models the positive aspects of Orthodoxy. Visiting Elena in Tashkent, she recalls that the religious instruction imparted by her mother has allowed her to lead a Christian life. In doing so, she need not trouble herself with "philosophical questions which it is by no means essential for each individual to try to resolve." Instead, she continues, one must live according to the knowledge that nothing can turn evil into good and that many people have strayed from righteousness. This statement is the closest Medea ever comes to formalizing the ethical system reflected in her everyday life, where it is the individual who is ultimately responsible.⁸⁰ Impoverished Zina in "The Chosen People" proposes a similarly quiet yet crucial concept. After begging outside a church, she argues with her friend and protector Katia the Redhead. When challenged to explain the Mother of God, she defines the *Bogoroditsa* as the "Mother of her daughter." To build on our discussion in chapter 1, Katia's scoffing reaction misses the underlying wisdom of the remark: Christianity is a family of believers. Choosing to belong to it is an inalienable part of human existence—as when Medea shuns arcane theology, Zina identifies belief and support as the true bulwarks of Orthodoxy. It is all the more telling that the bearer of this message is also someone who desperately needs it; for Ulitskaya, Christianity exists for the dispossessed and meek, not the powerful and proud.⁸¹

Faith should not be complicated by abstract theory. Daniel Stein takes particular issue with manifestations of theology that lack redeeming action. In an anomalous instance of anger, he drives from his church a

Balkan woman selling cloth that, she claims, brings protection by the Virgin Mary. He later explains his actions to Hilda in a manner that elaborates on Zina's statement: "Personally I cannot accept the dogma of the Virgin Mary's Immaculate Conception as it is currently presented by the Church. I greatly admire Miriam, quite irrespective of how she conceived. She was a holy woman, and a suffering woman, but we really do not have to turn her into the progenitor of the world." Daniel objects heatedly not to the sale of the cloth itself but to the contention that Mary is important as a holy "progenitor" rather than a suffering mother. What makes this distortion even more galling is its creation of an artificial rupture where none exists: Daniel does not accept the division of soul and *telesnost*.⁸² This lack of separation is crucial to Ulitskaya's revision of theology and literalizes her claim that Stein bridges the gap between Judaism and Christianity with his body. The gulf between flesh and spirit, by analogy, is as false as the partitioning of the faithful into Jews and gentiles. Conservative Jewish and Russian Orthodox critics were outraged at these statements, marking a shift toward more ideological attacks on Ulitskaya. Ironically, both contingents make the same argument: *Daniel Stein* advocates the merger of Christianity and Judaism. The presumed compatibility (and potential merging) of the two religions recalls the belief of some Russian Orthodox converts that Jewish holy tradition can be reduced to the Hebrew Bible. From the standpoint of *Daniel Stein's* conservative critics the rift between the two religions is a natural and necessary demarcation: overcoming it would destroy one faith to the benefit of the other.⁸³

Ulitskaya's refashioned theology operates in everyday life, that overlooked realm of banal wonders and understated wisdom. Ivan Isaevich, a modest man from an Old Believer family who marries Medea's sister Alexandra, develops a holistic view of family, *byt*, and *bytie*: "He was touched by [Alexandra's] prayerful sigh, but only much later, when he was already her husband, did he realize that the crucial point was the amazingly simple way she had solved the problem which had tormented him all his life. For him the worship of a righteous God simply could not be reconciled with the living of an unrighteous life, but [Alexandra] brought everything together in a splendidly straightforward way: she painted her lips and dressed to kill, and could throw herself into having fun with total abandon, but when the time came, she would sigh and weep and pray, and suddenly give generous help to someone in need." Alexandra is full of contradictions and is far from sinless, as her last husband senses and the narrative reveals. However, Ivan Isaevich values

the broader implications of her living in harmony with *byt*, namely being at peace with self and God in daily life. With this focus Ulitskaya follows a long tradition of Russian novelists who depict what Gary Saul Morson terms the "philosophy of the ordinary." The most celebrated is Leo Tolstoy who, as Berlin evinces in his seminal essay, shows readers how to live righteously not through dogma but by following "rules of thumb." For Ulitskaya these practical guidelines mandate that the sincerity and tolerance of the intelligentsia should shape everyday existence.⁸⁴

Life is more important than ideas; ideas without life take on a terrible abstraction, leading to the horrors of the twentieth century that Ulitskaya documents. Daniel Stein concludes that Jesus teaches us to endorse existence over theology; for this reason the monk sees the present as more important than the eventual Last Judgment. In doing so, Ulitskaya's protagonist rescues faith from the teleological justifications that created religious brutality (the Crusades) and its rationalist counterparts (Stalinism).⁸⁵

The principle of upholding deeds over dogma unites Ulitskaya's oeuvre. She articulates this assertion in an interview, stating, "I am no longer interested at all in dogmatic theology . . . All that interests me is behavior—how people treat their neighbors. It doesn't even matter to me very much what they think." As a number of critics have noted, the protagonist of *Daniel Stein*, *Interpreter* stresses "orthopraxis" over "orthodoxy," endorsing a practical philosophy steeped in Judeo-Christian tradition. This opposition accompanies a refusal to privilege any one religion over another. During the discussions with German schoolchildren about the Holocaust that form the backbone of the novel, he answers the question a Muslim girl poses about his attitude towards non-believers: "Dear Fatima, I have to admit that I have never in my life come across an unbeliever. Well, almost never. The majority of people, apart from those who completely and unconditionally accept the faith they have chosen or inherited from their parents, have their own ideas about a Supreme Power, a Mover of the world which we believers call the Creator."⁸⁶ The schoolchildren, like the reader, are another flock to whom the priest ministers. This audience makes it even more important that Daniel explain how dogma and denomination do not connote belief. Instead, actions are key. As one critic melodramatically but perceptively proclaims, faith is dead without deeds. One source for this idea is clear: Men', Ulitskaya's mentor, reminds believers that Christianity is neither an ideology nor a frozen system of rituals.⁸⁷

Ulitskaya's emphasis on actions over theology increases personal accountability instead of eliding it through a claim to save souls or, in a different vein, to build Communism. One fractious critic scoffs that *Daniel Stein, Interpreter* promotes a permissive god who pats sinners on the head and is a comfortable deity for the consumer era. In truth Ulitskaya's stance could not be more different. With all the righteousness of the marginalized intelligentsia, she denounces abstract ideology, moral laxity, and the culture of gratification that has come with the era of capitalism; her cry for responsibility echoes a central concern of women's prose. The author argues for a practical faith that relies on productive acts in place of empty phrases and promotes unity instead of division.⁸⁸

Difference can lead to strife or, as Stuart Hall has argued, to a new, liberating sense of self. Hybrid characters who combine disparate ethnic, ideational, and religious heritages embody Ulitskaya's philosophy that unity triumphs over conflict. The first major example of this type is Gulia from the early story of the same title, who observes holidays celebrated by her German, Polish, and Russian ancestors. As we note, Ulitskaya's oeuvre develops: it shifts from simply depicting such characters to elaborating on the discourse of tolerance that underlies their depiction. Gulia's mixed origins, for instance, anticipate the diverse backgrounds and beliefs of characters such as Maika and Alik in *The Funeral Party*. Shengeli in *The Big Green Tent*, with his Russian, Georgian, and Jewish roots, incarnates the same principle. Daniel Stein is the apotheosis of hybridity, exemplifying and commenting on the harmonious combination of linguistic, ethnic, and religious difference.⁸⁹ Ulitskaya also highlights Daniel's literalized connection of *byt* and *bytie*; what Levantovskaya labels his "gestures of translation" likewise show the bond between physical, quotidian existence and convictions. Ulitskaya herself is a hybrid figure, as her position between secular Jewish and Orthodox Christian identity indicates. In reflecting on her background, she asserts that she need not choose between its varied elements. As "My Favorite Arab" ("Moi liubimyi arab") recounts, the author is reluctant to represent Russians or Russianness. She feels comfortable only speaking for herself, an atypical figure who is "Russian by culture, Jewish by blood, and Christian by faith."⁹⁰

Hybridity recurs across Ulitskaya's oeuvre and reinforces a central part of her philosophy: homogenous groups and monolithic thinking are untenable in an inclusive society. One critic compares this presumption to polyphony: a mixture of viewpoints and distinct character voices

shapes Ulitskaya's story cycles. E. F. Shafranskaia theorizes in a parallel way that writing about other ethnicities generates "alien texts" (*inoteksty*) in *Daniel Stein*, which in turn create points of contact between self and other. She sees the existence of the novel—and the coexistence of faiths—as a hopeful sign, despite Daniel's death and failure to transform his principles fully into practice.⁹¹

Diversity and community are organizing devices in Ulitskaya's work. Mikhail Bakhtin famously charts how Dostoevsky's prose moves from one scandal scene to another. Our analysis examines how Ulitskaya relies on an opposite structure: nearly all of her longer works contain a central moment when relatives, friends, or survivors of a tragedy gather to celebrate or remember. One critic observes that, for a healthy family, celebration is tautological; the quotidian is itself a coming together that provides support through kinship. Nevertheless, to build on our discussion in chapter 2, Ulitskaya's emphasis on the family of affinity—particularly its multicultural dimension—is reinforced when relatives convene, often creating a focal point for plot and theme as well.⁹²

The early work *Sonechka* establishes this pattern when a motley assortment of friends, fellow artists, and admirers meet for a posthumous exhibit of Robert Viktorovich's paintings. *Medea and Her Children* transforms the principle of gathering into a rationale for the novel's existence, as its final paragraph makes clear when extolling Medea's clan.⁹³ This utopian vision of kinship overcoming loss, a favorite for citation by critics, helps explain Ulitskaya's enormous popularity with both intellectuals and ordinary readers eager for a believable but optimistic image of human behavior in difficult times. Earlier in the novel, Masha's suicide and the ensuing funeral have drawn Medea to Alexandra, the one person whom she has not been able to forgive throughout the plot. The service and wake, while following Greek Orthodox tradition, encompass a multitude of faiths and ethnicities.

This scenario has already occurred in the novel with the unusual combination of guests that commemorated Samuel's death decades ago: "Alexandra came with Sergei, Fyodor with Georgii and Natasha, brother Dimitry with his son Gvidas from Lithuania, and all the men of the family from Tbilisi. [. . .] Medea did not allow any baking of pies or a big funeral party. There was traditional kutiya with rice, raisins and honey, there was bread, cheese, a bowl of Central Asian greens, and hard-boiled eggs. When Natasha asked Medea why she had arranged it this way, she replied: 'He was a Jew, Natasha, and Jews don't have funeral parties at all. [. . .] I don't like our parties where people always

eat and drink too much. Let it be this way.” Food portrays unity and the combination of different traditions, ranging from the *kutiya* of Russian Orthodoxy to Central Asian greens. Despite being a strictly observant Christian, Medea melds the wake with Jewish belief, reminding readers that these sometimes antagonistic faiths are also related. The third element present is a natural reluctance to promote the over-indulgence alien to her own upbringing and values.⁹⁴ The multiethnic wake is a momentous occasion for the author, as *The Funeral Party* also demonstrates. The scene that gives the novel its name gathers a colorful set of guests in the melting pot of New York’s Russophone diaspora. It is significant that this coming together occurs outside the USSR: having moved abroad, friends and relatives can now replace the counterfeit unity of the Great Family with the family of affinity. These events reflect a main theme underlying Ulitskaya’s oeuvre, namely, that supportive kinship comes from harmony based on personal ethics and tolerance solidified during times of crisis.⁹⁵

Daniel Stein, Interpreter more explicitly reveals the ideals behind this conception of family. In 1992 Daniel travels to Emsk to take part in the fiftieth anniversary of the escape he organized from the ghetto. The event, which involves Jewish survivors from around the world, begins with Kaddish. When the priest who had planned a mass cannot attend, Daniel is the logical choice to replace him, and he conducts services in the church where he took refuge after fleeing from the Gestapo. This circular construction emphasizes that Daniel’s life has overcome the enmity between Jew and gentile that helped cause the Holocaust, thus binding plot development to the protagonist enacting a core idea (e.g., faith as a call for reconciliation). In doing so, the novel gives readers the crucial impression that humanity is, indeed, one extended family.⁹⁶

This kinship does not end with people. After Daniel’s death and the ransacking of his sanctuary by the crazed Fyodor, Hilda finds an icon that has escaped destruction: “It was a marvelous depiction of ‘Praise the Lord the Highest Heavens.’ On the icon the sprightly hand of Mother Ioanna had represented Adam with a beard and moustache and Eve with a long pigtail, hares, squirrels, birds, and serpents, and all of creation which had formed a long queue to embark on Noah’s Ark and was now leaping and rejoicing and praising the Lord. The flowers and the leaves gleamed, palms and willows waved their branches. A child’s train crawled along the earth and childish smoke spiraled joyfully from the funnel. A plane flew in the sky, leaving a slender white vapor trail behind it. The old lady had been a genius. She had envisaged all creation

praising the Lord: rocks, plants, animals, and even the iron creations of man.”⁹⁷ The image that has survived is one of hope that comes from unity under the gaze of a kind deity. Hilda admires the icon that Mother Ioanna has adapted, acknowledging both the original image and the creativity of the artist, a woman of solid faith and good deeds throughout the novel. The *obraz* displays all of the Lord’s creation waiting to board the ark: from the first son and daughter to the smallest animal, all will be saved from the impending flood. Even humanity’s “iron creations” will be spared, suggesting a need for the descendants of Adam and Eve to recognize their imprint on the world.

Given *Daniel Stein, Interpreter*’s revision of theology, it is appropriate that Mother Ioanna has diverged from the rules of icon painting, which privilege immediate recognition and reverence instead of revisionism and playfulness. The scene she crafts is emblematic of the monk’s church. For Daniel all things are connected; there is no division between God’s creatures, just as the Lord sees all the faithful as a single flock regardless of religion. The narrative within the icon also resonates with the novel’s ideational trajectory: Daniel has perished because he was cursed, and Fyodor has wrecked his sanctuary. In a similar manner, the horrors of the Holocaust and Soviet rule have warped the lives of many whom the Carmelite priest served. However, as the symbol of Noah’s ark implies, ultimately all will be saved by a deity who sides with the sufferers and not the persecutors. As in the closing paragraph of *Medea and Her Children*, the reader infers that all people have the chance to belong to the Christian family of affinity if they act with responsibility and tolerance.

The icon in this passage is a multilayered work that addresses the faithful. The legend of Noah and the flood is narrated in scripture, which in turn inspired the creation of the original icon Praise the Lord the Highest Heavens. Then Mother Ioanna reworks this image, which is depicted in the final pages of Ulitskaya’s novel. In *The Funeral Party* Alik’s version of the Last Supper fulfills a similar function: “Opposite [. . .] hung a large painting of Alik’s, depicting the Chamber of the Last Supper, with a triple window and a table covered in a white cloth. There were no people seated at the table, just twelve large pomegranates, drawn in meticulous detail in delicate shades of lilac, crimson and pink, rough and full of seeds, their jagged, hypertrophied crowns and vivid dents evoking their internal partitioned structure. Beyond the triple window lay the Holy Land, seen as it is now rather than in the imagination of Leonardo da Vinci.” Ekphrasis combines with veneration. Alik, like Mother Ioanna, has reworked a classic representation of a scene

(painted by Leonardo da Vinci) based on a written source (the New Testament). Both the icon and the painting rely on their viewer's conviction that these layers of representation are built on a real event but are also tied to a contemporary context. In *The Funeral Party*, the rabbi who has come to convert Alik recalls that some believed the pomegranate (not the apple) was the source of temptation; likewise, the cleric remembers how the Last Supper supposedly took place on top of the tomb of David. As throughout Ulitskaya's corpus, here Judaism and Christianity are inextricably linked by ties that are corporeal and familial as well as theological and historical.⁹⁸

Like Mother Ioanna's icon, Alik's painting implies the need to recognize all of God's creations, not just the human. Taken together, the images link the Old and New Testaments to the present day, advocating for a living and flexible faith (orthopraxis) instead of ossified dogma. Both works of art convey images of community via an oddly successful mixture of the reverent and the ludic that suits Daniel and Alik. The two men, born Jewish, are depicted as forces of reconciliation, whether through religion or art. It is no coincidence that even in death they cause diverse groups to come together in their honor. These and Ulitskaya's other images of gathering the likeminded contrast vividly with the *narod's* unthinking stampede at Stalin's funeral.

The icon and painting metaphorically depict the family of affinity, an image of kinship and inclusiveness that acquires added importance when viewed within the context of the intelligentsia. In promoting tolerance as part of an ethical, reflective life, Ulitskaya embodies this group's principles. The author reiterates intellectuals' mandate to educate and enlighten the rest of the population but does so through a new definition of belonging. This shift replaces post-Soviet exclusionary "negative solidarities" and their "patriotism of despair" with the more accepting model of *tolerantnost'*. Literature is the medium for both depicting togetherness and making it a reality. Just as Viktor Iul'evich in *The Big Green Tent* notes that books aid the moral development needed to ensure human survival, Ulitskaya's tolerance project uses writing to create a more inclusive society. Both efforts rely on the power of the text, a supposition with Judeo-Christian overtones of a people united by faith, love, and the word. This utopian scenario resonates with the messianic role Russian literature has long professed.⁹⁹

Christianity for its part can provide a basis for rethinking community. Ulitskaya's attempts to apply it to heal interethnic rifts, clashes between religions, and relations between individual and society reveal a

fundamentally optimistic viewpoint about the potential for change and unity. Her literary works (for children and adults) and *publitsistika* play an essential role, educating readers and engendering the awareness that is the precursor to action. Ultimately Ulitskaya's works illustrate not only the intelligentsia's claim to the writing of history but an even loftier goal: the resolution of deep-seated conflicts in past and present.¹⁰⁰

84. For a good outline of the differences between *byt'* and *bytie*, see Stephen Hutchings, *Russian Modernism: The Transfiguration of the Everyday* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 38; Ulitskaia, *Medea and Her Children*, 139; Morson, "Philosophy in the Nineteenth-Century Novel," 166; Isaiah Berlin, *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy's View of History* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967), 69.

85. Ulitskaia, *Daniel' Shtain, perevodchik*, 171. On *Daniel Stein*, ethics, and the everyday, see I. V. Kuznetsov, "Daniel' Shtain' L. Ulitskoi v russkoi literaturnoi traditsii," *Russkaia slovesnost'*, no. 6 (2008): 40.

86. Ulitskaia, "Ludmila Ulitskaya," in *Contemporary Russian Fiction*, 186–87. On Ulitskaia's views of orthodoxy and orthopraxis, see "Mladshaia shestidesiatnitsa," 8. For critics' discussions of these two terms, see the following: Gorelik, "Proshchanie s ortodoksiei," 172; Svetlana Shishkova-Shipunova, "Kod Danielia Shtaina, ili Dobryi chelovek iz Khaify," *Znamia*, no. 9 (2007): 194; Evgenii Ermolin, "Ubitoie vremia: Zhivye litsa," *Kontinent*, no. 134 (2007), <http://magazines.russ.ru/kontinent/2007/134/ee19.html>; Ulitskaia, *Daniel Stein, Interpreter*, 366.

87. On faith and deeds, see Chumakevich, "Postrealizm v sovremennoi russkoi proze," 34; Aleksandr Men', "Osnovnye zhiznennye printsipy khristianstva," in *O sebe . . . Vospominaniia, interv'iu, besedy, pis'ma*, comp. Natal'ia Grigorenko and Pavel Men' (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Zhizn' s Bogom, 2007), 285.

88. Ermolin, "Ubitoie vremia."

89. Stuart Hall, "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990), 223, 235. On Gulia's ancestry, see Iasmina Voivodich [Jasmina Vojvodić], "Chto otmechaet Gulia? O prazdnikakh v proizvedeniakh Liudmily Ulitskoi," *Russian Literature*, no. 1 (2007): 116.

90. Levantovskaya, "The Russian-Speaking Jewish Diaspora," 100; Ulitskaia, "Ludmila Ulitskaya," in *Contemporary Russian Fiction*, 186. On atypicality, see Ulitskaia, "Moi liubimyi arab," in *Liudi nashego tsaria*, 269.

91. Ulitskaia, "Ludmila Ulitskaya," in *Contemporary Russian Fiction*, 186; V. S. Abramova, "Kaleidoskop' kak khudozhestvennyi printsip v knige 'Liudi nashego tsaria,'" in *Natsional'no-kul'turnaia spetsifika teksta: Mezhdvuzovskii sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, ed. G. S. Dvinianinova et al. (Perm: Permskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 2007), 273; Shafranskaia, "Russkaia literatura," 41.

92. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, trans. and ed. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 146; Voivodich, "Chto otmechaet Gulia?," 116. On family as metaphor, see Clowes, *Russia on the Edge*, 138.

93. Ulitskaia, *Sonechka*, 272. Powers contends that this passage also includes the reader in Medea's family: "Novel Histories," 189.

94. Ulitskaia, *Medea and Her Children*, 305–7, 196–97. Portions of this discussion are adapted from Sutcliffe, "Everyday Life."

95. Ulitskaia, *Veselye pokhorony*, 264–83. On crisis as strengthening family, see Timina, "Ritmy vechnosti," 147. One critic argues that Alik's reinterpreted painting of the Last Supper is a symbol of the novel as a whole: Natal'ia Egorova, "Zhizn' ili 'Veselye pokhorony?'" L. Ulitskaia o russkoi literature v sovremennom zapadnom mire," in *Vostok-zapad: Prostranstvo russkoi literatury; materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii. (Zaochnoi). Volgograd 25 noiabria 2004 g. Volgogradskii gosudarstvennyi*

pedagogicheskii universitet, ed. N. E. Troпкиna et al. (Volgograd: Volgogradskoe nauchnoe izdatel'stvo, 2005), 114.

96. Ulitskaia, *Daniel' Shtain, perevodchik*, 431–32; Elena Stepanian, "Eto my, Gospodii': O diletantakh, professionalakh i o mirovom kholode," *Znamia*, no. 2 (2010): 195. On the connection between Daniel's faith and the human family, see Ulitskaia,

"Krizis—pravil'noe sostoianie," 31–32.

97. Ulitskaia, *Daniel Stein, Interpreter*, 402.

98. Ulitskaia, *The Funeral Party*, 60.

99. Ulitskaia, *Zelenyi shater*, 76.

100. Ulitskaia, "Portret iavleniia," 23.

Conclusion

1. Ulitskaia, *Daniel Stein, Interpreter*, 408.

2. Ulitskaia, *Daniel' Shtain, perevodchik*, 120. On predator and prey, see Borenstein, *Overkill*.

3. For a representative (liberal) view of the intelligentsia's fate in *The Big Green Tent*, see Latynina, "Vsekh sovetskaia vlast' ubila"; Likhachev, "O russkoi intelligentsii," 382.

4. A number of critics discuss action versus thought in *Daniel Stein*; for example Gorelik, "Proshchanie s ortodoksiei," 172. Rosalind Marsh, "New Mothers for a New Era? Images of Mothers and Daughters in Post-Soviet Prose in Historical and Cultural Perspective," *Modern Language Review*, no. 4 (2012): 1214. For comments on male and female priorities, see Ulitskaia, *Sviasbchennyi musor*, 231.

5. On the formation and fate of Pussy Riot, see Masha Gessen, *Words Will Break Cement: The Passion of Pussy Riot* (New York: Riverhead, 2014).

6. See Ulitskaia's comments on a liberal radio program: "Svoimi glazami," *Ekko Moskvy*, 7 August 2012, <http://echo.msk.ru/programs/svoi-glaza/916652-echo/>. For Ulitskaia's remarks on Crimea, see "Izvestnoi pisatel'nitse 'otvratitel'no' nasilie Rossii," *15 minut*, 11 March 2014, <http://15minut.org/article/izvestnoj-pisatelnice-otvratitelno-nasilie-rossii-ona-hochet-chtoby-tatarskij-k>. She discusses Russia and Ukraine in "Liudmila Ulitskaia: Otnosheniia Rossii s Ukrainoi isporcheny na neskol'ko pokolenii vpered," interview with Iurii Volodarskii, *Forbes Ukraina*, 2 May 2014, <http://forbes.ua/lifestyle/1370187-lyudmila-ulickaya-otnosheniya-rossii-s-ukrainoj-isporcheny-na-neskolko-pokolenij-vpered>. On the tolerance project, see Ulitskaia, "A Conversation with Ludmila Ulitskaya."

7. For putative links between consumerism and immaturity, see Ulitskaia, "Vse konchilos'," 12–13. On the rise of consumerism after the Great Patriotic War, see Ulitskaia, *Sviasbchennyi musor*, 266.

8. On Putin and Europe, see Liudmila Ulitskaia, "Liudmila Ulitskaia: Evropa, proshchai!" interview with Andrei Sharyi, *Radio Svoboda*, 20 August 2014, <http://www.svoboda.org/content/article/26541088.html>.

9. Ulitskaia first prognosticated the end of her career as novelist following the publication of *Sincerely Yours, Shurik*: Liudmila Ulitskaia, "Liudmila Ulitskaia napisala, vozmozhno, svoi poslednii roman," *Newsru.com*, 8 April 2004, <http://www.newsru.com/cinema/08apr2004/uli.html>. On the author poisoned by her material, see Ulitskaia, *Daniel' Shtain, perevodchik*, 372. Ulitskaia maintains that finishing *Daniel Stein* almost killed her: "Liudmila Ulitskaia: Dumala, ne dozhivu do finala."