FROM ROMANTIC EXOTICISM TO IMPERIAL CRITIQUE: THE CAUCASIAN EAST IN PUSHKIN, LERMONTOV, AND TOLSTOY

Mustafa M. Bayeshanov
Ph.D., Associate Professor
Gulistan State University
Gulistan, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article investigates the changing representation of the Caucasian East in nineteenth-century Russian literature through a comparative reading of Alexander Pushkin's The Prisoner of the Caucasus, Mikhail Lermontov's A Hero of Our Time, and Leo Tolstoy's Hadji Murat. It argues that the movement from romantic exoticism to a sustained critique of imperial authority is neither linear nor absolute. The works reveal successive alterations in narrative focalization, the distribution of agency, the construction of landscape, and the ethical treatment of violence. Pushkin's captive protagonist organizes the Caucasus around a Russian consciousness, while Lermontov exposes the consequences of instrumentalizing local characters within the psychology of the imperial officer. Tolstoy relocates moral attention toward the historical predicament of a Caucasian protagonist and makes the administrative logic of conquest visible. Rather than treating the East as a stable geographical or cultural essence, the article interprets it as a contested literary construction whose meanings depend on genre, narrative position, and historical conflict.

Keywords: Russian literature, Caucasus, Orientalism, imperial discourse, Pushkin, Lermontov, Tolstoy, narrative perspective.

I. Introduction

The representation of the East remains an important question in literary studies because cultural images are seldom separable from the conditions under which they are produced. In nineteenth-century Russia, the Caucasus occupied a particularly complex position: it was a region of military expansion, a destination of exile and travel, and an imaginative space through which Russian writers reflected on freedom, authority, masculinity, and national identity. The term "East" in this article denotes a historically variable literary designation rather than a homogeneous community. Caucasian societies differed in language, religion, social organization, and political experience; literary analysis must therefore avoid reducing them to one undifferentiated Oriental object.

The Caucasian theme is especially productive for comparing the relations between aesthetic form and imperial ideology. Romantic literature frequently transformed mountains, local customs, and conflict into signs of exotic freedom, yet the very formal choices that made this environment attractive could obscure the perspectives of its inhabitants. Later prose complicated this vision by examining the motives of imperial agents, the asymmetry of coercive power, and the destructive consequences of conquest. The proposed comparison concentrates on what narration permits particular characters to know, desire, and say, rather than only on whether a writer expresses sympathy for Caucasian peoples.

II. Literature Review

Edward Said's Orientalism (1978) established a major critical vocabulary for examining the relationship between cultural representations of the East and structures of political authority. Its analytical value here lies not in

applying a single Western model mechanically to Russia, but in investigating how descriptions of foreign space can authorize the observer's interpretive supremacy. The Russian imperial context requires additional historical and literary specificity, since the Caucasus was not only imagined from a distance but also encountered through war, settlement, military service, and political resistance.

Susan Layton (1994) demonstrates that Russian writing about the Caucasus cannot be understood as a uniformly celebratory literature of conquest. Romantic sympathy for mountaineers could coexist with imperial assumptions, while aesthetic admiration of indigenous independence could contradict official claims about Russia's civilizing mission. Harsha Ram (2003) similarly links imperial subject matter to the formal development of Russian poetic discourse, demonstrating that genre, elevated diction, and poetic authority shaped the imagination of empire. These studies suggest that ideological tensions become visible in literary form, not merely in explicitly political statements.

Alexander Etkind (2011) offers another relevant perspective by examining the contradictory configurations of empire, cultural hierarchy, and internal colonization in Russian history. Although the Caucasian frontier should not be conflated with internal colonization elsewhere, the conceptual emphasis on uneven relations and the instability of imperial self-description helps clarify the ambiguous position of Russian literary narrators. Mary Louise Pratt's concept of the contact zone (1992) also highlights asymmetrical encounters, although it must be adapted to the distinctive conventions of narrative fiction rather than treated as direct ethnographic evidence.

The present article builds on this scholarship while prioritizing close reading. It treats changes in narrative focalization, characterization, and the relation between setting and action as observable textual indicators of how the imperial relationship is imagined. The comparison is deliberately selective: it does not claim that these three texts exhaust nineteenth-century Russian representations of the Caucasus.

III. Methods

The study applies comparative literary analysis, contextual interpretation, and narratological close reading. The primary corpus consists of Pushkin's narrative poem The Prisoner of the Caucasus (1822), the "Bela" narrative and related episodes of Lermontov's A Hero of Our Time (1840), and Tolstoy's novella Hadji Murat, written in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and published posthumously in 1912. The works are considered in relation to different phases of literary development and of the prolonged Caucasian conflict.

IV. Results and Discussion

4.1. Pushkin: Romantic Freedom and the Limits of the Captive's Perspective

Pushkin's The Prisoner of the Caucasus establishes a structural opposition between a disenchanted Russian captive and a landscape associated with intensity, danger, and freedom. The mountain world appears to offer an alternative to the social exhaustion attributed to the protagonist's previous life. The image of Caucasian liberty is thus central to the poem's emotional organization, but it is filtered principally through the interests of the Russian outsider. The captive's spiritual drama determines how the surrounding society becomes meaningful.

The Circassian young woman introduces an important complication. Her attachment, practical assistance, and ultimate loss allow the reader to encounter vulnerability beyond the Russian protagonist's experience. Nevertheless, the asymmetry of representation remains pronounced. Her emotional life is largely arranged around her relationship with the captive, while her decisions serve the resolution of his story. The gesture of assistance makes her morally consequential without giving her the same narrative independence as the male traveler. Sympathy does not by itself cancel the hierarchy of narrative attention.

The poem's landscape similarly has a double function. Rugged mountains and apparently unconstrained life produce a Romantic critique of civilization, yet the exotic setting may also transform a contested region into an arena for the self-discovery of a Russian subject. The distinction matters because admiration for local freedom can coexist with an inability to represent local political aspirations on their own terms. Pushkin's poem thereby exposes a foundational paradox of Romantic Orientalism: the other is celebrated as free while the plot remains organized around the outsider's consciousness.

4.2. Lermontov: Bela, Pechorin, and the Ethics of Representation

Lermontov's A Hero of Our Time makes the asymmetry between Russian observer and Caucasian character more troubling by embedding the story of Bela within a layered narrative structure. The episode reaches the reader through the recollections of Maxim Maximych and through a travel narrator, so Bela is doubly mediated before her own desires can be inferred. These narrative frames create distance from Pechorin and prevent his explanations from becoming a final moral authority. The novel

does not merely reproduce the exotic romance; it subjects the conduct of its protagonist to interpretive scrutiny.

Pechorin's pursuit of Bela exposes the violence hidden in the notion of the East as an arena for adventurous self-realization. His desire for novelty converts another person into a temporary solution to boredom. The transactions and coercive arrangements surrounding her removal from her family are crucial to the ethical structure of the episode. What might have appeared in a simpler romance as masculine initiative becomes an instance of entitlement sustained by unequal social power. Bela has feelings, attachments, and moments of refusal, but the framework of the story restricts the future available to her.

The characterization of Pechorin also resists a simple division between civilized Russia and an irrational East. His remarkable capacity for introspection does not produce ethical responsibility. Indeed, he often understands the consequences of his actions without relinquishing the privilege to act. The novel consequently redirects critical attention from presumed cultural deficiency among Caucasian characters to the moral instability of the imperial subject himself. The East is not simply a picturesque background: it is the setting in which Russian claims to autonomy and sophistication are tested and found compromised.

At the same time, the structure does not fully escape representational inequality. Bela remains less discursively autonomous than Pechorin, whose psychological complexity dominates the novel. The resulting tension is precisely what makes Lermontov's text significant. It creates a critical distance from the imperial male protagonist while reproducing, at the level of narrative access, part of the imbalance it exposes. The reader

must distinguish the novel's critique of objectification from the partial objectification performed by its own form.

4.3. Tolstoy: Hadji Murat and the Visibility of Imperial Violence

In Hadji Murat, Tolstoy reverses a decisive component of the earlier pattern: a Caucasian figure becomes the central agent of an extended narrative rather than the secondary figure in a Russian traveler's romance. Hadji Murat's political calculations, familial obligations, shifting alliances, and effort to protect his relatives sustain the plot. He is neither an emblem of pure wilderness nor an uncomplicated heroic representative of an entire people. The narrative presents a person whose decisions occur under intersecting pressures from Russian military power and the rule of Shamil.

The familiar thistle frame contributes to this change of scale. A damaged yet resistant plant becomes an interpretive analogue for the protagonist's fate, locating endurance in a material form that is neither exclusively Russian nor simply picturesque. Unlike an Alpine panorama designed to intensify the outsider's emotions, the recurring plant image presses the reader toward questions of survival, injury, and resistance. Landscape is therefore reorganized from a spectacle available to the traveler into an ethical structure that shapes the novella's interpretation.

Tolstoy also makes violence bureaucratically and politically legible. His depictions of imperial decision-making juxtapose official calculation with the consequences of punitive action for households and communities. The contrast between the remoteness of sovereign authority and the immediacy of destruction undermines any assumption that the administration of conquest can be judged solely from the center. The narrative shifts across social positions, enabling the effects of power to be

considered outside the self-justifying vocabulary of those who command it.

Importantly, this change does not replace a simplistic Russian-centered narrative with an equally simplistic idealization of the Caucasus. Hadji Murat's conflicts include rivalries, strategic compromise, and coercion among indigenous political actors. The novella's critical force derives from its refusal to turn historical conflict into an uncomplicated opposition between virtue and corruption. It places the individual under competing forms of domination and shows the fragility of agency when political authorities demand allegiance while threatening family and community.

V. Conclusion

The comparative analysis demonstrates that the Caucasian East in nineteenth-century Russian literature is neither a fixed exotic object nor a uniformly emancipatory counter-image to empire. Its representation changes with the relation between genre, narrative perspective, characterization, and historical understanding. Pushkin's Romantic poem makes local freedom aesthetically powerful while maintaining the Russian captive as the dominant center of consciousness. Lermontov's novel destabilizes the prestige of the imperial male protagonist by exposing the human costs of his possessive desires, even as Bela remains constrained by mediated narration. Tolstoy's Hadji Murat goes further by granting a Caucasian protagonist political and moral agency and by linking personal tragedy to competing systems of power.

The central finding is that criticism of empire emerges most decisively when literary form reassigns the right to act and interpret, not merely when a narrator condemns conquest. This distinction offers a

methodological basis for further study of Russian Orientalism, including representations of Central Asia, the transformation of imperial travel writing, and the voices excluded from canonical accounts of the frontier. Future comparative work should integrate indigenous Caucasian texts and reception histories so that Russian literary constructions are not mistaken for the complete cultural history of the region.

References

Etkind, A. (2011). Internal Colonization: Russia's Imperial Experience. Polity.

Layton, S. (1994). Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy. Cambridge University Press.

Lermontov, M. (1840). A Hero of Our Time [Geroy nashego vremeni]. Original Russian publication.

Pratt, M. L. (1992). Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation. Routledge.

Pushkin, A. (1822). The Prisoner of the Caucasus [Kavkazskii plennik]. Original Russian publication.

Ram, H. (2003). The Imperial Sublime: A Russian Poetics of Empire. University of Wisconsin Press.

Said, E. W. (1978). Orientalism. Pantheon Books.

Tolstoy, L. (1912). Hadji Murat [Khadzhi-Murat]. Posthumous publication.

Reviewer:

Dr. José-Ignacio Antón

University of Salamanca, Spain