

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL



Volume VI

1993

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

Special Issue: Tolstoy and Sexuality

**Volume VI
1993**

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

Editor: Amy Mandelker (Graduate Center, City University of New York)

Editorial Board: Elizabeth Beaujour (Hunter College, City University of New York), Caryl Emerson (Princeton University), Richard Gustafson (Barnard College and Columbia University), Gary Jahn (University of Minnesota), Gary Saul Morson (Northwestern University), Donna Orwin (University of Toronto), Kathleen Parthé (University of Rochester), Anna Tavis (Williams College), Andrew Wachtel (Northwestern University), Thomas G. Winner (Boston University)

Managing Editor: George Ouwendijk (Graduate Center, City University of New York)

Bibliography Editor: Harold K. Schefski (California State University, Long Beach)

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL, an annual publication of the Tolstoy Society, is supported by the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, and the Department of Comparative Literature in the Graduate Center of the City University of New York.

OFFICERS OF THE TOLSTOY SOCIETY (1992-1993):

President: Gary Saul Morson (Northwestern University)

Vice-Presidents: Amy Mandelker (Graduate Center of the City University of New York), Kathleen Parthé (University of Rochester)

Subscriptions: Journal subscription is included in membership to the Tolstoy Society. Annual dues are \$35 for institutions, \$20 for faculty, \$10 for emeriti, students and independent scholars. Please make checks out to the Tolstoy Society and send to Kathleen Parthé, 104 Jefferson Road, Princeton, NJ, 08540-3303.

Manuscripts: Please consult the "Style Guide and Information for Authors" at the back of this issue. Submissions for Volume VII of the *Tolstoy Studies Journal* should be sent to Charles Isenberg, Russian Department, Reed College, 3203 SE Woodstock, Portland, Oregon, 97202-8199. Send bibliographical entries to Professor Harold K. Schefski, Department of German, Russian and Classics, California State University Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA, 90840.

Cover Illustration: N. Andreev, *Tolstoy at Work*, 1905.

Cover Design: George Ouwendijk

Cover Graphics: Elaine Robin

Copyright 1992

ISSN 1044-1573

Tolstoy Studies Journal

Volume VI, 1993

SPECIAL ISSUE: TOLSTOY AND SEXUALITY

Contents

FROM THE EDITOR: Amy Mandelker	i
CRITICISM: Ronald LeBlanc	
Unpalatable Pleasures:	
Tolstoy, Food, and Sex	1
 Daniel Rancour-Laferriere	
Anna's Adultery:	
Distal Sociobiology vs. Proximate Psychoanalysis.	33
 Anthony Anemone	
Gender, Genre, and the Discourse of Imperialism	
in Tolstoy's <i>Cossacks</i>	47
 Dragan Kujundžić	
Pardoning Woman in <i>Anna Karenina</i>	65
 Robert Edwards	
Tolstoy and Alice B. Stockham:	
The Influence of Tokology on <i>The Kreutzer Sonata</i>	87
 Leo Tolstoy: Preface to <i>Tokology</i>	105
 A History of the Composition of	
the "Afterword to <i>The Kreutzer Sonata</i> "	107
 Leo Tolstoy: Afterword to <i>The Kreutzer Sonata</i>	111
 William Nickell	
The Twain Shall Be of One Mind:	
Tolstoy in "Leag" with Eliza Burnz and Henry Parkhurst	123
 Leo Tolstoy: On the Relations between the Sexes.	153

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION:

Donna Tussing Orwin, <i>Tolstoy's Art and Thought 1847-1880</i>	
Caryl Emerson, Andrew Wachtel, Gary Jahn	157
Donna Orwin Replies.	167

REVIEWS: Gareth Williams, <i>The Influence of Tolstoy on Readers of His Works</i>	
by Natasha Sankovitch.	171
William Edgerton, ed., <i>Memoirs of Peasant Tolstoyans in Soviet Russia</i>	
by Gina Kovarsky	175

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABSTRACTS: Harold K. Schefsky.	178
--	-----

ANNOUCEMENTS	179
------------------------	-----

STYLE GUIDE AND INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS.	180
--	-----

From the Editor

At the risk of appearing to subscribe to an overly pervasive pluralism, I might change the title of this special issue to "Tolstoy and Sexualities," since what has emerged in the essays collected here is the earnest intensity with which Tolstoy scrutinized various theories of sexuality, and diverse prescriptions (social and medical) for sexual practice. Here is not an author whose issues with sex need to be teased out of textual repressions and discursive obsessions: if anything, Tolstoy was one of the most frank and outspoken critics of the sexual practices and mores of his generation, as well as an uncannily empathic psychologist of both male and female sexuality. This is not to argue that his naked descriptions of passion, childbirth, and marital strife were not exceeded by the murkier eroticisms of modernist and symbolist art. Nor is Tolstoy unique in coupling issues of sexuality to morality, ultimately to Christian *askesis*. We pay attention to Tolstoy, however, because his great novels so exhaustively retrace these same issues of corporeality, flesh, and passion, that he easily assumes the title, "seer of the flesh."

Furthermore, Tolstoy's personal and political involvements with the "sexual question" made it all too easy for critics to translate his literary treatments of the topics into a form of dramatized autobiography; his texts, from *Anna Karenina* to *Kreutzer Sonata*, "The Devil," and "Father Sergius" have all fallen prey to a common critical interpretation, verging on a kind of hermeneutic voyeurism, that casts Tolstoy in the role of all his anguished male protagonists. So, recently, I was treated to an off-Broadway musical performance of *Anna Karenina* that earnestly satirized Tolstoy in the figure of Levin, turning the game of chalk ciphers in the proposal scene--a transcendent, lyrical passage in the novel--into broadly played farce, which, for those in the know, was easily recognizable as the playwright's adaptation of the diary and correspondence accounts of Tolstoy's courtship of his wife. In preparing for the even more notorious production of "Plunging My Knife Swiftly into her Corset," (an off-off Broadway avant-garde theatricalization based on *Kreutzer Sonata*) the cast was forced to read Sophia Andreevna's diaries, thus reiterating Ted Hughes' poetic indictment of the author ("Kreutzer Sonata", 1967):

Now you have stabbed her good
A flower of unknown colour appallingly
Blackened by your surplus of bile
Blooms wetly on her dress.

'Your mystery! Your mystery! . . .'
All facts, with all absence of facts,
Exhale as the wound there
Drinks its roots and breathes them to nothing.

Vile copulation! Vile! --etcetera.
 But now your dagger has outdone everybody's.
 Say goodbye for your wife's sweet flesh goes off,
 Booty of the envious spirit's assault.

A sacrifice, not a murder.
 One hundred and forty pounds
 Of excellent devil, for God.
 She tormented Ah demented you.

With that fat lizard Trukachevsky,
 That fiddling, leering penis.
 Yet why should you castrate yourself
 To be rid of them both?

Now you have stabbed her good
 Trukachevsky is cut off
 From any further operation on you,
 And she can find nobody else.

Rest in peace, Tolstoy!
 It must have taken supernatural greed
 To need to corner all the meat in the world,
 Even from your own hunger.

Tolstoy's biography, correspondence, and belle-lettres document his life-long preoccupation and struggle with "sexual questions" and thus challenge the serious scholar to mine this fertile and complex field of investigation in order to move responsibly beyond the types of facile author/protagonist conflation sketched above. Indeed, the topic of this issue was selected with this goal in mind, as a direct result of my own frustration with existing discussions of Tolstoy and sexuality (Peter Ulf Møller's excellent study of the *Kreutzer Sonata* being a notable exception). And, thankfully, the contributors to this volume were united in their motivation to probe the topic without simply exposing and exploiting the vicissitudes of Tolstoy's personal crises. The contributors were furthermore generous and energetic in providing documentation and translations of supplementary materials that are collected and published together here in an anthology, thus combining critical views with Tolstoy's own words for the first time since Chertkov's compilation on this topic.

Interestingly, the work which most of these articles return to is not the *Kreutzer Sonata*, but the early novel that belabors the mind-body problem as it is couched in the Rousseauian categories of nature vs. civilization, female vs. male, etc. Both Anenome's "Gender, Genre, and the Discourse of Imperialism in Tolstoy's *Cossacks*" and LeBlanc's

"Unpalatable Pleasures: Tolstoy, Food, and Sex" explore these topics in *Cossacks*, as well as in other works. The debate is taken up again in the Roundtable Discussion of Donna Tussin Orwin's book, *Tolstoy's Art and Thought 1847-1880*, the heart of which is arguably, her definitive treatment of Rousseau's *oeuvre* within Tolstoy's philosophy. That Tolstoy's concerns with sexuality need to be understood in the larger context of his philosophical thought and his concerns with the body is made clear in LeBlanc's synoptic essay which reminds us of the links between sexual consumation, and the urge to *consommer* that become operative in Tolstoy's post-conversion struggles (both actual and textual) with the appetites of the flesh.

Rancour-Laferriere's "Anna's Adultery: Distal Sociobiology vs. Proximate Psychoanalysis" and Kujundžić's "Pardoning Woman in *Anna Karenina*" explore the functions of the adultery theme in *Anna Karenina*, in two divergent, but ultimately connected approaches. Rancour-Laferriere considers the ultimately reproductive results of sexual drives and the resultant gender differences in socio-sexual mores; Kujundžić explicates the scriptural sub-texts of *Anna Karenina* to illuminate the theme of pardoning and forgiveness as a phenomenological dimension of the novel.

The final two articles in this collection provide a happily complete literary history of Tolstoy's correspondence with American movements in "sexuality" at the time of his work on the *Kreutzer Sonata*. Edward's "Tolstoy and Alice B. Stockham: The Influence of "Tokology" on *The Kreutzer Sonata*" succinctly outlines the features of Stockham's work and summarizes her contact with Tolstoy. The significance of her *Tokology* for the *Kreutzer Sonata* is documented in Tolstoy's correspondence of the time, his preface to the *Tokology*, and his various "Afterwords" to the *Kreutzer Sonata*, all of which are presented here in translation. Similarly, Nickell's article is the first comprehensive history of Tolstoy's curious involvement with the "Diana" movement created by Parkhurst and Burnz. Tolstoy's cautious approbation of the "Diana" pamphlet was published in his "On the Relations between the Sexes", also translated here.

Tolstoy's own quest for a moral sexuality he could endorse, painfully charted in his "Afterword to the *Kreutzer Sonata*," resulted in his notorious advocacy of chastity, even within marriage. Such an extreme view -- "there is no such thing as a Christian sexually consummated marriage" -- forced him to create a striking document: a definition of Christian idealism that infused *praxis* with *theoria*, and rendered the flawed human progress towards a perfect *imitatio Christi* as sacred as its ultimate goal. When reading Tolstoy, and reflecting on the all too apparent tear wounds of the struggle between flesh and spirit, we might do well to return to Tolstoy's own account of the battle, one that ultimately redeems the world and the flesh as the place where spirit is made manifest.

This issue is the last I will edit for the *Tolstoy Studies Journal*. I have been honored to be at the helm of this publication for the last three years, and have benefited tremendously from sitting at the vantage point for reading the ongoing scholarship on Tolstoy and his work. I have been sustained and assisted by the generosity and tireless efforts of the Editorial Board, outside expert readers too numerous to mention by name, research and editorial assistants, George Ouwendijk's competent labor as managing editor, support from the Graduate Program in Comparative Literature of the City University of

New York Graduate Center and the Slavic Department of Columbia University, and the contributions of all those who have written for the journal while I was editor.

The journal now passes to the capable hands of Charles Isenberg and all submissions should be directed to him in future at the following address:

Professor Charles Isenberg
Russian Department
Reed College
3203 SE Woodstock
Portland, Oregon 97202-8199

Amy Mandelker
New York City, December 16, 1993

UNPALATABLE PLEASURES: TOLSTOY, FOOD, AND SEX

RONALD LEBLANC, UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Everyone requires a strict diet. There needs to be a book about food.
L.N. Tolstoy

At times it seems to me as if the Russian is a sort of lost soul. You want to do everything and yet you can do nothing. You keep thinking that you will start a new life as of tomorrow, that you will start a new diet as of tomorrow, but nothing of the sort happens: by the evening of that very same day, you have gorged yourself so much that you can only blink your eyes and you cannot even move your tongue.
N.V. Gogol

When the topic of food and eating in Russian literature is mentioned, one is likely to think almost instantly of Nikolai Gogol, that robust prose writer whose culinary, gastronomic and alimentary obsessions--in his verbal art as well as his own personal life--often reached truly gargantuan proportions.¹ The fond references to food and drink that one frequently finds in Gogol's prose fiction are commonly explained in psychoanalytic terms as the manifestation of the attempt by this sexually repressed author to hasten a "retreat from love": his orally fixated characters are said to compensate for their paralyzing fear of sex through their great love of eating.² Another nineteenth-century Russian writer whose fictional works are fairly replete with memorable food imagery and eating metaphors is Lev Tolstoy. Indeed, the episode where Levin and Oblonskii go to a Moscow restaurant to share a meal in Part I of *Anna Karenina* has become one of the most celebrated, and most closely scrutinized, scenes of dining in all of world literature.³ Unlike Gogol's characters, however, the people who inhabit Tolstoy's fictional universe generally do not regress from genital to oral modes of libidinal satisfaction. Their creator instead allows gastronomic appetite to accompany--and in some cases even to trigger--carnal desire within them. Whereas in Gogol's world one must choose either food or sex, in Tolstoy's one can enjoy them both. In his works, eating serves not as a substitute for sexual gratification, but instead as its complement: eating and fornicating constitute two

¹The two standard studies of Gogol's use of food in his fiction are those by Obolensky and Kolb-Seletski. For testimony to Gogol's obsession with food in his own personal life, see the comments by his contemporaries reported in Veresaev (114, 171, 185-86, 215, 217-18, 228, 235, 239, 245). Karlinsky points out that "both Pushkin and Chekhov could write of food with enthusiasm, but it is impossible to imagine either of them giving a cooking demonstration" (206-7), which is exactly what Gogol did for the benefit of some of his Russian friends directly upon his return from Italy, where he first discovered the joys of pasta.

²For psychoanalytic studies of Gogol and his fiction, see Karlinsky, McLean, and Rancour-Laferrriere.

³Wolfe, for instance, includes this scene (196-204) in her book, a collection that she describes as "The Pleasure of Reading about Wonderful Food in Scenes from Great Literature." For critical analyses of this scene of dining, see also Goscilo, Gutkin, LeBlanc, Pearson, and Schmidt.

of the main human activities through which people seek to satisfy their carnal desire for sensual pleasures.

As we know from his works of fiction and non-fiction alike, Tolstoy's attitude toward sensual pleasure was deeply ambivalent. On the one hand, he himself seems to have possessed acute sensual sensibilities and strong physical appetites for the pleasures of the flesh as well as of the palate. His early diaries, for instance, are filled with entries where he admonishes himself for failing to curb his sensuality, usually when he visits prostitutes, gypsies or serf girls at night and when he overindulges his weakness for rich foods.⁴ In his literary works, meanwhile, this strong craving for life's physical pleasures manifests itself in his portrayal of characters who enjoy intensely felt bodily sensations. "His earlier novels and stories," G.W. Spence observes in a study of Tolstoy's asceticism, "often express a very vivid awareness of the beauty and richness of sensuous, physical life" (20). Indeed, Dmitry Merezhkovsky recognized in this Russian writer's works such an intuitive awareness of--and appreciation for--the instinctive, animal life of human beings that he called Tolstoy a "seer of the flesh," in contradistinction to his most famous contemporary and polar opposite, Dostoevsky, whom Merezhkovsky regarded as a visionary of the spirit.⁵ In a similar vein, Thomas Mann writes that Tolstoy's life, like that of the pagan Goethe, recalls the myth of the giant Antæus, "who was unconquerable because fresh strength streamed into him whenever he touched his mother earth" (106). Admiring what he calls Tolstoy's "animalism, his unheard-of interest in the life of the body, his genius for bringing home to us man's physical being," Mann contends that the Russian novelist displays in his art "a sensuousness more powerful, more immediately fresh in its appeal," than does the great German humanist himself (108).⁶ Finally, John Bayley asserts that in the early part of Tolstoy's career his works emit a pagan feeling of optimism about the world, or what the critic labels as *самодовольность*: that is, a *joie de vivre* that reflects an innate sense of satisfaction with self, life, and nature (50).

After his midlife spiritual crisis, however, Tolstoy came to condemn categorically those pleasures of the flesh that he had once celebrated so memorably in his fiction and he began to advocate instead a rigorous asceticism. During this post-conversion period, Tolstoy's dualistic conception of human beings, as creatures who are tragically torn

⁴"Ate too much at dinner (gluttony)," Tolstoy reproaches himself, for example, in a diary entry for 8 March 1851. "Ate too many sweets" (*PSS*, XLVI, 48). All quotes from Tolstoy's novels, stories, diaries, essays and letters come from the ninety-volume jubilee edition of his complete works. These references are listed parenthetically in the text by volume (Roman numerals) and page (Arabic numerals).

⁵Davie maintains that Merezhkovsky's "brilliantly perceptive but one-sided view of Tolstoy is distorted by his determination to make Tolstoy and Dostoevsky antithetical" (7).

⁶In light of the many unflattering things that he had to say about Goethe during his lifetime, Tolstoy himself probably would have resented Mann's analogy. "I don't like Goethe at all. I don't like his self-assured paganism," Tolstoy writes, for instance, in a letter in August 1891 (*PSS*, LXVI, 34). Later, in his diary for 1906, Tolstoy writes, "I am reading Goethe and can see all the pernicious influence of this insignificant, bourgeois-egotistical gifted man on the generation I encountered" (*PSS*, LV, 248). With respect to Goethe's most famous work, Tolstoy once referred to *Faust* as "that trashiest piece of trash" (*PSS*, LXIII, 38).

between body and soul, between the lure of carnal desire and the promptings of spiritual aspirations, becomes more explicit and prominent in his writings. The author of *The Kreutzer Sonata* would go so far as to condemn sexual intercourse altogether, advocating instead total celibacy, even for married couples. This tension between the animal nature and the spiritual nature of human beings, most critics would agree, is present in Tolstoy's works long before his conversion to a radical brand of Christianity in the 1880s. "Among the philosophical questions that tormented Lev Tolstoy throughout his life," Irina Gutkin asserts, "the dichotomy between flesh and spirit in human nature probably ranks second only to the meaning of death" (84). Richard Gustafson, meanwhile, maintains that, as moral and spiritual types, Tolstoy's fictional characters polarize around two extremes: they are either men of the flesh or men of the spirit. "The man of the flesh lives for himself, his own purposes, pleasure, or profit," Gustafson writes. "Often he is represented in pursuit of sex or food" (207). Fleshly characters such as Stiva Oblonskii, he explains, "define themselves by their bod[ies], their animal urges" (207). What predominates in Tolstoy's post-conversion period is the strict moral imperative that his fictional characters are now made to heed with respect to the body: they are required to subdue the desires of the flesh, to subordinate their physical urges to their spiritual aspirations, and to transcend their animal natures in order to allow the divine element that lies buried deep within them to emerge. In his later works of fiction as well as in his moralistic essays, it becomes especially clear that Tolstoy now condemns sexual passion as an inherently demeaning, degrading, and destructive instinct within human beings, as an animal urge that only impedes us in our quest for moral and spiritual self-perfection.

What I mainly intend to explore in this essay is how Tolstoy's evolving attitude toward human sexuality is mirrored in many respects by his treatment of gastronomic indulgence. As the carnal pleasures of the flesh come increasingly to be seen as sinful temptations that lure people away from the straight and narrow path of moral righteousness, Tolstoy tends more and more to regard the gastronomic pleasures of the table with a feeling of revulsion and disgust--as bodily pleasures that can no longer be considered morally and spiritually "palatable." What causes gastronomic pleasure to become so distasteful for Tolstoy is the belief that eating can lead directly to the arousal of sexual desire. If in his early works Tolstoy tends to depict food and sex in a parallel relationship, as analogous sensual pleasures that usually accompany and complement each other, then in his later writings the author often depicts this relationship as a causal one, whereby eating actually induces sexual activity. In Jakobsonian terms, we could say that Tolstoy's treatment of food moves from the pole of similarity to the pole of contiguity, from metaphor to metonym. As Tolstoy's disenchantment with sexual love (as a coarse and brutish passion) grew more acute and as his commitment to a strict asceticism intensified, his attitude toward food consumption and eating patterns likewise became less moderate. His later advocacy of such radical ideals as celibacy, chastity, and conjugal continence in sexual matters is thus mirrored by his support of extreme dietary measures as well--such as vegetarianism, abstinence, and fasting. Like William Alcott, Sylvester Graham, and a number of other religious reformers in nineteenth-century America, Tolstoy seems to have succumbed to the temptation of believing that eating practices could provide

a ready solution to the complex problems posed by the issue of our spiritual well-being and moral health: that diet, in other words, could shape morality.⁷

ANIMAL APPETITES: SENSUAL PLEASURES OF THE NATURAL MAN

For those who subscribe to the notion that Tolstoy, at least in his earlier works, was a hedonist who understood life primarily as a "born pagan" and "seer of the flesh," Daddy Eroshka in *The Cossaks* would no doubt qualify as the archetypal Tolstoyan character. Endowed with a robust constitution, earthly nature and animal vitality, this elderly Cossack appears to epitomize freedom from any moral laws--Christian or otherwise--that might threaten to restrict, constrain or condemn the gratification of sensual desire. In psychoanalytic terms, Daddy Eroshka could be said to embody the *id*, for he lives mainly according to the ethos that Freud identified as the "pleasure principle": that is, his primitive instincts seek everywhere the immediate satisfaction of an unrestrained animal desire for pleasure and happiness. In accord with Eroshka's hedonistic philosophy, nature ought to serve as the sole moral standard in life: since our animal appetite for food and sex is quite natural, it is therefore right and good that we satisfy that sensual hunger. "God has made everything for the joy of man. There is no sin in any of it," he tries to explain to a sceptical Olenin. "Just look at any animal.... It eats whatever God gives it!" (PSS VI, 56). Under Eroshka's permissive ethic, the moral correctness of appeasing our animal appetites extends, naturally enough, from the gastronomical to the sexual realm. "A sin? Where's the sin? A sin to look at a pretty girl? A sin to make merry with her? Or a sin to love her?" he asks rhetorically. "No, my dear fellow, it's not a sin, it's salvation! God made you, and God make the girl too. He made it all, old chap; so it is no sin to look at a pretty girl. That's what she was made for: to be loved and to give joy" (PSS VI, 47).

It is not difficult to understand the strong attraction that such a "wild beast" (PSS VI, 46) of a man, with his natural self-absorption and inherent lack of self-consciousness, poses to the more "civilized" and libidinally repressed Olenin, the young Russian officer who has fled Moscow social life in his search for a more authentic way of life in the exotic Caucasus. Indeed, Olenin clearly envies the ability of rugged Cossacks such as Daddy Eroshka and Lukashka to act freely and instinctually like feral animals, rather than cautiously and cerebrally like domesticated human beings. In the moment of epiphany that he experiences while sitting in the stag's lair, Olenin strips away the layers of his oppressive social identity and actually visualizes himself as just such a wild animal, a totally instinctual creature, rather than as the reflective and self-conscious human being that he has learned to become as a product of civilization:

⁷For historical studies that examine the development of the health reform movement in nineteenth-century America (and Sylvester Graham's ideological system in particular), see Nissenbaum and Whorton. Deutsch, meanwhile, discusses the food fadism of these health reformers rather more irreverently and unsympathetically in his popular book.

And it became clear to him that he was not a Russian nobleman, a member of Moscow society, the friend and relation of so-and-so and so-and-so, but just such a mosquito, or pheasant, or deer, as those that were now living all around him. "Just as they, just as Daddy Eroshka, I shall live awhile and die..." (PSS VI, 77).

After toying for a while with the idea of finding happiness in a Christian spirit of self-sacrifice and self-abnegation, Olenin later returns to the *carpe diem* "recipe" for happiness that Daddy Eroshka swears by, and the hero resolves to follow suit by living like a simple Cossack in harmony with nature.

In living close to nature, of course, free-spirited Cossacks such as Daddy Eroshka and Lukashka not only hunt and kill, they also liberally indulge their basic animal appetites for both food and sex. "The people live as nature lives," Olenin tries to explain to one of his Moscow acquaintances, "they die, are born, copulate, and more are born--they fight, eat and drink, rejoice and again die, without any restrictions but those that nature imposes on sun and grass, on animal and tree. They have no other laws" (PSS VI, 102). Olenin himself, of course, has already experienced a moral freedom of sorts in Moscow, where, we are told, "neither physical nor moral fetters of any kind existed for him: he could do as he liked, lacking nothing and bound by nothing...he yielded to all his impulses only in so far as they did not restrict his freedom" (PSS VI, 8). Indeed, Olenin's self-indulgent, immoral lifestyle in Moscow, Gustafson points out, "is captured in the image of his farewell party, the late hours, the abundance of food and drink, the idleness, and the endless conversations about life" (55). Even the fun-loving Lukashka is puzzled as to why Olenin, a wealthy Russian aristocrat, would ever want to leave a materialistic playground such as Moscow for the Caucasus. "And why on earth did you want to come here?" he asks Olenin. "In your place I would do nothing but make merry!" (PSS VI, 85). Like both Daddy Eroshka and Lukashka, therefore, Olenin already is a man of the flesh; unlike his hedonistic Cossack acquaintances, however, this educated Russian visitor is restrained by a self-consciousness, intellect, and conscience that prevent him from behaving in the same free, instinctual manner as do these primitive natural men.

Much of the narrative in the second half of *The Cossacks* concerns itself with describing the holiday festivities that take place in this Cossack village in conjunction with the summer solstice and later with the grape harvest. These are both festive times during the seasonal calendar, periods of carnival when, as Bakhtin has noted (122-3), all the hierarchical rank, privileges, norms and prohibitions that mark the established order of everyday life within official culture are temporarily suspended. The conscience-stricken Olenin, however, finds it difficult to allow himself to share in the carnival spirit of moral license and libidinal release that reigns in the Cossack village, where few (if any) restrictions are placed upon pursuing the gratification of sensual appetite. Instead, it is his fellow Russian officer Beletskii, a fun-loving type with loose morals, who seems to adapt quite easily to this permissive atmosphere. Indeed, when Olenin balks at the invitation to attend a party at Ustenka's, Beletskii chides him for his puritanical churlishness. "Charming women such as one sees nowhere else, and to live like a monk!" Beletskii exclaims. "What an idea! Why spoil your life and not make use of what is at hand?" (PSS VI, 94). The "monkish" Olenin occupies himself each day with solitary hunting

expeditions that serve largely to mortify his flesh and distract him from his sexual attraction to Mar'ianka: we are told that he returns home "tired and hungry" from them, "with his bag of food and cigarettes untouched" (*PSS VI*, 88). Meanwhile, the fun-loving "Grandad," as Beletskii is fondly nicknamed by the Cossack girls, participates very actively in the local party scene, which is characterized by both gastronomic indulgence (the "refreshments" of spicebread and sweets) and sexual license (the "merrymaking" with the girls). Indeed, an organic connection between food and sex is firmly established in this section of the text, where male characters such as Beletskii and Lukashka seek to "buy" sexual favors by providing tasty comestibles for the young maidens in the village. Out of the two Russian guests, therefore, it is the negative character Beletskii who eagerly follows Daddy Eroshka's injunction to "make merry," which this amoral libertine does by indulging his animal appetite for both sweet confections and young Cossack girls. Restrained by his keen moral sensibilities, meanwhile, the hero Olenin can only ask himself, "What demon has brought me to this disgusting banquet?" (*PSS VI*, 98).

Despite the apparent celebration of animal vitality and natural appetite that we observe in the portrayal of Daddy Eroshka in *The Cossacks*, the author's own attitude toward sexual and gastronomic indulgence during this period of his life more closely approximates that of the highly autobiographical Olenin. Like his fictional alter ego, Tolstoy seems to have possessed a healthy fear of his own powerful libidinal urges even during his younger years. It should not surprise us, therefore, to find that the artistic representation of Daddy Eroshka is pervaded by the same ambivalence toward physical pleasure and man's animal nature that characterized the author's own attitude. Although Olenin may mythologize, exoticize and romanticize this merry man of the flesh, readers of *The Cossacks* are nonetheless shown that in reality Daddy Eroshka is little more than, in Gustafson's words, "a liar and drunkard whose life is based on economic self-interest and personal pleasure" (56).⁸ Despite his protagonist's fascination with the primitive vitality of Daddy Eroshka, Tolstoy makes it clear that there are some serious moral flaws in this ancient warrior, a rather lewd old man who has now been reduced to reminiscing nostalgically about his earlier sexual and military exploits and who behaves in a rather opportunistic fashion toward his wealthy young Russian friend. "The closer we look," John Hagan writes, "the more clearly we recognize that Eroška is a very ambiguous figure, indeed--a bundle of contradictions, who epitomizes the incongruous fusion of Christian and Heathen in the Cossack character in general, and whom Tolstoy views with as much irony as admiration" (36). This incongruous fusion of pagan and Christian sensibilities, of course, applies equally well to the author's own spiritual personality: the deep contradictions that we find in the author's portrayal of Daddy Eroshka, as was

⁸In her study of the Cossack hero in Russian literature, Kornblatt agrees that the drunken and nostalgic Daddy Eroshka emerges as "a highly contradictory character, a former hero now mocked by the younger Cossacks" (94). Appropriately enough, Kornblatt entitles the chapter of her book that deals with *The Cossacks* "The Ambivalent Tolstoi."

suggested earlier, seem to mirror Tolstoy's own troubling ambivalence about the flesh and the spirit in human nature.⁹

MONOGAMY: TAMING SEXUAL APPETITE THROUGH MARRIAGE

During his life-long search for moral self-perfection, Tolstoy came increasingly to believe that our natural appetites for food and sex must be held firmly in check if our spiritual natures can ever hope to transcend our mere animal personalities. The first step on the path to the morally good life, therefore, is to learn moderation, restraint and self-control in matters concerning the flesh and our physical appetites.¹⁰ This, of course, is precisely the moral lesson that the ebullient young Natasha Rostova is forced to learn in *War and Peace*. Like Daddy Eroshka, the sprightly Natasha is often mentioned as one of those Tolstoyan fictional characters who convey vividly the author's pagan celebration of life and nature. Nicknamed the "Cossack" on account of her wild, free, and primitive behavior, Natasha enlivens and rejuvenates nearly everyone who comes in contact with her--especially male characters such as Andrei Bolkonskii and Pierre Bezukhov--with her abundant vitality, and infectious *жизнерадостность* that manifests itself to some extent in this adolescent girl's emerging sexuality. Indeed, she seems to personify the life force of Nature itself. Perhaps no single episode in *War and Peace* better illustrates this joyful spontaneity and acute responsiveness on Natasha's part to the instinctual, intuitive side of life than the scene in Book 7 when she extemporaneously performs a native folk song and lively dance *à la russe* at Uncle's home following the wolf hunt. The spirit of earthly sensual pleasure that pervades this scene, as well as Book 7 as a whole, is rendered in large part through the joyful celebration of culinary delight and gastronomic abundance that we find at Uncle's home. Witness in this regard the following description of the sumptuous home-style feast prepared by Anisia Fyodorovna, Uncle's domestic partner and cook:

On the tray was some herb vodka, various kinds of liqueurs, mushrooms, rye cakes made out of buttermilk, honeycombs, still mead and sparkling mead, apples, raw and roasted nuts, and nut-and-honey sweets. Afterwards Anisia Fyodorovna brought a freshly roasted chicken, ham, and preserves made with honey or with sugar. All of this was the result of Anisia Fyodorovna's housekeeping; gathered and prepared by her. All of this had the smell and aroma of Anisia Fyodorovna herself; all of it gave off a savory succulence, cleanliness, whiteness, and a pleasant smile. (PSS X, 263).

⁹Hagan explains the author's ambivalence in the following way: "Tolstoy feels the pull of an ethic of love and self-sacrifice as fully as he feels the pull of an amoral freedom from such an ethic; he is Puritan and Primitivist at one and the same time, for he cannot decide whether God resides 'in' Nature and is obeyed by living according to natural impulse, or whether God is 'outside' Nature and is obeyed by resisting natural impulse. This is the crux of the whole matter, and the main point about *The Cossacks* is that it expresses this dilemma without ever resolving it" (44).

¹⁰In a letter dated 28 December 1851, for example, Tolstoy writes, "Nothing to excess. That's a principle that I'd be very glad to follow in all things" (PSS LIX, 138).

"Natasha had a bite of everything," the narrator reports, "and it seemed to her that she had never seen or eaten such buttermilk cakes, such aromatic jam, such honey-and-nut sweets, or such a chicken anywhere" (PSS X, 263). In this passage Tolstoy joyfully extols, in epic fashion, the munificence of the rich natural bounty with which earthly life is blessed.

The author, however, also feels compelled to show readers or *War and Peace* what Ruth Benson refers to as the "dark side" of Natasha's sexual energy: that is, the potentially destructive element implicit in her pagan enjoyment of elemental life (55). Soon after the scene at Uncle's in Book 7, therefore, we are made to witness in Book 8 how Natasha's unrestrained passion for life and its sensual pleasures can become truly demonic: this still fairly naive and innocent Moscow girl falls prey to the hypnotic, bewitching, and intoxicating spell of the Kuragins' sexual mystique at the opera and suffers a debilitating fall from moral grace. Natasha eventually learns to "tame" her sexual passion and finds spiritual redemption not only through the traditional religious regimen of abstinence, prayer, and penance that she observes after her "fall," but also through her subsequent marriage to Pierre Bezukhov, a conjugal union that succeeds in diminishing the heroine's bewitching charms--and harnessing her sexual energy--through the discipline she acquires in fulfilling daily routines in her new roles as a wife and mother. By the time they come to the Epilogue, with its nearly suffocating atmosphere of dirty diapers, noisy children, and prosaic domesticity, many readers feel that the author of *War and Peace* has suddenly brought forth a Natasha who is entirely new and different. "Confronted with the two Natashas," Benson writes, "Tolstoy mutes the wild sensual Natasha, takes away the primitive power which she displayed in her dance at Uncle's and transforms this 'heavenly creature' into the model mother and wife of the Epilogue" (65). Tolstoy, in effect, "de-eroticizes" Natasha by glorifying her newly acquired identity as wife and mother. In a manner not terribly unlike the way Freud, in *Civilization and Its Discontents*, would later describe the civilizing processes of sublimation and repression, Tolstoy shows us how the institution of marriage can be made to fulfill an important regulative function within society with respect to the libidinal urges of human beings. Natasha's marriage to Pierre, as Benson puts it, "exemplifies Tolstoy's attempt to cope with the destructive force of sexuality by controlling and legitimizing it within the framework of marriage" (x).¹¹ In *War and Peace*, maternity and sexuality are thus kept at a safe, comfortable distance from one another, "neatly compartmentalized," in Evan's words (12), in order to preserve and protect the existing social order, an order that finds its microcosmic mirror image in the family unit.

The regulative function that marriage is designed to fulfill within society, that of effectively neutralizing the largely destructive tendencies of the sensual appetites for pleasure within human beings, finds its gastronomical parallel in Tolstoy's highly functional attitude toward food and eating. One must eat in moderation, according to Tolstoy, since an unrestrained appetite leads to gluttony or overeating, which only leaves

¹¹"Central to Tolstoy's notion of the family is that it disciplines, justifies, and redeems sexual relations," Benson writes elsewhere in her book. "More than that, it places sex in a natural, biological order which can minimize its erotic and maximize its functional essence" (91).

one with a feeling of physical and spiritual dissatisfaction. To make explicit this connection between the need to restrain appetites both sexual and gastronomical, Tolstoy in the Epilogue to *War and Peace* resorts to an alimentary analogy that draws a direct parallel between the purpose of marriage (family) and the purpose of a meal (nourishment). "If the purpose of a meal is nourishment of the body," the narrator observes,

then the person who eats two meals at once perhaps gets greater enjoyment, but he will not attain his purpose, since his stomach will not digest both meals. If the purpose of a marriage is the family, then the person who wishes to have many wives and husbands may perhaps obtain much pleasure, but in no case will he have a family. If the purpose of food is nourishment and the purpose of marriage is the family, then the whole question resolves itself into not eating more than one can digest and not having more wives or husbands than are needed for the family--that is, one wife or one husband. (*PSS XII*, 268)

It is perhaps worth noting in this regard that Pierre's first wife, the sexually promiscuous and decidedly immoderate Hélène Kuragina, suffers a painful death after contracting an illness that arose, in the narrator's words, "from an inconvenience resulting from marrying two husbands at the same time" (*PSS XII*, 4). The monogamous Natasha, on the other hand, learns to adopt an ethos of moderation, restraint and self-control that enables her not merely to restrict her sexual appetite by limiting it to just one "meal" (i.e. her husband). It also allows her to channel her dangerous libidinal energies safely into the domestic routines that are maintained by a busy wife and mother. Tolstoy's so-called "therapeutic" view of marriage thus saves his heroine from sensual excess by teaching her moral, emotional and even visceral discipline.

AN ETHOS OF MODERATION, RESTRAINT AND SELF-CONTROL

Tolstoy's advocacy of an ethos of moderation, restraint and self-control in matters of sexual and gastronomic appetite--as well as his faith in the institution of marriage and the family as an effective social harness upon human sexual desire--reaches its apex during the period of the writing of *Anna Karenina*, the work which in many ways marks a watershed both in Tolstoy's personal life and in his artistic career. "In the context of Tolstoy's own development," Irene Pearson asserts, "*Anna Karenina* represents a transitional stage between his joy in expressing intensely-felt physical sensations and his urge to asceticism and social reform" (10). In Tolstoy's famous novel of adultery, the largely autobiographical Konstantin Levin embodies the author's functional approach to the problem of the strong gastronomic and sexual temptation generated by tasty foods and enticing women. The most memorable instance in *Anna Karenina* where this ethos of moderation, restraint and self-control collides against an indulgent philosophy of epicureanism and hedonism occurs, of course, in the well-known restaurant scene depicted in Part 1 of the novel, when Levin goes to dine with his future brother-in-law, Stiva

Oblonskii.¹² From the moment he enters the Moscow restaurant, Levin is immediately made ill at ease by the decadent features of the establishment, by those same elements of urban aristocratic luxury that seem to make his future brother-in-law, by contrast, so radiant with delight: namely, the Tartar waiters in their swallow-tail coats, the vodka and hors d'oeuvres at the buffet, the painted Frenchwoman sitting at the counter. "Levin did not take any vodka," we are told, "simply because that Frenchwoman--all made up, as it seemed to him, of false hair, *poudre de riz*, and *vinaigre de toilette*--was offensive to him. He hastily moved away from her as from some dirty place" (PSS XVIII, 37). Whereas Stiva feels right at home in this culinary pleasure palace, Levin loses his appetite almost immediately upon entering the restaurant and is made very uncomfortable by the vulgar surroundings, which he seems to fear will profane the sacred image of Kitty that he carries around with him in his heart.

During this scene of dining Tolstoy conflates the gastronomic and sexual discourses that will be at work throughout his entire novel, exploiting culinary motifs here as an effective way to convey the contrasting attitudes toward sexuality of these two long-time but antipodal friends. The foods that they enjoy eating become emblematic not only of their opposing personalities, life values, and moral natures, but also of their diametrically opposed views on sexuality. Stiva Oblonskii, the hedonistic "man of the flesh" whose eyes actually become moist and glisten with delight as he dines, is in ecstasy as he swallows quivering oysters from his silver fork and sips chablis from his wide-lipped champagne glass. Konstantin Levin, on the other hand, the simple and sober "man of the spirit," can find little pleasure in such exotic culinary fare. On the contrary, he expresses a feeling of disappointment that there is no buckwheat porridge or cabbage soup at this restaurant (PSS XVIII, 38). "Levin ate some oysters, though he would have preferred bread and cheese," the narrator observes, succinctly encapsulating for us the simple gastronomic dialectic at work here, that, as Lynn Visson has argued, partakes in a wider rivalry within nineteenth-century Russian literature between Russian peasant or "Slavophile" cooking, on the one hand, which features simple and earthy native food items, and elegant Gallic fare, on the other, which the Europeanized gentry imported into Russia from the West. For the Slavophile Tolstoy, of course, Levin's simple peasant diet of cabbage soup and porridge (щи да каша) is immensely preferable in moral terms to Oblonskii's aristocratic culinary indulgence in oysters and champagne, which represent a decadent Western concern with material values.¹³

The contrast in the gastronomical appetites of these two diners in *Anna Karenina*

¹²The following discussion about the restaurant scene with Levin and Oblonskii repeats some of the arguments that I made in my earlier article on *Anna Karenina*, "Levin visits Anna."

¹³Later, in Part III of the novel, Tolstoy shows us the moral antipodes in the countryside to this urban scene of decadent gastronomic indulgence at the Moscow restaurant. First of all, there is the scene where Levin shares a simple meal of bread and water with an old peasant during a break from the mowing on his estate, a scene in which, as Goscilo correctly notes (485), food symbolizes a sense of "true communion" between the hero and some simple rural laborers engaged in a common activity (PSS XVIII, 268-9). Secondly, there is the scene where Levin receives a pleasant impression of spiritual well-being while he watches a peasant family dine together modestly on щи and каша (PSS XVIII, 344).

extends well beyond this Westernizer/Slavophile dialectic, however, to encompass their greatly differing perspectives upon the broader semiotic significance of the very act of eating. As Helena Goscilo observes, Levin and Stiva define for us here the "culinary moral spectrum" that assumes increasing importance in Tolstoy's life and works (482). For the primitive and rustic Levin, eating is a basic biological act, necessary for the purposes of nutrition by sustaining one's life, strength and health; for the urbane and sophisticated Oblonskii, on the other hand, eating constitutes, in his words, "one of life's pleasures" (*PSS XVIII*, 38).¹⁴

Semiotically considered, Levin, with his rustic *appétit naturel*, eats to live, whereas Oblonskii, with his urbane *appétit de luxe*, lives to eat: Stiva, in other words, must artificially stimulate his appetite and create a false hunger in order to generate ever new pleasure out of eating.¹⁵ "It seems strange to me that while we country people try to get over our meals as quickly as we can, so as to be able to get on with our work, here you and I try to make our meal last as long as possible, and therefore we eat oysters," Levin observes at one point. "Well, of course," Oblonskii replies. "That is, after all, the aim of civilization: to get enjoyment out of everything." "Well, if that is its aim," Levin fires back, "I'd rather be a savage." "You are a savage as it is. All you Levins are savages," Stiva exclaims (*PSS XVIII*, 40). As Irene Pearson observes, "the simple way of life in the Russian countryside," where people take a practical, functional, utilitarian approach to food, is made to contrast in this scene with what she calls "the French-style civilization of the city," where the aim is instead to derive as much pleasure and satisfaction as possible from the act of eating (11).¹⁶ In addition to the geographical contrast between city and country, Oblonskii's and Levin's differing perspectives on food and eating thus reveal to us a whole series of binary oppositions with broader sociological, psychological and moral categories: e.g. enjoyment versus nourishment, luxury versus necessity, the "ego" versus the "id," the pleasure principle versus the reality principle, urban

¹⁴If we were to borrow the terms suggested by Barthes (8), we could say that eating for Levin operates within the "realm of necessity" (*l'ordre de besoin*), where food indicates deprivation, while for Oblonskii it operates within the "realm of desire" (*l'ordre de désir*), where food indicates indulgence.

¹⁵"Socrates points out that eating is a pleasure because it takes away the pain of hunger," Pearson writes. "But as soon as one is satisfied, the pleasure disappears along with the pain. A false hunger, a type of greed, must be stimulated in order to re-create the possibility of feeling more pleasure. The same is true of sexual pleasure, Tolstoy seems to imply" (13). Tolstoy, in fact, states this belief quite explicitly in a letter of 27-30 October 1895, when he writes, "if life's happiness lies in the satisfaction of one's lusts, then as they are satisfied, one's pleasure decreases and decreases, and one must constantly arouse newer and stronger lusts in order to obtain the same pleasure" (*PSS LXVIII*, 240).

¹⁶Brown observes that Balzac is another author who makes a clear distinction in his novels between city appetites and country appetites, contrasting the elegant cuisine and fashionable dining rooms of Parisian *bons vivants* with the modest fare served by provincial misers (30). In the "Glossary of Metafictional Terms" appended to his book, Brown defines "Food-work metonym" as "the peasant ethic whereby the purpose of food is to supply energy for work. Food is a means, not an end in itself: eating to live, not living to eat" (202).

sophistication versus rural simplicity, the gentry class versus the peasant class, hunger versus appetite.¹⁷

When the meal has ended and the table conversation switches over to the subject of women we see that Tolstoy continues to use the gastronomic analogy as a way to reify the contrast between Stiva's hedonism and Levin's puritanism. Establishing a setting similar in most respects to Plato's *Symposium*, where, as Gutkin notes, both physical and intellectual pleasures can be enjoyed through the twin activities of dining and discourse (86), Tolstoy's two male characters proceed to engage in a dialogue about carnal versus spiritual love. As we might well expect, each of these men brings to the issue of sexual love the same semiotic code that he abides by with respect to the act of eating: for Levin, the sex drive is a dangerous, if necessary, instinctual urge that must be restrained by channeling it within the institution of marriage and the framework of the family; for Oblonskii, sex, like food, constitutes one of life's delicious pleasures and is thus to be enjoyed for its own sake. For the stoical and spartan Levin, sex is merely a means to an end; while for the hedonistic and epicurean Oblonskii, sex is an end in and of itself.¹⁸ Why a married man would commit adultery is just as incomprehensible to the puritanical Levin as why one would ever go to a baker's shop and steal a roll after having eaten one's fill at a restaurant. "But why not steal a roll (калач)?" the philandering Stiva muses. "After all, a roll sometimes smells so good that one can't resist it!" (PSS XVIII, 44-45).¹⁹ Gluttonous overeating and adulterous extramarital sex are thus linked together here as pleasurable sensual activities that for Oblonskii, as a representative member of the rich and idle aristocracy in Moscow, seem to complement and accompany each other.

The lines of verse from Heinrich Heine that Stiva proceeds to quote during this dining scene underscore for us the semiotic field within which Tolstoy's treatment of sensual pleasure is to be understood throughout the rest of the novel: "It is heavenly when I have mastered my earthly desires; but when I have not succeeded, I have also had right good pleasure!" (PSS XVIII, 45). If the line about mastering earthly desires characterizes Levin's position, then the line about the joy of failing to restrain such desire captures Oblonskii's attitude. As we see repeatedly throughout the novel, Stiva is hardly even trying to master his "earthly desires" (be they gastronomical or sexual in nature); he is seeking only to enjoy "right good pleasure" wherever and whenever he can. For Levin, on the other hand, libidinal restraint does not seem to pose much of a problem, since he eats for nourishment rather than for pleasure. Like the tamed and domesticated Natasha

¹⁷In her study A.N. Engelgardt's *Letters From the Country, 1872-1887*, Frierson explores a number of these same binary oppositions that were utilized by the Russian Populist writer (and contemporary of Tolstoy) in his publicistic writings.

¹⁸Goscilo makes this classical Greek distinction between Levin, who is associated with Plato and the Stoics, and Oblonskii, who is associated with Epicurus and the Hedonists (486).

¹⁹Arguing that Stiva "epitomizes the pursuit of one alternative that Tolstoy did not allow himself in his own life" (56), Armstrong claims that the author himself actually longed for stolen "rolls" like Oblonskii, but he simply refused to admit it (58-9). In her psychoanalytic reading of *Anna Karenina*, Armstrong thus sees both Levin and Oblonskii as products of the author's self-projection. Tolstoy, she asserts, "allows Stiva, his supposed opposite, to satisfy vicariously all these banned appetites" (65-6).

in the Epilogue to *War and Peace*, Levin understands the necessity of harnessing his sexual instincts and he has thus adopted a functional attitude not only toward food but also toward sex, a sensual activity that for him can only be legitimized and justified through the institution of marriage. This is reflected in his comment to Oblonskii that he feels a physical revulsion for "fallen women," sexual creatures whom he considers to be moral abominations (*PSS XVIII*, 45). Indeed, Levin's aversion for erotic women--who are epitomized by the obscenely painted Frenchwoman with her curls--is largely what accounts for his being so "ill at ease and uncomfortable in this restaurant with its private rooms where men took women to dine" (*PSS XVIII*, 39). He realizes full well, of course, that these private rooms facilitate not only elegant dining, but also romantic trysts.²⁰

EARTHLY DESIRES: SINS OF THE FLESH AND THE PALATE

Throughout *Anna Karenina*, Tolstoy continues to identify the satisfaction of gastronomic and sexual desire with a sinful animal appetite for pleasure. The quintessential "man of the flesh" in Tolstoy's famous novel of adultery (if not in his entire literary oeuvre) is, of course, the tragic heroine's philandering brother. As a fun-loving character whose behavior is governed almost entirely by the pleasure principle, Stiva Oblonskii throughout the novel is shown freely indulging his hearty appetite for both food and women. We learn, for instance, that his "married bachelor" regularly conducts amorous liaisons with young actresses, and we witness how he flirts shamelessly with loose women such as Betsy Tverskaia and the painted hostess at the restaurant. In the gastronomic realm, meanwhile, Oblonskii is shown to derive great pleasure from hosting an elegant dinner party at his Moscow home in Part IV and he clearly enjoys consuming a sumptuous repast not only at the posh restaurant in Part I but also at Levin's country home when he goes hunting with him in Part II. The hedonistic Stiva, in short, personifies a lifestyle that Levin roundly condemns for its sinful праздность: that is, he epitomizes all the idleness, luxury, and self-indulgence of urbane aristocratic life in Russia. When Stiva suddenly shows up at Levin's rural estate in Part 6, accompanied by his younger pleasure-seeking partner in sensuality, the amiable *bon vivant* Vasia Veslovsky, the reader observes once again how in Tolstoy's novel the pleasures of the flesh are invariably made both similar to and contiguous with the pleasures of the palate. Food is here linked closely with sex during the hunting trip, when we learn not only that Stiva and Veslovsky spent the first night of the expedition making love to some of the local peasant

²⁰Kiltz has written an entire book about the erotic dining that transpired in such private dining rooms (*chambres séparées*). Indeed, a typical pattern that emerges from the nineteenth-century European novel involves a group of men going to a restaurant or a club to dine and drink, and then, in an intoxicated mood of post-prandial lethargy, either retiring to private rooms or setting off for a brothel where they pair off with the prostitutes working there. "Nineteenth-century French novelists in particular," writes Brown, "fully exploited the relationships between food and fornication in their depictions of *tête-à-tête* meals, and, in the novel as in contemporary society, the co-occurrence of the culinary and the sexual acts was made explicit in public dining houses where the *cabinet particulier* was designed specifically for amorous diners" (14).

girls, but also that chubby little Vasia has managed to consume by himself all of the provisions that Kitty had prepared as meals for the trio of hungry sportsmen.

The romantic, adulterous relationship between Anna and Vronskii is likewise associated with gastronomic images of food and drink, but invariably, as Pearson notes, "in a negative or tainted sense" (12). Like Oblonskii, neither the tragic heroine nor her lover ever really attempts to master their earthly desires. Vronskii, for example, who travels in a fast aristocratic crowd made up of people who "abandon themselves unblushingly to all their passions" (*PSS XVIII*, 121), is consistently portrayed as a healthy, virile and carnivorous beast. Witness in this regard, as Goscilo rightly notes (488-9), the repeated references to his strong white teeth and his fondness for beefsteak. Much like Sappho Shtolz's young admirer Vaska, who has been nourished on "underdone beef (говядина), truffles, and Burgundy" and who seems to possess a "superabundance of health" (*PSS XVIII*, 315), Vronskii is presented as a fine physical specimen. And in much the same manner that the concupiscent Vaska is ready to "eat" the enticing Sappho (*PSS XVIII*, 315), Vronskii's animal passion drives him ultimately to devour the beautiful Anna. At one point, when he is forced to spend a week serving as the official escort for a foreign prince who is visiting the capital, Vronskii even experiences an epiphany of sorts and comes to recognize his own bestial nature. Due to gymnastics and rigorous exercise, the Prince, who epitomizes animal vitality and appetite, is able to maintain a healthy appearance in spite of the sensual excess he indulges in when amusing himself sexually and gastronomically. In search of a "taste" of distinctively Russian sensual amusements, the Prince is escorted on a round of native popular entertainments: while in St. Petersburg, he experiences, among other things, horse racing, bear hunting, troika riding, crockery smashing, gypsy girls, pancakes, and champagne. Vronskii, however, soon finds this escort duty both wearisome and aggravating. "The chief reason why the Prince's presence especially oppressed Vronskii," the narrator explains, "was that he could not help but see himself reflected in the Prince, and what he saw in that mirror was not flattering to his vanity. The Prince was a very stupid, very self-assured, very healthy and very clean man--and nothing more" (*PSS XVIII*, 374). To Vronskii's mind, however, the Prince is not even a human being; instead he is merely a "stupid hunk of meat" (говядина) (*PSS XVIII*, 374). "Can I really be like that myself?" muses a perplexed Vronskii, who is not normally given to reflection of this kind. He later describes the Prince to Anna as "a finely-bred animal like those that get first-place prizes at cattle shows," the sort of creature who despises "everything except animal pleasures" (*PSS XVIII*, 378). To this unflattering characterization, a pregnant, jealous, and thus unsympathetic Anna responds sarcastically, "But don't all of you love those animal pleasures?" (*PSS XVIII*, 378).²¹

Anna, the St. Petersburg adulteress who relinquishes her domestic identity as wife and mother by abandoning her husband and young son to pursue her sexual passion for Vronskii (thus reversing the pattern of development followed by Natasha Rostova),

²¹When Vronskii in Part 5 is desperately searching for some pastime to occupy him while he is staying with Anna in Italy, Tolstoy compares him to "a hungry animal," one who "seizes every object it meets, in hopes of finding food in it" (*XIX*, 32).

likewise is closely identified throughout the novel with food imagery that serves mainly to reinforce her negative image as a fleshly creature. In Anna's case, however, it is the language of gastronomy that is frequently invoked when she wishes to express her spiritual state of her emotional needs. "I unhappy?" she says to her lover soon after they consummate their love affair. "I am like a hungry person to whom food has been given. He may be cold, his clothes may be ragged, and he may be ashamed, but he is not unhappy" (PSS XVIII, 201). By equating her sexual appetite with such a basic human need as physical hunger, Anna seeks through this metaphor to justify the necessity, and hence the morality, of indulging her sexual passion. "I am alive and I am not to blame that God made me so that I need to love and live," she says later in another transparent attempt to rationalize her sin of adultery. "I cannot repent of breathing, of loving" (PSS XVIII, 308-9). As the story progresses, however, and the heroine's moral, emotional and psychological deterioration becomes ever more painfully evident to the reader, we see that Anna's sexual desire is actually more an "appetite" that she has chosen to indulge than a basic, essential "hunger" that she has no choice but to appease.²² In sexual matters, therefore, Anna seems to possess an *appétit de luxe* (like Stiva's), although she strives to convince herself that her erotic desire is actually an *appétit naturel* (like Levin's).

"The key to understanding Anna," Gary Saul Morson boldly maintains, "is that she is Stiva's sister, Anna Oblonskaya" (7). This Oblonskian family resemblance, this commonality of shared sensual traits, becomes especially prominent in Part 7, when Anna takes her final carriage ride through Moscow prior to her suicide. During that ride, Anna confesses that, while she may not know any longer who she is, she does, as the French say, know her "appetites." She proceeds to generalize about the nature of human desire, using a gastronomic metaphor for her sexual lust that sounds quite Oblonskian:

"Those boys want some of that dirty ice cream; they know that for a certainty," she thought, as she saw two boys stopping at an ice cream vendor, who lifted down a tub of from his head and wiped his perspiring face with the end of the cloth. "We all want something sweet, something tasty; if we can get no bonbons, then dirty ice cream! And Kitty is just the same; if not Vronskii, then Levin." (PSS XIX, 340)

Like Stiva's *kalach*, Anna's ice cream and bonbons are here shown to represent much more than merely some sweet and tasty comestibles; these gastronomic objects of desire also serve as metaphors for the voracious sexual appetite of a now jaded libertine. Moreover, Anna realizes that she has herself become that dirty ice cream: she openly expresses here the fear that, as an object of carnal desire, she no longer has "the right flavor" for her lover (PSS XIX, 343). Like her pleasure-seeking brother, therefore, Anna comes increasingly to identify human desire with basic animal lust, with a purely physical appetite for food and sex. As Pearson correctly notes, Anna by the end comes to view life in Darwinian terms as "a battle between individuals for the satisfaction of their appetites"

²²For a useful distinction between "hunger" (essentially a bodily drive) and "appetite" (a state of mind), see Cappon (21).

(14).²³ Not unlike Vronskii, Anna has reduced all of human existence essentially to the satisfaction of one's animal urges; as a result, living has become a meaningless activity from which she can no longer derive any pleasure. As she herself succinctly puts it (significantly enough, in English), "the zest is gone" (*PSS XIX*, 343).²⁴

Tolstoy's condemnation of the sinful pleasures of the flesh and the palate in *Anna Karenina* culminates with the discussion Levin has in Part 8 with the peasant Fedor, who distinguishes between those people who live selflessly for the betterment of their "soul" (душа) and those who instead live selfishly for the benefit of their "stomach" (брюхо). At first sight, one would think that the cast of characters in Tolstoy's novel helps to support this distinction, since there seems to be such a clear dichotomy between selfish egoists (such as Anna, Vronskii, Oblonskii, and Veslovskii) who freely indulge their sensual appetite for physical pleasures, and more moral and spiritual creatures (such as Levin, Kitty, Dolly, and Varenka) who live largely to satisfy the needs and desires of others rather than their own. The novel's parallel plot lines—one focused on Anna, the other on Levin—likewise seem to support this polarity: whereas the female heroine, a "man of the flesh" who lives largely for the benefit of her own stomach, ultimately perishes due to despair, the male hero, a "man of the spirit" who lives mainly for the benefit of his soul, seems ultimately to find spiritual peace. One difficulty with this polarized scheme, however, is that it overlooks the fact that the author's masterful artistic portrayal of Anna has the effect of mitigating much of our moral condemnation of her sinful behavior. "We are so moved by compassion for her suffering," Edward Wasiolek observes about Tolstoy's heroine, "that we tend to overlook the fund of sheer nastiness in her by the end of the novel" (130). Not all readers, perhaps, are as willing as Wasiolek to overlook Anna's serious failings, but most of them do seem to believe that Tolstoy did not wish for his graceful, charming, and passionate heroine to be categorically condemned.²⁵

Another difficulty with this overly neat opposition between sensual and moral characters in *Anna Karenina* is that Levin is not without some problems of his own by novel's end. In Part 8, for instance, he is contemplating suicide and experiencing marital difficulties of his own with Kitty. Worse yet, the narrative events that are depicted in Part 7, when Levin and Kitty move to Moscow for her confinement, show us that the hero's ethos of moderation, restraint, and self-control in matters involving sensual pleasure is severely tested—if not in fact defeated—by the same infectious spirit of aristocratic праздность that Stiva and Veslovsky had brought with them from the city to the country when they invaded Levin's rural estate in Part VI. As I have argued elsewhere, Levin's activities in Moscow during this section of the novel closely resemble—rather than sharply

²³"Towards the end," Pearson writes, "Anna thinks more and more on the level of 'dog-eat-dog,' or to use Tolstoy's own reference to Katavasov's scientific research, on the level of 'the cuttlefish's eating habits'" (14).

²⁴In my earlier article on *Anna Karenina*, I noted the deeper culinary significance of Anna's statement. "Although 'zest' carries the usual meanings of 'gusto' and 'relish,'" I pointed out, "the word originally denoted the peel of citrus fruit such as lemons and oranges, which was used as flavoring" (10).

²⁵Even such a staunch opponent of the pro-Anna camp as Morson openly admits that he belongs to the "minority camp" when he holds that the book condemns Tolstoy's heroine (8).

contrast with--the immoral behavior of Stiva Oblonskii: for example, Levin pays a number of meaningless social calls, attends the theater, and even dines at the English Club--that notorious "temple of idleness" (храм праздности) (*PSS XIX*, 268)--in the company of such merry sybarites as Oblonskii, Vronskii, and Iashvin. "If the scene of dining at the Hotel *Angliia* depicted in Part I had served to illustrate Levin's moral puritanism, displaying for us his staunch opposition to gastronomic pleasure and sexual indulgence," I pointed out in an earlier article,

then the scene of dining at the *Angliiskii klub* depicted in Part VII reveals how Levin's characteristic sense of restraint in libidinal matters has now given way to a desire to indulge in a variety of sensual pleasures.... Thus we see our hero eating and drinking, seemingly without restraint, while his wife, nine months pregnant, lies home in bed. Caught up in the holiday atmosphere reigning at the club, Levin now partakes quite willingly and enthusiastically in those leisure activities that--either explicitly or implicitly--he had condemned so categorically in Part I: namely, eating, drinking, gambling, and socializing. (6-7)²⁶

This evening of sensual indulgence reaches its climax when Levin decides to cancel his plans to attend a meeting of the Agricultural Society with Sviazhskii and opts instead to go with Oblonskii to visit his sister Anna. As critics such as Grossman, Mandelker, and myself have already noted, Levin's visit to the home of this "fallen woman," who succeeds in seducing the hero with her beauty, grace, and charm, bears some uncanny resemblances with a trip to a brothel. Those affinities are certainly not lost upon Levin's pregnant and jealous wife, who upbraids her husband soundly upon his return home late that evening. "You have fallen in love with that horrid woman!" Kitty screams at Levin. "She has bewitched you! I saw it in your eyes. Yes, yes! What can come of this? You were at the club drinking and drinking, and gambling, and then you went...to whom?" (*PSS XIX*, 281). Infected by the spirit of праздность that permeates aristocratic life in the capital, the puritanical Levin seems this evening to have been transformed suddenly into an Oblonskian playboy and hedonistic "man of the flesh."

RADICAL MEASURES FOR SWEET PLEASURES: SEXUAL ABSTINENCE

Most readers of *Anna Karenina* are perhaps inclined to dismiss Levin's sensually indulgent behavior in Part VII of the novel as nothing more than a temporary aberration due to the "intoxicated" consciousness that he experiences while staying in Moscow.²⁷ After all, once he leaves that "immoral Babylon" and returns to his estate in the Russian

²⁶I have argued that "the scene at the English Club shows Levin being essentially seduced by the charms of aristocratic life in Moscow. The 'noble savage' from the Russian countryside to whom we were first introduced in Part I, the rustic who once prided himself in his simple peasant ways, appears to have been effectively 'civilized' in Part VII as he comes to realize his inherent kinship with his gentry brethren in the city" (7).

²⁷Gustafson discusses at some length this notion of "intoxicated consciousness" (338-402).

countryside in Part VIII, Levin does regain his moral composure. Upon completing *Anna Karenina*, Tolstoy, on the other hand, did not regain his. As he reveals in his *Confession*, the author had now become thoroughly disenchanted with his conventional mode of life. Sounding more like Anna than Levin, Tolstoy's narrator in *Confession* claims that once his eyes had at last been opened to all the evil in life and to the meaninglessness of human existence, he could no longer deceive himself: in the face of inevitable death, all of life's charms are revealed as merely a cruel and stupid hoax perpetrated upon man. To illustrate his point, the narrator recounts an ancient Eastern fable whose central metaphor is a gastronomic one. Surprised by a wild beast that threatens to kill him, a traveler seeks refuge in a dried-up well, at the bottom of which he sees a dragon with gaping jaws anxiously waiting to devour him. The man grabs hold of a wild bush growing in the cracks of the well and he clings desperately to its branch, even as he sees that two mice (one white, the other black) are gnawing away at it. "Soon the branch will give way and break off, and he will fall into the jaws of the dragon," the narrator explains. "The traveler sees this and knows that he will surely die. But while he is still hanging there, he looks around and sees some drops of honey on the leaves of the bush, and he stretches out his tongue and licks them" (PSS XXIII, 14). For Tolstoy, this gastronomic image--of a man licking tasty drops of honey as he awaits certain death--captures perfectly our basic existential predicament as human beings:

Thus I cling to the branch of life, knowing that inevitably the dragon of death is waiting, ready to tear me to pieces; and I cannot understand why this torment has befallen me. I try to suck the honey that once consoled me, but the honey no longer brings me joy. Day and night the black mouse and the white mouse gnaw at the branch to which I cling. I clearly see the dragon, and the honey has lost all its sweetness for me. I see only one thing--the inescapable dragon and the mice--and I cannot avert my eyes from them. This is no fable, this is the naked truth, irrefutable and understood by everyone. (PSS XXIII, 14)

Just like his tragic heroine, who finds at the end of *Anna Karenina* that she has lost her appetite for living ("the zest is gone"), Tolstoy now finds that the two drops of honey that he had formerly considered so delicious and tasty in his own life--his love for his family and for his writing--have lost all their flavor for him: the sweetness is gone.

This parable about the human condition, however, seems to apply only to the members of the privileged gentry class, and not to the impoverished peasantry, whose lives, according to the narrator, are marked "more by deprivation and suffering than by pleasures" (PSS XXIII, 32). The conditions of luxury, idleness and epicurean indulgence under which the "parasites" from the upper class live in Russia, he maintains, make it impossible for them ever to understand the true meaning of life. In order to live according to the ways of God, one must renounce entirely the gentry way of life--as well as the sensual pleasures traditionally associated with it--and adopt instead the more genuine and morally authentic lifestyle of the hard-working peasants, who have never strayed from their religious faith. In keeping with his view of gentry праздность as a pervasive and infectious condition, Tolstoy not only advocates living like a simple peasant. He also comes to recognize that gastronomic appetite and sexual desire are powerful libidinal

drives that cannot be merely restrained, moderated or controlled. The physical pleasures of the flesh and the palate must instead be avoided entirely since they are, by their very nature, so debasing, dangerous, and destructive for any human being who wishes to rise at all above the level of gratifying his basic animal inclinations. Like alcohol, tobacco, and other addictive drugs, food and sex are seen to "stupefy" people, not only because such items stimulate our desire for sensual pleasure, but more importantly because they blur the demands of our moral conscience and thus deaden the spiritual part of our human nature.²⁸ Levin's ethos of moderation and libidinal restraint with regard to food and sex in *Anna Karenina*, much like his anachronistic defense of the rural gentry, conventional marriage, and traditional religious belief, simply could no longer constitute a viable code of moral behavior for the disillusioned Tolstoy. He now regarded both food and sex as highly addictive sources of pleasure whose despotic power over man's will, and debilitating effect upon his life, called for more radical measures than mere moderation.

Tolstoy's fear and distrust of erotic desire receive their most explicit artistic expression, of course, in the highly controversial *The Kreutzer Sonata*, a work that seems to have grown out of the author's own bitter disillusionment with married life. In his attempt to deromanticize our idealized notions of love, the story's central character, Pozdnyshev, manages to strip love of any emotional or spiritual value it might have, reducing it to mere sexual passion and a brutish animal lust. In addition, he condemns the institution of marriage as a moral fraud perpetrated by the members of his decadent social class: he exposes it as a sham whose main purpose is actually to legitimize man's wanton sexual desires. Wishing to leave no doubt in the reader's mind that the extreme opinions on sexuality, love, and marriage expressed by his deranged protagonist accurately reflect the author's own views, Tolstoy wrote an *Afterword to The Kreutzer Sonata*, in which he asserts that sexual continence, "which constitutes an indispensable condition of human dignity in the unmarried state, is still more essential in the married one" (PSS XXVII, 81).²⁹ For our purposes, what is particularly interesting about the views expressed by Pozdnyshev in *The Kreutzer Sonata* is how excesses of sexual debauchery are linked causally in this text with gastronomic indulgence. "You see, our stimulating superfluity of food, together with complete physical idleness, is nothing but the systematic excitation of lust," Pozdnyshev explains,

The usual food of a young peasant lad is bread, kvas, and onions; he keeps alive and is vigorous and healthy; his task is light agricultural work. When he goes to perform railway work, his rations are buckwheat porridge and a pound of meat a day. But he works off that pound of meat during

²⁸"Don't let us stupefy ourselves, don't let us kill our reason with strong food which is not natural to man, and with stupefying drinks and smoking," Tolstoy writes in a letter of 27-30 October 1895 (PSS LXVIII, 244).

²⁹Chertkov published an interesting little booklet in England, entitled *On the Relations of the Sexes*, which is a collection of essays, diary entries and letters that contain Tolstoy's various pronouncements on sexual relations. (This includes his *Afterword to The Kreutzer Sonata*, a translation of which appears in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal*.) For a thorough reception study of Tolstoy's *The Kreutzer Sonata*, mainly within the context of the debate over sexual morality that was taking place in contemporary Russia, see Møller.

his sixteen hours wheeling around thirty pound barrow-loads, so it's just enough for him. But we, who consume two pounds of meat every day, and game, and fish, and all sorts of hot foods and drinks--where does all that go? Into excesses of sensuality. And if it goes there and the safety-valve is open, everything turns out all right; but close the safety-valve a bit, as I closed it temporarily, and at once a stimulus arises which, passing through the prism of our artificial life, expresses itself in utter infatuation, sometimes even platonic. (PSS XXVII, 23)

When he accounts for the origins of his own infatuation with the woman he would later wed (and subsequently murder), Pozdnyshv asserts that this love was the result, in large part, of "the excess of food I consumed while living an idle life" (PSS XXVII, 24). This direct causal connection between gastronomic excess and sexual excitation is reiterated when Pozdnyshv claims that, had he lived in circumstances normal to man, "consuming just enough food to suffice for the work I did," he would not have fallen in love and "none of all this would have happened" (PSS XXVII, 24). In a variant version of *The Kreutzer Sonata* that circulated privately in manuscript form, Pozdnyshv states bluntly, "All of our love affairs and marriages are, for the most part, conditioned by the food we eat" (PSS XXVII, 303).³⁰

THE WAY OF NO FLESH: ASCETIC/AESTHETIC VEGETARIANISM

Given Tolstoy's artistic representation of food in some of his later works of fiction as a dangerous stimulant that can excite sexual lust,³¹ it should not surprise us terribly to find that among the radical measures the author comes to advocate late in his life (pacifism, celibacy, opposition to hunting, smoking, and violence) he would also include vegetarianism. After all, if the moral and spiritual ideal Tolstoy believed we should all be striving to attain is absolute sexual continence, then it follows that we should avoid eating meat, since fleshly food, he came to believe, arouses in us sexual passion and carnal desire.³² According to Sergei Tolstoy (145), his father was convinced to become a

³⁰As Nissenbaum points out, Sylvester Graham likewise maintained (albeit for physiological rather than theological reasons) that, with a proper diet, people could subdue their sexual propensity and thus preserve chastity (32). Witness, for example, what Graham writes in his *Lecture to Young Men* about the direct connection between stimulating foods and sexual arousal: "All kinds of stimulating and heating substances; high-seasoned foods; rich dishes; the free use of flesh; and even the excess of aliment; all, more or less-and some to a very great degree, increase the concupiscent excitability and sensibility of the genital organs, and augment their influence on the functions of organic life, and on the intellectual and moral faculties" (18-19).

³¹In "Father Sergius," for instance, the possibility that the hero will succumb to the sexual temptations of the feeble-minded but voluptuous daughter of a local merchant is foreshadowed in the text by mention of how Sergius no longer threatened his health by fasting, but now indulged his appetite for food and drink, "often eating with special pleasure and not, as before, with revulsion and a consciousness of sin" (PSS XXXI, 34). In a narrative as well as a physiological sense, therefore, gastronomical appetite seems to trigger sexual appetite in Tolstoy's story.

³²Tolstoy was not the first person, of course, to link eating meat with sexual arousal. Many of the American health reformers in the nineteenth century likewise preached the sexual dangers of carnivorousness. Nissenbaum notes how Sylvester Graham, for example, argues in the 1830s for a meatless diet largely on

vegetarian by William Frey, a Russian of Estonian extraction who had emigrated to America to set up an agricultural commune, but later returned to Russia and visited Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana during the fall of 1885.³³ Tolstoy's decision to adopt a meatless diet would seem consistent with his moral and humanitarian objections, as an avowed pacifist and opponent of all forms of violence, to the killing of animals for human food; indeed, he had already given up his beloved pastime of hunting just a few years earlier. When Tolstoy in 1891 writes an essay in which he explains his reasons for refusing to eat meat, his motivation for vegetarianism turns out, however, to be as much ascetic as ethical. Eating fleshly foods is wrong, according to Tolstoy, not only because it perpetuates cruelty and brutal violence to animals (which he depicts quite graphically in his essay when he describes his recent visit to a slaughterhouse in Tula). Carnivorism is also to be condemned, he writes, because it "serves only to develop animal feelings, to excite lust, to promote fornication and drunkenness" (*PSS* XXIX, 84). Tolstoy contends that a carnivorous diet stimulates a carnal appetite: eating animal food arouses animal passions. He argues, in fact, that one should abstain from eating not just meat, but any tasty food item from which one might conceivably derive gustatory enjoyment. After all, gastronomic pleasure, in Tolstoy's chain of reasoning, leads directly and ineluctably to sexual pleasure. Accordingly, he inveighs strongly in this essay against the sin of gluttony (overeating) and he encourages his readers to practice abstinence and fasting, rather than mere moderation, in matters of concerning the consumption of food and drink.

Tolstoy's essay on vegetarianism, which is entitled "The First Step" ("Первая ступень"), was originally intended to serve as the preface to a book by Howard Williams, called *The Ethics of Diet: A Catena of Authorities Deprecatory of the Practice of Flesh-Eating* (1883), a copy of which Vladimir Chertkov had recently given to Tolstoy, who called it a "wonderful" and "needed" work (*PSS* LXXXVII, 84) and who arranged to have it translated into Russian.³⁴ In the opening sections of "The First Step," Tolstoy asserts that it is impossible for one to lead a good and moral life--whether as a Christian or a pagan--unless one begins with abstinence (воздержание) and self-abnegation

the grounds that meat acted as a sexual stimulant, exciting vile tempers and driving men to sexual excesses (33-36, 119-120). Indeed, the belief among health reformers that "meat excited libido," Whorton writes, "was a truism" (92). In her book about the sexual politics of meat (155-9), Adams examines "Grahamism" (as a dietary method for controlling male sexuality) from a feminist perspective and draws some interesting connections between male power and meat eating. Ethical vegetarianism, according to Adams, represents a feminist way not merely to reject a carnivorous view of the world, but also to rebuke the generally violent and aggressive male discourse that has predominated in our patriarchal culture.

³³Christian provides a brief description of Tolstoy's acquaintance with Frey (2:401). For an overview of Tolstoy's vegetarianism, and its influence on some of his followers, see Barkas ("Tolstoy and the Doukhobors," 154-165).

³⁴This book by Williams, who was a classical scholar and close associate of Henry Salt, contains pro-vegetarian views from over sixty important thinkers throughout history: from Plutarch and Porphyry to Shelley and Schopenhauer. As Ghandi notes in his autobiography, his acquaintance with the views of British vegetarians such as Williams and Salt (especially the latter's *A Plea for Vegetarianism*) convinced him to become an avowed vegetarian (48). In a study of Tolstoy and Ghandi, Green describes the latter's conversion to vegetarianism during this trip to England (54-7).

(самоотречение). The indispensable "first step" up the ladder of virtues, Tolstoy writes, involves the renunciation of our basic physical appetites and our liberation from the animal lusts that plague us. Although the abstract language that Tolstoy employs in the early part of this essay might lead one to think that he is speaking about our sexual appetite and our lust of the pleasures of the flesh, it soon becomes clear that the author has in mind mainly our gastronomical appetite and our lust for the pleasures of the palate. When he finally does specify the three basic "lusts" (позоти) that torment human beings, Tolstoy identifies them as being "gluttony, idleness, and carnal love" (PSS XXIX, 73-4). Not unlike Pozdnyshv in *The Kreutzer Sonata*, Tolstoy in his essay on vegetarianism posits a direct causal link between food and sex.

"The gluttonous person is not equipped to struggle against laziness, nor will the gluttonous and idle person ever be strong enough to struggle against sexual lust. Therefore, according to all moral teachings, the striving for abstinence commences with the struggle against the lust of gluttony; it commences with fasting" (PSS XXIX, 73-4).

In the same way that the first condition for a good life is abstinence, Tolstoy explains, "the first condition for a life of abstinence is fasting" (PSS XXIX, 74). Just as gluttony is the first sign of a bad life, so is fasting "the essential condition for a good life" (PSS XXIX, 74). What lends particular urgency to this need to fast, according to Tolstoy, is the fact that the main interest of the vast majority of people is to satisfy their craving for food.³⁵ "From the poorest to the wealthiest levels of society," he writes, "gluttony is, I think, the primary aim, the chief pleasure of our life" (PSS XXIX, 74). Even destitute working-class people, Tolstoy sadly notes, seek to follow the example of the decadent upper classes; they too seek to acquire "the tastiest and sweetest foods, and to eat and drink as much as they can" (PSS XXIX, 74).³⁶

The only effective way to curb our sexual appetite, Tolstoy asserts in his *Afterword to The Kreutzer Sonata*, is to eliminate any pleasure one might possibly derive from the act of sexual intercourse. Only in this way can we hope to succeed in our efforts to strive to make ourselves what he calls voluntary "eunuchs" and thus to conquer our carnal

³⁵"The main concern and the main preoccupation of people is not eating--eating doesn't require much effort--but rather overeating. People talk about their interests and exalted aims, women about lofty feelings, and they don't talk about food; but their main activity is directed towards food," Tolstoy writes in his diary on 10 May 1891. "All people eat on the average, I think, three times as much as they need" (PSS LII, 31). Only a year earlier, Tolstoy had expressed the desire to write "a book about GORGING. Belshazzar's feast, bishops, tsars, taverns. Meetings, partings, jubilees. People think they are occupied with various important matters, but they are only occupied with gorging" (PSS LI, 53).

³⁶Tolstoy was also distressed by the gluttony he saw in his own children. "They eat to excess and amuse themselves by spending money on the labors of other people for their own pleasure," he wrote to Chertkov in 1885 (PSS LXXXV, 294). "You look for the cause; look for the remedy," he wrote to his wife a few days later. "The children can stop overeating (vegetarianism)" (PSS LXXXIII, 547).

lust.³⁷ The same anti-hedonistic, anti-epicurean reasoning seems to inform the solution that Tolstoy advances in "The First Step" for curbing our basic animal craving for food: that is, one should strive as much as possible to remove all the pleasure out of eating.³⁸ As long as a person continues to enjoy the pleasure that eating provides, Tolstoy maintains, there can be no limit to the increase of the desire or appetite for that pleasure. One can keep this gastronomic lust under control only when one does not eat except in obedience to necessity. "The satisfaction of a need has limits," he writes, "but pleasure does not have any limits. For the satisfaction of one's needs, it is necessary and sufficient to eat bread, buckwheat porridge (каша), and rice. While for the augmentation of pleasure, there is no end to the flavorings and seasonings" (PSS XXIX, 77). In a lengthy passage that ensues, Tolstoy proceeds to illustrate in elaborate detail how, if we continue to eat tasty and spicy comestibles (rather than these three bland food items), our appetite for gustatory pleasure will never be satisfied but will instead keep growing larger and larger: that is, we will be seduced into piling one more delicious entrée on top of another at a meal.³⁹ Since eating tasty foods stimulates our desire for additional physical pleasures (both gastronomical and sexual), Tolstoy's solution is thus for us to practice abstinence by striving as much as possible to make "unpalatable" the pleasures of the palate.⁴⁰ Our main purpose in eating, after all, is to provide healthy nourishment for the

³⁷In the pamphlet *On the Relations of the Sexes*, Tolstoy makes it clear that the expression "make themselves eunuchs" is to be understood figuratively (as spiritual victory over the flesh) rather than literally (as actual physical mutilation). "I think that self-mutilation is as much a sin as physical union for the sake of pleasure, just as I think that it is equally sinful to overeat or to exhaust oneself by starvation. That food for the body which enables man to serve this fellows is lawful, and that sexual union which continues the race is lawful" (38).

³⁸In *Die Pfennig-Sonate* (1890), one of the several parodies of *The Kreutzer Sonata* that arose as part of the counter-literature in the wake of Tolstoy's tale, Sigmar Mehrling pokes fun at the connection that Tolstoy makes between sexual and gastronomical abstinence. As Møller summarizes the plot of Mehrling's tale, the narrator once again meets Pozdnyshov on a train and listens to his account of how he killed a second wife. "His account of his second conjugal murder," Møller writes, "is interwoven with a series of nonsensical arguments in favour of total abstinence--from food!" (169). Chekhov, who admitted that Tolstoy's philosophy had informed his own thinking for a number of years, likewise came to see this connection that Tolstoy established between abstinence from sex (chastity) and abstinence from fleshly food (vegetarianism and fasting). In a letter written on 27 March 1894 to A.S. Suvorin, Chekhov explains his growing disenchantment with Tolstoyanism by noting that he saw "more love for mankind in electricity and steam, than in chastity and abstinence from meat" (PSS XVI, 133).

³⁹The nearly insatiable gastronomical appetite of Nikolai Gogol may well provide a case in point for Tolstoy's argument. In Veresaev's book, one of Gogol's contemporaries (N.F. Zolotarev), commenting on the "extraordinary" appetite of the Russian writer while he lived in Rome, writes the following: "it would happen that we would stop in at some *trattori* to eat dinner, and Gogol would consume an entire meal and the dinner would be over. Then suddenly a new patron would come in and order himself some entrée. Gogol's appetite would suddenly flare up anew and, despite the fact that he had just finished dinner, he would order himself either the same entrée or something different" (215).

⁴⁰"Those things designed to caress the five external senses," Tolstoy observes in his diary in 1901, "are the things that inflame lust" (PSS LIV, 86). "The taste of plain food and fruit," he adds, are among those things that "do not arouse lust. It is aroused by...gourmet dishes" (PSS LIV, 86).

body, not to derive pleasure, enjoyment or stimulation for our taste buds. Nutrition, rather than gustation, ought to be the primary aim of the activity of eating.⁴¹

Tolstoy's all-out Victorian attack upon the pleasure principle in connection with both sex (*The Kreutzer Sonata*) and food ("The First Step") enters the realm of aesthetics when, in the essay *What is Art?*, he challenges the notion that "taste" can ever serve as the arbiter of what constitutes good art. Any theory that defines art on the basis of the pleasure derived from an aesthetic object will necessarily be a false one. To substantiate this claim, Tolstoy makes use of the following gastronomic analogy:

If we were to analyze the question of food, it would not occur to anyone to see the importance of food in the pleasure that we receive from eating it. Everyone understands that the satisfaction of our taste can in no way serve as the basis for our determination of the merits of food, and that we therefore have no right to suppose that the dinners with cayenne pepper, limburger cheese, alcohol, etc., to which we are accustomed and which please us, constitute the very best human food.... To see the aim and purpose of art in the pleasure we get from it is like assuming...that the purpose and aim of food consists in the pleasure derived from consuming it. (PSS XXX, 60-1)

"People came to understand that the meaning of food resides in the nourishment of the body only when they ceased to consider that the aim of that activity is pleasure," Tolstoy continues. "And the same is true with regard to art. People will come to understand the meaning of art only when they cease to consider that the aim of that activity is beauty, i.e. pleasure" (PSS XXX, 61). In art as in life, therefore, one must judge the quality of an object not in terms of the pleasure it may give, but rather of the nutritive purpose--moral or physiological--that it serves. Counterfeit art, like perverted sex and rich foods, succeeds only in "stupefying" people since it debilitates their moral constitution and weakens their spiritual strength.⁴²

⁴¹Tolstoy sounds very much like a "Grahamite" when he expounds his functional approach to eating. Listen, for instance, to what Graham has to say about the dangers of gastronomic pleasure in a lecture that addresses the issue of juvenile masturbation: "But when we make gustatory enjoyment the ulterior and paramount object of eating and drinking, and one of the principal sources of pleasure in life, and, according to the proverb 'Live to eat,' and eat for the sake of sensual indulgence, and make our rational powers the panders of our appetites, we deprave the propensities of instinct, disorder the body, impair the intellectual faculties, darken the moral sense, and blindly pursue a course which inevitably leads to the worst of evils" (31).

⁴²In his later years, Tolstoy quite frequently drew analogies between art and food, using gastronomic tropes as a way to describe the processes of intellectual, moral and spiritual ingestion. "We eat sauces, meat, sugar, sweets--we overeat and think nothing of it. It doesn't even occur to us that it's bad," he writes in 1890. "And yet catarrh of the stomach is an epidemic ailment of our way of life. Isn't the same true of sweet aesthetic food--poems, novels, sonatas, operas, romances, paintings, statues? The same catarrh of the brain. The inability to digest or even to take wholesome food, and the result--death" (PSS LI, 45). In the second of his "Three Parables" (1895), meanwhile, Tolstoy uses an extended metaphor about adulterated food to convey his point about the counterfeit nature of the art and science that he had been "fed" in his day (PSS XXXI, 60-2). Goscilo finds Tolstoy's use of these reductive tropes--through which he compares art to food--both crude and inaccurate. After all, as she reminds us, "our ingestion of food culminates, literally, in excretion" (494).

SPIRITUAL MALNUTRITION: FUNCTIONAL EATING, DYSFUNCTIONAL DIETING

In his quest to remove all the pleasure out of the consumption of food, sex and even art, Tolstoy thus maintained a highly "functional," utilitarian attitude in his approach to these three basic elements of human life. In the gastronomic realm, as we have seen, this type of orientation manifested itself in Tolstoy's advocacy of such radical dietary practices as fasting, vegetarianism, and a menu of simple, bland foods. Ironically enough, however, Tolstoy's adherence to a vegetarian diet, which he claimed never consciously to have betrayed and which he alleged never cost him any effort or deprivation,⁴³ coincided almost exactly with the onset of the chronic digestive problems with his stomach that would plague him throughout the remainder of his life. Although Tolstoy boasted about the inexpensive yet nutritious vegetarian diet that he followed, his wife complained not merely of the burden such a special diet placed upon her as a homemaker (by forcing her to have two menus prepared for every meal instead of just one). She also lamented the fact that this "abominable" and "senseless" diet was having quite a ruinous effect upon her husband's once robust health.⁴⁴ In Sophia's opinion, Lev's vegetarian diet did not give him nearly enough nourishment; indeed, she believed that it was directly responsible for his rapidly deteriorating physical condition and his constant bouts with digestive ailments (the doctors diagnosed him as having severe catarrh of the stomach) (1:139). "An old man of sixty-nine," she objected, "really shouldn't eat this sort of food, which just bloats him up and doesn't give him any nourishment at all!" (3:35).⁴⁵ According to Tolstoy's utilitarian approach to food, the purpose in eating a rather bland vegetarian diet, of course, was for its nutritional value rather than its pleasing taste. His wife's testimony, however, asserts that, in strictly physiological terms at least, his "functional" diet had proven after all to be quite "dysfunctional."

In light of what we know today about the nutritional benefits of a vegetarian diet (not to mention Tolstoy's longevity), Sophia's concern for her husband's health seems

⁴³In response to a letter from A.D. Zutphen, a Dutch medical student who had read in a newspaper about Tolstoy's frugal meals and wrote to inquire about the writer's diet, Tolstoy wrote, "My diet consists mainly of hot oatmeal porridge, which I eat two times a day with whole wheat bread (graham bread). In addition to this, at dinner I eat cabbage soup or potato soup, buckwheat porridge or a potato, either boiled or fried in sunflower oil or mustard oil, and apple and prune compote. Dinner, which I eat together with my family, can be replaced, as I have tried to do, by simply oatmeal porridge, which serves as my basic diet. My health not only has not suffered; it has in fact improved significantly since I have given up milk, butter, and eggs, as well as sugar, tea and coffee" (*PSS* LXVII, 32).

⁴⁴"Lev Nikolaevich is unwell," Sophia records in her diary for 14 March 1887. "He has bad indigestion and stomach aches, and yet he eats the most senseless diet; first it's rich food, then vegetarian food, then rum and water, and so on" (1:139).

⁴⁵Sophia was even more upset that two of his daughters were likewise experiencing chronic ill health due, she insisted, to the vegetarian diet their father had convinced them to follow. "Yet one more sacrifice to Lev Nikolaevich's principles!" she noted bitterly (3:35). The stormy relationship that developed between Tolstoy and his wife following his conversion is chronicled by Smoluchowski and Feiler.

rather misplaced. Indeed, Lev's vegetarianism was for her mainly paradigmatic of what she considered the many eccentric ideas her husband had begun to preach after his midlife crisis, when he seemed to have abandoned so many of his earlier values, beliefs and practices. His abandonment of a normal diet, therefore, struck her as but another behavioral abnormality that she could only hope would prove short-lived rather than permanent. "I should be happy to see him healthy again--instead of ruining his stomach with all this (in the doctor's words) harmful food," she noted sadly in 1891. "I should be happy to see him an artist again--instead of writing sermons which masquerade as articles. I should be happy to see him affectionate, attentive, and kind again--instead of this crude sensuality, followed by indifference" (2:50). As this diary entry strongly suggests, Sophia considered her husband's advocacy of vegetarianism, much like his sexual ideal of celibacy and his religious ideal of brotherly love, not merely counterproductive; to her mind, it was also patently hypocritical. Indeed, she seemed to derive special pleasure from pointing out those occasions when the "saint" and "prophet" from Yasnaya Polyana failed--with respect to food and sex--to practice what he preached. As far as sex is concerned, Sophia contends in her diary that the physical side of love continued to be very important to her husband, who seems to have remained quite concupiscent even though he had already passed the age of sixty-five and was publicly preaching absolute marital chastity.⁴⁶ "If only those who read *The Kreutzer Sonata* with such reverence could catch a glance of the voluptuous life he leads, and realized that it was only this that made him happy and good-natured," she wrote in 1891 following one of her husband's sudden (bulimic?) outbursts of sexual passion, "then they would cast their deity down from the pedestal on which they have placed him!" (2:18). Sophia likewise questioned the authenticity of his Christian love, since it was practiced by a man who seemed to her to have so little compassion for the members of his own family. "Oh, this sham Christianity, founded on hatred for those closest to you" (4:199), she exclaimed angrily amidst all the legal wrangling over her husband's will and the personal quarrels that went on with Chertkov and other of Tolstoy's followers in the period just prior to his death.

This purported sexual and religious hypocrisy on her husband's part, Sophia insisted, was matched by his gastronomic insincerity as well. Although in his publicistic writings he preached moderation in food consumption, abstinence from meat, and simplicity as well as blandness in diet, Tolstoy apparently continued in his private life to succumb to the sinful temptations presented by the pleasures of the table.⁴⁷ In her diary, where she in effect chronicles the persistent digestive troubles that Tolstoy experienced during the last part of his life, Sophia repeatedly upbraids her husband for eating enormous

⁴⁶"I often suffer because his love for me is physical, more that emotional" (2:132), she would write as late as 1897, when Lev Nikolaevich was almost seventy years old.

⁴⁷Sophia seems to have felt that the chances of maintaining gastronomic abstinence were as slim as they were of maintaining sexual celibacy. "Over tea we had a conversation about food, luxury and the vegetarian diet that Lyovochka is always preaching," she notes in 1891. "He said that he had seen a vegetarian diet in some German newspaper which recommended a dinner of bread and almonds. I am quite sure that the man who is preaching that keeps to such a régime in much the same way as Lyovochka practices the chastity he preaches in *The Kreutzer Sonata*" (2:14).

amounts of food--often at the wrong time of day and usually on a weak stomach. "Just before he left, he greedily gulped down some treats we had got for little Andriusha's sixth birthday--some dumplings, grapes, a pear and some chocolates," she writes soon after her husband's recovery from a bout with stomach pain in December 1901. "And now look what happens. The moment he gets a little better he undoes it all with his intemperate appetite and excessive activity" (3:160). On more than one occasion Sophia claimed that she had to take steps to guard against her husband upsetting his stomach through overeating. "Being healthy evidently bores him," she noted sardonically with regard to his immoderate eating habits (2:10). As was true with so many other aspects of his life, Tolstoy's indulgent gastronomic behavior in the privacy of his own home seemed to her to be greatly at variance with the rigid principles of abstinence that he preached in public. Even during the final year of his life, she would lament the glaring discrepancy that she saw between his ethical tenets on the one hand and his actual personal conduct on the other.

How much more spiritually inclined he was a few years ago! How sincerely he aspired to live simply, to sacrifice all luxuries, and to be good, honest, and open; to be sublimely, spiritually inclined! Now he enjoys himself quite openly, loves good food, a good horse, cards, music, chess, cheerful company and having hundreds of photographs taken of himself. (4:177)

Her husband's attempt to improve himself spiritually, through a rigorous brand of Christian asceticism, thus seemed to be undermined by what she considered to be the relatively sybaritic lifestyle that he continued to maintain on his gentry estate. In her opinion, his radical "diet" had turned out to be dysfunctional not only for his physical health, but for his spiritual health as well.⁴⁸

Sophia's perspective on Tolstoy's dietary practices--and, indeed, on his post-conversion Christian beliefs generally--is not without some decided bias, of course. Yet Tolstoy himself confessed to being deeply troubled by the chasm that existed between the luxurious way of life that he and his aristocratic family enjoyed at Yasnaya Polyana and the terrible hunger and deprivation that characterized the situation of the peasants who lived nearby. For Tolstoy, the socio-economic inequity that lay at the base of the entire class structure in Russia gave rise to this sharp contrast between the wealth of the upper classes and the poverty of the lower classes, a contrast that for him repeatedly found expression in gastronomic terms: food came to serve in his writings as one of the chief measures of a life lived rightly or wrongly. The idle, luxurious life of the aristocratic Tolstoy family was thus frequently emblemized by the excessive gorging that went on at their dinner table, where a large number of relatives, friends, and guests would regularly sit down to a veritable orgy of excessive eating and drinking. Alongside all this shameless feasting, meanwhile, there lived hungry, ill-clad servants who were oppressed by the endless toil they were forced to exert daily in their efforts to feed these comfortable social parasites. "I had no dinner," Tolstoy records in his diary in April 1910;

⁴⁸Those efforts at spiritualization were doomed to be ineffectual, Mann, Merezhkovsky, and Gorky would argue, because they were undertaken by such an unregenerate and earthy pagan as Tolstoy.

I felt a tormenting anguish from the awareness of the vileness of my life among people who are working so that they can just barely save themselves from a cold, hungry death, save themselves and their families. Yesterday there were fifteen people gorging themselves with pancakes, while five or six domestics were running about, barely managing to prepare and then serve the fodder. (PSS LVIII, 37)⁴⁹

As a result of his volunteer work with famine relief, during which time he helped to set up free food kitchens in various parts of the country, Tolstoy was well aware of the terrible hunger that afflicted thousands of poor peasants daily throughout Russia. Despite the charitable relief efforts that he and some other members of his privileged class undertook to help feed these starving people, Tolstoy realized full well that in socio-economic terms, as he put it, "we live by devouring the labors of thousands of people" (PSS LXVIII, 244).⁵⁰

Tolstoy's feeling of shame at the wide disparity between rich and poor in his country was only further exacerbated, therefore, by the knowledge that he himself continued to succumb at times to the gastronomic indulgence that he condemned so roundly in the Russian gentry. Indeed, the shame must have intensified even further in light of Tolstoy's well-publicized views on abstinence, fasting, and diet. "I am sensual and I lead an idle, well-fed life," he reproaches himself in a letter to Chertkov in 1884 (PSS LXXXV, 80). As late as 1908 he would still find himself unable to keep from drinking excessive amounts of coffee: "Always too much--I can't restrain myself" (PSS LVI, 110). In the secret diary that he began to keep in 1908, Tolstoy would even admit that Sophia was right to taunt him about eating asparagus on the sly while preaching culinary simplicity (PSS LVI, 173). In one of the more telling entries in her diary, meanwhile, Sophia expresses the torment she felt while reading drafts of *Resurrection*, and realizing that her husband, already an old man of seventy, could describe with such extraordinary gusto, "like a gastronome savoring some particularly delicious piece of food," the secrets of carnality between the chambermaid and the officer depicted in Tolstoy's final novel (3:81). While food and sex may well have become socially, morally and spiritually "unpalatable" for Tolstoy after his conversion, Sophia's testimony and the Russian author's own writings suggest that these objects of desire had lost few of their sensual charms and little of their physical attraction for the old apostly of Yasnaya Polyana. "All life is a struggle between the flesh and the spirit," Tolstoy had written in 1895, "and gradually the spirit triumphs over the flesh" (PSS LII, 26). Such existential optimism is tempered, however, by the more candid remark he reportedly made to Gorky that "the flesh rages and riots, and the spirit follows it helpless and miserable" (53).

⁴⁹"It's impossible to eat even porridge or peacefully have a roll with tea," Tolstoy observes in a letter written in May 1886, "when you live with the knowledge that right by you there are people you know--children...who are going to bed without any bread" (PSS LXXXIII, 568).

⁵⁰"I am living abominably," Tolstoy writes in the midst of the famine relief efforts in 1891. "I don't know myself how I got dragged into this abominable affair, this work of feeding the starving, because it isn't for me to feed those by whom I am fed. But I got dragged in, with the result that I now find myself distributing the vomit puked up by the rich" (PSS LXVI, 94).

Although Tolstoy may have sought in his later years to follow a rigid ascetic diet that he hoped would feed his spiritual rather than his animal nature, the Russian author never did lose entirely his physical appetite for food and sex. He never completely ceased to crave those pleasures of the flesh and the palate that gratified his body rather than nourished his soul.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, Carol J. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum, 1990.
- Armstrong, Judith. *The Unsaid Anna Karenina*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Barkas, Janet. *The Vegetable Passion*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975.
- Barthes, Roland. "Lecture de Brillat-Savarin." In *Jean Anth  lme Brillat-Savarin, Physiologie du go  t*. Paris: Hermann, 1975. 7-33.
- Bayley, John. *Tolstoy and the Novel*. New York: Viking Press, 1966.
- Benson, Ruth. *Women in Tolstoy: The Ideal and the Erotic*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
- Brown, James W. *Fictional Meals and Their Function in the French Novel, 1789-1848*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.
- Cappon, Daniel. *Eating, Loving and Dying: A Psychology of Appetites*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.
- Chekhov, Anton P. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*. 20 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1944-1951.
- Christian, R.R., ed. *Tolstoy's Letters*. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.
- Davie, Donald. "Introduction." *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965. 1-13.
- Deutsch, Ronald M. *The New Nuts Among the Berries*. Palo Alto, Ca.: Bull Publishing Co., 1977.
- Evans, Mary. *Reflecting on Anna Karenina*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Feiler, Lily. "The Tolstoi Marriage: Conflict and Illusions." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 23.3 (1981): 245-260.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. Trans. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1961.
- . *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1961.
- Frierson, Cathy. "A Populist's Vision of Russian Food Cultures: A.N. Engelgardt's Letters From the Country 1872-1887." Paper presented at a conference on "Food in Russian History and Culture" held at Harvard University on October 1, 1993.
- Ghandi, Mohatmas K. *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.
- Gorky, Maxim. *Reminiscences of Tolstoy, Chekhov, and Andreev*. Trans. S.S. Koteliansky and Leonard Woolf. New York: The Viking Press, 1959.
- Goscilo-Kostin, Helena. "Tolstoyan Fare: Credo    la Carte." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 62.4 (1984): 481-495.
- Graham, Sylvester. *Lecture to Young Men*. Providence, 1834; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1974.
- Green, Martin. *Tolstoy and Ghandi: Men of Peace*. New York: Basic Books, 1983.

- Grossman, Joan Delaney. "Tolstoy's Portrait of Anna: Keystone in the Arch." *Criticism* 18.1 (1976): 1-14.
- Gustafson, Richard F. *Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger. A Study in Fiction and Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Gutkin, Irina. "The Dichotomy Between Flesh and Spirit: Plato's Symposium in Anna Karenina." In *In the Shade of the Giant*. Ed. Hugh McLean. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989. 84-99.
- Hagan, John. "Ambivalence in Tolstoy's The Cossacks." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 3.1 (1969): 28-47.
- Jakobson, Roman. "The Metaphoric and Metonymic Poles." *Fundamentals of Language*. The Hague: Mouton, 1956. 76-82.
- Karlinsky, Simon. *The Sexual Labyrinth of Nikolai Gogol*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Klitz, Halmut. *Das erotische Mahl: Szenen aus dem "chambre séparée" des neunzehnten Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt: Syndikat, 1983.
- Kolb-Seletski, Natalia M. "Gastronomy, Gogol, and His Fiction." *Slavic Review* 29.1 (1970): 35-57.
- Kornblatt, Judith Deutsch. *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: A Study in Cultural Mythology*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.
- LeBlanc, Ronald D. "Levin Visits Anna: The Iconology of Harlotry." *Tolstoy Studies Journal* 3 (1990): 1-20.
- Mandelker, Amy. "A Painted Lady: Ekphrasis in Anna Karenina." *Comparative Literature* 43.1 (1991): 1-19.
- Mann, Thomas. "Goethe and Tolstoy." *Essays by Thomas Mann*. Trans. H.T. Lowe-Porter. New York: Vintage Books, 1958. 76-179.
- McLean, Hugh. "Gogol's Retreat from Love: Toward an Interpretation of Mirgorod." *American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists*. The Hague: Mouton, 1958. 225-244.
- Merezhkovsky, Dmitry. *Tolstoy as Man and Artist*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1902.
- Morson, Gary Saul. "Prosaics and Anna Karenina." *Tolstoy Studies Journal* 1(1988): 1-12.
- Møller, Peter Ulf. *Postlude to The Kreutzer Sonata: Tolstoj and the Debate on Sexual Morality in Russian Literature in the 1890s*. Trans. John Kendal. New York: E.J. Brill, 1988.
- Nissenbaum, Stephen. *Sex, Diet and Debility: Sylvester Graham and Health Reform*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980.
- Obolensky, Alexander P. *Food-Notes on Gogol*. Winnipeg, Canada: Trident Press, 1972.
- Pearson, Irene. "The Social and Moral Roles of Food in Anna Karenina." *Journal of Russian Studies* 48(1984): 10-19.
- Rancour-Laferrriere, Daniel. *Out from under Gogol's Overcoat: A Psychoanalytic Study*. Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1982.
- Schmidt, Paul. "What do Oysters Mean?" *Antæus* 68(1992): 105-111.

- Smoluchowski, Louise. *Lev and Sonya: The Story of the Tolstoy Marriage*. New York: Paragon House Publishers, 1987.
- Spence, G.W. *Tolstoy the Ascetic*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1968.
- Tolstaya, Sof'ia. *Dnevnik Sof'i Andreevny Tolstoi*. 4 vols. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1928-1936.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *On the Relations of the Sexes*. Trans. Vladimir Chertkov. Christchurch, England: The Free Age Press, 1901.
- , *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. 90 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1928-1958.
- Tolstoy, Sergei. *Tolstoy Remembered by His Son*. Trans. Moura Budberg. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1961.
- Veresaev, V. *Gogol' v zhizni*. Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1990.
- Visson, Lynn. "Kasha vs. Cachet Blanc: The Gastronomic Dialectics of Russian Literature." In *Russianness: Studies on a Nation's Identity (In Honor of Rufus Mathewson), 1918-1978*. Ed. Robert L. Belknap. Ann Arbor, MI: Ardis, 1990. 60-73.
- Wasiolek, Edward. *Tolstoy's Major Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Whorton, James C. *Crusaders for Fitness: The History of American Health Reformers*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982.
- Wolfe, Linda. *The Literary Gourmet*. New York: Random House, 1962.

ANNA'S ADULTERY: DISTAL SOCIOBIOLOGY VS. PROXIMATE PSYCHOANALYSIS

DANIEL RANCOUR-LAFERRIERE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

Anna Karenina is, among other things, a novel about adultery. In particular, it is about female adultery, not male adultery. Stiva Oblonsky may be as adulterous as his sister Anna, but the focus is on Anna. Stiva's behavior is unmarked, Anna's is marked. Tolstoy instinctively understands that a woman's adultery is more interesting than a man's. Great novels of adultery — e.g., Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*, Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*, and Fontane's *Effie Briest* — consistently center about an adulteress, not an adulterer.

Some scholars have noticed this asymmetry (e.g., Tanner, 13; Cooke speaks of a "literary focus on female, as opposed to male, infidelity" — 112). The literary asymmetry derives in turn from a rather banal, yet essential biological asymmetry: a man can be cuckolded, and this fact opens up interesting possibilities for fiction; a woman cannot, and *this* fact is about as interesting as a happy family (to extend a Tolstoyan trope).

When a woman has extramarital sex she places in jeopardy her husband's paternity of any subsequent offspring, but when a man has extramarital sex his wife's maternity is not questioned. From this it follows (all other things being equal) that the genes of men who tolerate sexual infidelity in their spouses have a lesser chance of being replicated than do the genes of sexually possessive men. That is, there has been natural selection against tolerance of female adultery. Presumably this is why most men in most cultures have become what they are: bossy, possessive, and generally sexist. They wouldn't be that way if they didn't need women to have their babies for them.¹

Dolly is capable of forgiving Stiva for his sexual escapades or at least looking the other way. Karenin cannot, in the long run, forgive Anna. Nor can society at large. Oblonsky continues to function in society while he is being unfaithful to his wife, but Anna becomes a pariah as a result of being unfaithful to her husband.

Tolstoy means for us to compare male adultery with female adultery, even though the latter is of central interest. He makes siblings of the two major adulterers in the novel, and he repeatedly invites the reader to compare the two of them. The similarity is particularly painful for poor little Serezha, the neglected victim of Anna's sexual waywardness and Karenin's obstinacy. When Stiva accidentally encounters Serezha on a visit to Karenin's, the boy blushes with shame: "He felt uncomfortable at meeting his

¹For abundant cross-cultural documentation, see my *Signs of the Flesh* (91-100) and the references cited therein. For a very interesting application of the sociobiological theory of male jealousy to Pushkin's *Tsygany*, see Cooke.

uncle, *who resembled his mother*, because it awakened those very memories which he considered shameful" (657, italics added).²

The similarity is also painful to Anna, who even tries to deny it in the early stages of falling in love with Vronsky:

'This is a confession of something that oppresses me, and I want to make it to you,' said Anna, determinedly throwing herself back in an arm-chair and looking straight into Dolly's eyes.

And to her surprise Dolly saw that Anna was blushing to her ears and to the curly black locks on her neck.

'Do you know,' continued Anna, 'why Kitty did not come to dinner? She is jealous of me. I have spoiled . . . I mean I was the cause of the ball being a torture instead of a pleasure to her. But really, really I was not to blame, or only a very little,' she said, drawling out the word 'very' in a high-pitched voice.

'Oh how like Stiva you said that,' remarked Dolly laughing.

Anna was annoyed.

'Oh no, no I am not Stiva,' she said frowning. 'The reason I have told you is that I do not even for a moment allow myself to distrust myself.'

But at the moment when she uttered these words she knew they were untrue: she not only distrusted herself but was agitated by the thought of Vronsky, and was leaving sooner than she had intended only that she might not meet him again.(90)

First there is a practically Freudian *Verneinung* ("Oh no, no I am not Stiva..."), but then it is insightfully discarded ("... at the moment when she uttered these words she knew they were untrue..."). But the insight cannot block Anna's free fall into Vronsky's arms. She can no more stop herself than her brother can stop himself.

Early in the novel Anna feels obliged to deal directly with her brother's philandering. But this effort is the start of her own unfaithfulness: while taking the train to Moscow to counsel Dolly regarding Stiva's sexual misbehavior, she first encounters the man who will be her ruin. Before she has even had an opportunity to start repairing her brother's marriage, her own begins to crumble:

The trained insight of a society man enabled Vronsky with a single glance to decide that she belonged to the best society. He apologized for being in her way and was about to enter the carriage, but felt compelled to have another look at her, not because she was very beautiful nor because of the elegance and modest grace of her whole figure, but because he saw in her sweet face as she passed him something specially tender and kind. When he looked round she too turned her head. Her bright grey eyes which seemed dark because of their black lashes rested for a moment on his face as if recognizing him, and then turned to the passing crowd evidently in search of some one. In that short look Vronsky had time to notice the subdued animation that enlivened her face and seemed to flutter between her bright eyes and a scarcely perceptible smile which curved her rosy lips. It was as if an excess of vitality so filled her whole being that it betrayed itself against her

²Page numbers refer to the Maudes' translation; passages quoted in the original Russian are indicated by volume number (Roman numeral) followed by page number.

will, now in her smile, now in the light of her eyes. She deliberately tried to extinguish that light in her eyes, but it shone despite of her in her faint smile. (56)

Again, she cannot stop herself. Some inner light has been lit, and it will not go out until she herself puts it out toward the end of the novel. In the meantime, we as readers are already preparing to excuse Anna for her adultery. As Anthony Thorlby has observed, this particular passage, the first depiction of Anna in the novel, reveals Vronsky falling in love at first sight (Thorlby, 43). Vronsky's first impression is our first impression. How can we not fall in love with Anna as well?

If early in the novel Anna convinces Dolly to forgive Stiva, later on Dolly attempts to return the favor. Having heard of Anna's liaison with Vronsky, Dolly goes to Karenin and manages to speak with him alone. She tries valiantly to soften his heart:

'What can I do?' said Karenin, shrugging his shoulders and raising his eyebrows. The recollection of his wife's last delinquency irritated him so much that he again became as cold as he had been at the beginning of the conversation. 'I am very grateful for your sympathy, but it is time for me to go,' he said rising.

'No, wait a bit! You should not ruin her. Wait a bit. I will tell you about myself. I married, and my husband deceived me; in my anger and jealousy I wished to abandon everything, I myself wished . . . But I was brought to my senses, and by whom? Anna saved me. And here I am living; my children growing, my husband returns to the family and feels his error, grows purer and better, and I live . . . I have forgiven, and you must forgive.'

Karenin listened, but her words no longer affected him. All the bitterness of the day when he decided on a divorce rose again in his soul. He gave himself a shake and began to speak in a loud and piercing voice.

'I cannot forgive; I don't wish to and don't think it would be right. I have done everything for that woman, and she has trampled everything in the mud which is natural to her. I am not a cruel man, I have never hated anyone, but I hate her with the whole strength of my soul and I cannot even forgive her, because I hate her so much for all the wrong she has done me!' he said with tears of anger choking him. (359)

What Dolly fails to observe here, in her fit of Christian kindness, is that Karenin's situation is much worse than hers had ever been, biologically. Her many children are thriving, but Karenin's one child may not even be his own. It's fine for *her* to be forgiving, for she is a great reproductive success. But Karenin cannot forgive for the perfectly good biological reason that Serezha's paternity is doubtful in his mind: "I doubt everything so much that I hate my son, and sometimes believe he is not my son. I am very unhappy" (358).

Of course neither Dolly nor Karenin consciously compute reproductive success in order to arrive at their respective, diametrically opposed decisions. Rather, they behave *as if* they had made such computations. That is all that is required by abstract, Darwinian mathematics. It is psychological mechanisms which do the real work. In Dolly's case masochistic inclinations keep her in the vicinity of her faithless inseminator as she continues to produce offspring. In Karenin's case vengeful, sadistic feelings are (at this

point) directed against the woman who cuckolds him.³ Tolstoy disapproves of such feelings, of course, as is clear from the repeated biblical epigraph stating that only the highest ranking male — God — is permitted to be a sadist ("Mne otmschenie, i az vozdam").

What about Anna herself? What is the distal, Darwinian cause of her adultery, and what proximate psychological mechanisms move her to an action which, theoretically at least, might foster the further replication of her genes?

A woman who rejects a husband and takes a lover is putting herself at risk of losing resources for herself and her previous offspring while at the same time she is not necessarily gaining any increased probability of producing more offspring. She can only give birth once every year or so at the most, after all (while a man could theoretically parent several children by different women in that same period of time). What, then, is the reproductive advantage for a woman to commit adultery?

Elsewhere I have proposed several possible advantages (*Signs of the Flesh*, 83-90), but here I wish to concentrate specifically on the advantages available to Anna Karenina in her specific social situation. Anna has had one child by Karenin. But that was approximately eight years previous to the time frame of the novel. In the meantime, the marriage has been sterile in both the reproductive and psychological senses. There is no hint that further offspring could be produced with Karenin. Anna is a young woman in her prime, and her maternal inclinations and abilities are obvious (she is devoted to Serezha, Dolly's children climb all over her at the beginning of the novel, etc.). Karenin, on the other hand, is twenty years older than she is and, more important, he is sexually uninteresting. Tolstoy makes this clear in the early bedroom scenes. For example:

Exactly at midnight, when Anna was still sitting at her writing-table finishing a letter to Dolly, she heard the measured tread of slippers feet, and Karenin entered, freshly washed, his hair brushed, and a book under his arm.

'It's time! It's time!' said he with a significant smile, going into their bedroom.

'And what right had he to look at him as he did?' thought Anna, remembering how Vronsky had looked at Karenin.

When she was undressed she went into the bedroom, but on her face not only was there not a trace of that animation which during her stay in Moscow had sparkled in her eyes and smile, but on the contrary the fire in her now seemed quenched or hidden somewhere very far away. (103)

At a purely intellectual level Anna believes her husband is a kind, truthful, and generally admirable person. He has moral stature (even if his ears stick out in an annoying way). It is alright to sleep with him (even if he comes to bed with a book under his arm, even if in a later bedroom scene he falls to loudly snoring right after having declared "I love you"). Anna *could* go on living with Karenin in this fashion, she *could* deflect Vronsky's

³For a brief period, when it appears that Anna is going to die (and will therefore not be able to cuckold Karenin anymore), Karenin takes a forgiving stance. This is only temporary, however. Later he becomes spiteful again and is ashamed of having forgiven Anna.

advances. But she cannot seem to do without that special animation which Vronsky brings to *her eyes*.

'So you really are going tomorrow?' said Vronsky.

'Yes, I think so,' Anna replied as if surprised at the boldness of his question; but the *uncontrollable radiance of her eyes* and her smile set him on fire as she spoke the words. (76, italics added)

... Just for an instant as she looked at [Vronsky] he saw *a gleam in her eyes* and, though the spark was at once extinguished, that one instant made him happy. (97, italics added)

'Do this for me [Anna says to Vronsky]: never say such words to me, and let us be good friends.' These were her words, *but her eyes said something very different*. (127, italics added)

The most distal possible interpretation of this gleam in Anna's eye is the advantageousness of more offspring. An obvious proximate interpretation is sexual desire. As it turns out, going over to Vronsky does pay off reproductively, for Anna gives birth to a daughter. Psychologically, however, she remains unfulfilled. She may have done the right thing from a sociobiological perspective, but something is very wrong at the psychological level. This suggests that the obvious interpretation of the gleam in Anna's eye is incomplete at best.

Of course, Tolstoy *needs* for something to be wrong in order to give his readers a juicy plot. But a closer look at Anna in sexual situations even early in the novel reveals why something *had* to go wrong later.

The curious thing about Anna's itch for sexual change is that it is not really very sexual at all. The gleam in her eye signifies so much more than her sexuality. Many critics mistakenly believe that Anna is "swept away by physical passion" (Wasiolek, 131). In fact, eroticism is only a small part of Anna's growing need for a new sexual object. When she does have sex with Vronsky for the first time there is not the slightest indication that she gains sexual pleasure, although it is clear that Vronsky does.

The two of them are on the floor next to a sofa right after the act is over. Anna is filled with shame and horror at what she has just done. Her humiliation is practically physical ("fizicheski chuvstvovala svoe unizhenie" — VIII, 178). In vain Vronsky tries to console her. Suddenly she pushes him away and sits up:

'It's all over,' she said. 'I have nothing but you left. Remember that.'

'I cannot help remembering what is life itself to me! For one moment of that bliss. . .'

'What bliss?' she said with disgust and horror, and the horror was involuntarily communicated to him. 'For heaven's sake, not another word!'

She rose quickly and moved away from him.

'Not another word!' she repeated, and with a look of cold despair, strange to him, she left him. She felt that at that moment she could not express in words her feeling of shame, joy, and horror at this entrance on a new life, and she did not wish to vulgarize that feeling by inadequate words. Later on, the next day and the next, she still could not

find words to describe all the complexity of those feelings, and could not even find thoughts with which to reflect on all that was in her soul. (136)

The word "bliss" ("*schast'e*") actually disgusts Anna here, although bliss is supposedly what Anna has been seeking with Vronsky for "nearly a year."

Very well, then, perhaps the first time is not the best time. But subsequent times are not much better either. The slightest indications of any sexual pleasure are regularly and massively cancelled out by feelings of humiliation, shame, degradation. Sociobiological expectations about the slightly greater modesty and sexual repression in females than in males (see my *Signs of the Flesh*, 162 ff.) are not enough to explain Anna's severe reaction to her own sexual misbehavior. Even when Anna manages to take pride in Vronsky's love, shame springs back to overwhelm her:

She had only his love left, and she wanted to love him. 'Try to understand that since I loved you everything has changed for me. There is only one single thing in the world for me: your love! If I have it, I feel so high and firm that nothing can be degrading for me. I am proud of my position because . . . proud of . . . proud . . .' — she could not say what she was proud of. Tears of shame and despair choked her. She stopped and burst into sobs. (288-89)

Through the middle parts of the novel Anna's pride ("*gordost'*") and shame ("*styd*") are in precarious balance, with little room left for actual pleasure, sexual or otherwise.

What Vronsky *does* give Anna, and what she gains immense pleasure from early in the novel is his slavish devotion. Nontechnically speaking, she is more concerned that he stroke her ego than stroke her erogenous zones:

She turned round, and instantly recognized Vronsky. With his hand in salute, he bowed and asked if she wanted anything and whether he could be of any service to her. For some time she looked into his face without answering, and, though he stood in the shade she noticed, or thought she noticed, the expression of his face and eyes. It was the same expression of respectful ecstasy that had so affected her the night before. She had assured herself more than once during those last few days, and again a moment ago, that Vronsky in relation to her was only one of the hundreds of everlastingly identical young men she met everywhere, and that she would never allow herself to give him a thought; yet now, at the first moment of seeing him again, she was seized by a feeling of joyful pride [*ee okhvatilo chuvstvo radostnoi gordosti*]. There was no need for her to ask him why he was there. She knew as well as if he had told her, that he was there in order to be where she was.

'I did not know that you were going too. Why are you going?' she asked, dropping the hand with which she was about to take hold of the handrail. Her face beamed with a joy and animation she could not repress.

'Why am I going?' he repeated, looking straight into her eyes. 'You know that I am going in order to be where you are,' said he. 'I cannot do otherwise.' (94/VIII, 124)

Vronsky is true to his word. He goes where Anna goes for the rest of the novel (except under the wheels of the train). In traditional psychoanalytic terms, Vronsky is constantly

shoring up Anna's delicate self-esteem with needed narcissistic supplies.⁴ In Kohutian terms, Vronsky becomes complicit in Anna's growing narcissistic personality disorder.⁵ Vronsky may be a gambler and a good-for-nothing, he may not treat Frou-Frou very well, but he does not let up on the servility toward Anna. Even late in the novel he is remarkably patient with Anna's jealous tantrums, and he never stops making adjustments for *her* benefit: "He, so virile a man, not only never contradicted her, but where she was concerned seemed to have no will of his own and to be only occupied with anticipating her every wish" (422). At one point Anna herself compares him to an obedient dog (690).

If toward the end of the novel this servility is no longer an adequate support for Anna's self-esteem, at the beginning it was essential to her move toward adultery. Karenin, after all, was doing nothing to satisfy her narcissistic wants (cf. Rothstein, 237-40). He, in effect, induced her dissatisfaction with herself. Thus, shortly after receiving the servile salute from Vronsky, Anna arrives back in Petersburg to confront a lower opinion of herself: "She was particularly struck by the feeling of dissatisfaction *with herself* which she experienced when she met him [Karenin]" (95, italics added).

The narrator focuses not so much on Anna's sense of her sexuality as on her sense of herself, that is, on her narcissistic concerns. A striking example of this is the early bedroom scene with Karenin, right after he has begun his famous snoring. An opportunity for sexual interaction has just been missed. Anna is now thinking of Vronsky, naturally, and her heart fills "with excitement and guilty joy at the thought." But it is the eye-imagery which (again) reveals her very deepest thoughts:

'It's late, it's late,' she whispered to herself, and smiled. For a long time she lay still with wide-open eyes, the brightness of which it seemed to her she could herself see in the darkness [blesk kotorykh, ei kazalos', ona sama v temnote videla]. (134/VIII, 176)

In other words, Anna is so much on her mind to herself that she can practically see herself. At this moment she is a female Narcissus positively evaluating the image of herself, her "*blesk*," her *glory* — to give the Russian word its standard metaphorical meaning.

Then, on the very next page, she sleeps with Vronsky for the first time, and never again will have sex with Karenin. There is no sign of an orgasm, but there is "*blesk*." Meantime, a "new Anna" has come into existence, and there begins the long process of the disintegration of her personality (cf. Bulanov on the "*raspad sobstvennogo ja*" in Anna, 32; Sémon on Anna's "*clivage de la personnalité*," 324-28; also Thorlby, 79 and Mandelker, 61).

The bedtime self-observation scene is but one of many instances where Anna seems to split, psychologically. Her splitting is an important feature of her growing narcissistic disturbance. On the train ride back to Petersburg, for example, she falls half asleep and

⁴See Fenichel (135-36; 387-89) on the notion of narcissistic supplies.

⁵For a psychoanalysis of Anna from the viewpoint of Heinz Kohut's theory of the narcissistic personality, see Rothstein (235-49). Armstrong (70-106) utilizes what might be best characterized as a "French Freud" approach to Anna's narcissism.

asks herself: "...am I here, myself? Am I myself or another [*Ia sama ili drugaia*]?" (92/VIII, 122). Shortly after giving birth to a daughter she declares to Karenin that "there is another in me," that is, the person who fell in love with Vronsky is not really Anna herself ("*Ta ne ia*" — 375/VIII, 483). That "other" person will eventually have to be (self-) punished for what she does, and the punishment will ultimately take the form of suicide. In the meantime that "other" continues to be in desperate need of narcissistic supplies. The fits of jealousy are designed to provoke even more adoration than Vronsky has already given. Anna recognizes that her love for Vronsky grows not only increasingly passionate, but also increasingly narcissistic ("*strastnee i sebi libfubivee*" — IX, 382, emphasis added). At one point, when Vronsky is away, Anna splits in two again and gives *herself* a little narcissistic boost:

'Who is that?' she thought, gazing in the mirror at the feverish, frightened face with the strangely brilliant eyes looking at her. 'Yes, that is I!' she suddenly realized, and looking at her whole figure she suddenly felt his kisses, shuddered, and moved her shoulders. *Then she raised her hand to her lips and kissed it.*

'What is it? Am I going mad?' and she went to her bedroom, where Annushka was tidying up. (683, italics added)

The answer to Anna's question has to be affirmative: she *is* going mad if she is willing to accept *herself* as a substitute for Vronsky to gratify herself. This is not mere masturbation. It is a crumbling of narcissistic structure, a disintegration which Tolstoy emphasizes by placing *four* "Annas" within the one scene:

- 1) Anna herself (to the extent that she is herself)
- 2) Anna's *reflection* in the mirror
- 3) The little daughter *Annie*, with whom Anna has just played, but who has just disappointed her because she is not her son ("How is this? That's not it — this is not he!" — 682)
- 4) Anna's maid *Annushka*⁶

Tolstoy's heroine seems to be breaking up into narrative bits and pieces. This fragmentation presages the physical smashing up of Anna's body by the train a few pages later.

It would be tempting to conclude that the way Tolstoy treats Anna toward the end of her life reflects hostility toward her (he would not treat his other double, Levin, that way). Such a conclusion would require evidence from outside the novel, however, for unlike the rather sloppy elimination of H  l  ne Kuragina from *War and Peace* (see Rancour-Laferr  re, 1993, 216-19), Anna's destruction is organic to the overall narrative trajectory of *Anna Karenina*. It is clear and credible that Anna experiences great hostility toward *herself*. She is a masochist — quite apart from the issue of whether Tolstoy is a sadist in his treatment of her.

⁶Anna's little English proteg  , *Hannah*, is not present in this scene, however. Cf. also Armstrong, 123 and Mandelker, 61.

The masochism is not erotogenic, but moral.⁷ Anna gains no sexual pleasure from the harm she does herself. There is perpetual guilt (see, e.g., Stern, 371; Rothstein, 242-43; Gustafson, 121-27), which is an internal form of self-punishment. As for external punishment, Anna arranges for that as well. She gets into a position where she *knows* she can expect nothing but suffering:

She sat down at her writing-table, but instead of writing she folded her arms on the table and put her head on them, and began to cry, sobbing with her whole bosom heaving, as a child cries.

She wept because the hopes of clearing up and defining her position were destroyed for ever. *She knew beforehand that everything would remain as it was and would be even far worse than before.* She felt that, insignificant as it had appeared that morning, the position she held in society was dear to her, and that she would not have the strength to change it for the degraded position of a woman who had forsaken husband and child and formed a union with her lover; that, however much she tried, she could not become stronger than herself. She would never be able to feel the freedom of love, but would always be a guilty woman continually threatened with exposure, deceiving her husband for the sake of a shameful union with a man who was a stranger and independent of her, and with whom she could not live a united life. *She knew that it would be so,* and yet it was so terrible that she could not even imagine how it would end. And she cried, without restraint, like a punished child. (267-68/VIII, 345, italics added)

Here Anna is aware in the depths of her soul that she is never going to experience that "freedom of love" ("*nikogda ne ispytaet svobody liubvi*") which she supposedly committed adultery for. Such knowledge should certainly make her cry "like a punished child," as Tolstoy's narrator says — or rather like a child who has *invited* punishment, to be psychoanalytically specific. Passages such as these convey the impression that Anna maintains her illegitimate affair with Vronsky *in order to harm herself and to be humiliated, not only to gain narcissistic supplies*. If Dolly's moral masochism resides in her humble acceptance of Stiva's constant philandering, Anna's consists of an ever-increasing, depressive self-destructiveness which climaxes in the most masochistic conceivable act: suicide.

Anna's narcissism may be what sets her adultery in motion, but her masochism is what gives it its decisively downward trajectory. It was perfectly possible for a woman to be adulterous, even in late nineteenth century Russian high society, without having to destroy herself into the bargain. For example, Anna could have continued seeing Vronsky discreetly, away from the Karenin household. For a while Karenin is willing to look the other way. But no, Anna invites her lover over, and the two Aleksei's meet at her entranceway (there is a male homosexual fantasy buried here). Or, she could even have divorced Karenin at one point. But instead she runs off to Italy with Vronsky without

⁷Freud's essay "On the Economic Problem of Masochism" (1924) establishes this basic distinction. Etymologically the word "masochism" derives from the name Leopold von Sacher-Masoch (1836-1895), an author of novels describing desired sexual humiliation.

bothering to obtain a divorce, and leaving her supposedly beloved son behind. Subsequent misery is inevitable.

Most of the critics have understood how self-defeating and self-destructive is Anna's behavior. The psychoanalytic label "masochism," however, has not been applied, nor has the relevant psychoanalytic literature been cited⁸ — partly out of ignorance, partly out of the traditional Slavistic aversion to psychoanalysis, and partly just because it is so difficult to understand why anyone would *consistently seek self-humiliation and self-defeat*.

In Edward Wasiolek's sensitive reading of the novel, for example, there are many observations about Anna's deliberately keeping her love for Vronsky unsatisfied and her tendency to set up bad situations for herself. Here is an example:

...there is evidence that Anna needs a rejecting society—even its insults and cruelties. There is a very revealing scene after her return to Russia from Italy that underscores this need. Anna insists on going to the opera in a low-cut dress with the Princess Oblonsky, a person of doubtful reputation. By going out openly in society when her cohabitation with Vronsky is known, she exposes herself to public humiliation. Vronsky, horrified by Anna's intention, is astonished at her inability to understand what she is doing. Anna does understand, of course, but she purposely misunderstands. She knows that she is throwing down the gauntlet to society. Yet Anna wants to be humiliated, cut off from society, because by so doing she will also cut Vronsky off from society. (Wasiolek, 146-47)

There is considerable (unacknowledged) psychoanalytic insight here — except for the very last clause: Anna does not humiliate herself *because* of a need to "cut Vronsky off from society." Such a *sadistic* wish is really irrelevant at this point. Anna's *masochism*, however repulsive to the normal reader, is what makes her go out and seek public humiliation. Eventually she does "punish" Vronsky by killing herself, of course, but the sadism of this act pales by comparison with its self-destructiveness. Anna is really too preoccupied with herself, too childish, in effect, to understand how much she hurts Vronsky. Her major project is to hurt herself.

How is Anna's masochism possible? Here the psychoanalytic literature on the ontogeny of moral masochism can be of some help. Freud was inclined to trace masochistic practices back to defective early interaction with the parents, especially the Oedipal father. More recent psychoanalytic studies, however, focus on problematical pre-Oedipal interaction with the mother. For example, the mother may not have been sensitive enough to the child's need for milk, she may have been emotionally unresponsive (or responded inappropriately) in dyadic interaction with the child, she may have physically abused the child, she may have abandoned the child at some point, etc. Such a mother has, in a sense, defeated her child, and the child, having had no adequate experience of

⁸The only exception I am aware of is Judith M. Armstrong's interesting study titled *The Unsaid Anna Karenina* (and the comments on this study by Adelman, 89-90). Armstrong, however, gives the impression that Anna's masochism is erotogenic rather than moral (see especially pp. 89, 96, 105-6), or that it is a manifestation of the Freudian death drive (i.e., "primary masochism"). Most psychoanalysts reject the idea of a death drive. Anna's death wish, the existence of which is abundantly demonstrated by Armstrong, is best viewed as the emotional extreme of Anna's moral masochism.

what it means to be victorious may grow up to be someone who tends to engage in self-defeating behavior. The masochist *repeats* prior defeats. In effect: "I shall repeat the masochistic wish of being deprived by my mother, by creating or misusing situations in which some substitute of my pre-oedipal mother-image shall refuse my wishes" (Bergler, 5). The mother herself is not necessarily "at fault" in the problematical early interaction (e.g., her child may suffer from a genetic defect which makes the interaction difficult, or she may die unexpectedly). In any case, it is the psychoanalytic consensus that *something* went wrong in the masochist's early interaction with his or her mother — regardless of who was "at fault." As Kerry Kelly Novick and Jack Novick assert, "...the first layer of masochism must be sought in early infancy, in the child's adaptation to a situation where safety resides only in a painful relationship with the mother" (Novick and Novick, 360).

Wasiolek (157) claims that nothing is known of Anna's childhood. This is not true, however. Some crucial information is available: Anna was brought up by her aunt (673), and when she married it was the aunt who made the arrangements (461). Therefore Anna must have been deprived of her mother for much of her childhood, for whatever reason. Perhaps also her father was absent. In any case she is essentially an orphan — as are so many of Tolstoy's major characters — e.g., Pierre Bezukhov, Andrei Bolkonskii, Aleksei Karenin, Konstantin Levin (see Gustafson, 14; see also Armstrong, and Rancour-Laferriere, 1993, 64-67 on the importance of motherlessness in Tolstoy's works). If *most* of the upbringing was accomplished by the aunt (as suggested by the imperfective verb "*vospityvalas'*" — IX, 361), then Anna probably lost her mother early. This loss, which would normally be experienced by a young child as painful abandonment, is a plausible ontogenetic basis for Anna's masochism (as well as her generally disturbed narcissism). Wasiolek himself (without citing any of the psychoanalytic literature on masochism) suspects that Anna's suicide has something to do with her mother (157). Anna's last thoughts concern childhood. She tucks her head down ("*vzhav v plechi golovu*" — IX, 389) just before leaping under the train, as if going into a fetal position. She recalls the childhood sensation of preparing to go into the water for a swim ("*voiti v vodu*"). In Russian folklore water is often characterized as maternal: "*Plevat' na vodu, vse odno, chto materi v glaza*," to quote a peasant proverb (see my *Slave Soul of Russia*, Ch. 8 for more examples). The psychoanalytic literature on water symbolism (e.g., Dundes) would indicate that Anna is making one last desperate attempt to retrieve the mother. Some of the clinicians who work with masochistic patients believe that masochistic sequences are unconsciously intended to enact a merger with the mother (e.g., Asch).

Anna herself is a mother. Within the time-frame of the novel she gives birth to her second child, a daughter by Vronsky. The post-partum period is intensely depressive and masochistic. Anna is certain she is going to die. She persists in this belief even after she has recovered from her puerperal fever. Karenin has (temporarily) forgiven both her and Vronsky, yet she still anticipates death. She hates Karenin, perhaps because his own current masochistic stance reflects hers. She sees suicide as the only way out. But her light-hearted, nonmasochistic brother and fellow-adulterer Stiva intervenes, persuading Karenin to go through with a divorce. Anna understands this to mean she is free to leave Karenin, and she does leave him, thereby averting immediate self-destruction. But she

cannot stop punishing herself. She refuses the divorce decisively, and makes no effort to take her son with her as she runs off to Italy with Vronsky. She never will bring herself to divorce Karenin and marry Vronsky, believing that marriage to him would only be continuation of the (unrecognized self-inflicted) "*muchen'e*" (IX, 383) she endures with him toward the end of the novel.

Anna eventually comes to believe that life is nothing but suffering for everyone, not just herself. Florid projection characterizes her final hours. Seeing a beggar-woman (mother) and child in the street, she thinks: "Are we not all flung into the world only to hate each other, and therefore to torment ourselves and others [*muchat' sebia i drugikh*]?" (691/IX, 384). We are all created *in order to suffer* ("...vse my sozdany zatem, chtoby *muchat'sia*..." — IX, 386). In other words, in creating us our mothers deliberately meant for us to suffer. That is the accusation Anna is unconsciously hurling at her mother, after having hurled similarly narcissistic accusations at her mother-icon, Vronsky, on many of the preceding pages of the novel.

There is much else of psychoanalytic interest which takes place just before Anna commits suicide. But we have come a long way from her adultery. After death, of course, there is no adultery. The light which goes out at the end ("...svecha...*potukhla*" — IX, 389) is precisely the one Anna could not put out upon first seeing Vronsky ("*Ona potushila umyshlenno svet v glazakh, no on svetilsia protiv ee voli*..." — VIII, 77). But, although that light signified adulterous sexual desire, it also represented Anna's narcissism, as we have seen. In the traditionally collectivist Russian culture it is even more important to quash narcissism than to prevent adultery. By killing herself Anna may not turn outward to busy herself with the concerns of others. But she does put a definite stop to her obsessive self-concern.

Anna's suicidal masochism not only puts a stop to her adultery and narcissism, it also forecloses further reproductive success. This is the distal, Darwinian consequence of her last act. And it is an appropriate consequence. From a sociobiological perspective, an individual who can no longer either reproduce or render altruism to others in the collective — especially genetically related individuals — is as good as dead anyway. Technically speaking: "...suicide typically occurs among individuals whose residual capacity to promote inclusive fitness is seriously impaired" (de Catanzaro, 319). We would all live forever if we could all reproduce and care for offspring and relatives forever. Anna is not just psychologically disturbed (depressed, narcissistic, masochistic, etc.) toward the end of her life; she is also a reproductive wreck. She is emotionally incapable of either producing more offspring or of caring for the offspring and other relatives she already has. It is especially difficult to imagine how she might render altruism to anyone related to her (sharing genes with her). The psychological appropriateness of her death reflects its biological appropriateness, proximate mechanisms match distal, Darwinian considerations. This does not always happen in unruly reality, of course, but somehow it seems right that it should happen in great art.

WORKS CITED

- Adelman, Gary. *Anna Karenina: The Bitterness of Ecstasy*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990.
- Armstrong, Judith M. *The Unsaid Anna Karenina*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- Asch, Stuart S. "The Analytic Concepts of Masochism: A Reevaluation." *Masochism: Current Psychoanalytic Perspectives*. Ed. R. Glick and D. Meyers. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Analytic Press, 1988. 93-115.
- Bergler, Edmund. *The Basic Neurosis: Oral Regression and Psychic Masochism*. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1949.
- Bulanov, A. M. "Logika serdtsa v romane L. N. Tolstogo «Anna Karenina»." *Russkaia literatura*, no. 3 (1991):25-35.
- Cooke, Leighton Brett. "Pushkin and the *Femme fatale*: Jealousy in *Cyngany*." *California Slavic Studies* 14 (1992):99-126.
- de Catanzaro, Denys. "Evolutionary Pressures and Limitations to Self-Preservation." *Sociobiology and Psychology: Ideas, Issues and Applications*. Ed. C. Crawford, M. Smith, D. Krebs. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1987. 311-33.
- Dundes, Alan. "The Flood as Male Myth of Creation." *Journal of Psychoanalytic Anthropology* 9 (1986):359-72.
- Fenichel, Otto. *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1945.
- Freud, Sigmund. "On the Economic Problem of Masochism." *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. J. Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1961 (1924). 157-70.
- Gustafson, Richard. *Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Mandelker, Amy. "The Woman With a Shadow: Fables of Demon and Psyche in *Anna Karenina*." *Novel* 24 (1990):48-68.
- Novick, Kerry Kelly and Jack Novick. "The Essence of Masochism." *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 42 (1987):353-84.
- Rancour-Laferriere, Daniel. *Signs of the Flesh: An Essay on the Evolution of Hominid Sexuality*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992 (1985).
- , *Tolstoy's Pierre Bezukhov: A Psychoanalytic Study*. Bristol, England: Bristol Classical Press, 1993.
- , *The Slave Soul of Russia: Psychoanalytic Explorations in a Culture of Moral Masochism*. Forthcoming, 1994.
- Rothstein, Arnold. *The Narcissistic Pursuit of Perfection*. New York: International Universities Press, 1984.
- Sémon, Marie. *Les femmes dans l'oeuvre de Léon Tolstoi*. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 1984.
- Stern, J. P. M. "'Effi Briest': 'Madame Bovary': 'Anna Karenina'," *Modern Language Review* 52 (1957):363-75.

- Tanner, Tony. *Adultery in the Novel: Contract and Transgression*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Thorlby, Anthony. *Leo Tolstoy: Anna Karenina*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Tolstoi, Lev. *Sobranie sochinenii*, 20 vols. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1960-65.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenina*, tr. L. and A. Maude, ed. G. Gibian. New York: W. W. Norton, 1970.
- Wasiolek, Edward. *Tolstoy's Major Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

GENDER, GENRE, AND THE DISCOURSE OF IMPERIALISM IN TOLSTOY'S *THE COSSACKS*

ANTHONY ANEMONE, COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

"Lo naturel e sempre senza errore..."

Dante, *Purgatorio*, Canto XVII

Although critics have long recognized the importance of the Nature/Culture dichotomy in Tolstoy's *Cossacks*,¹ the precise relationship between Tolstoy's Caucasian adventure novel and Rousseauian anthropology remains problematic and ultimately unresolved. It is particularly important to reexamine this issue in Tolstoy's work because it is related to several themes that play a central role in post-Structuralist criticism and theory. For example, any analysis of the relationship between *The Cossacks* and Rousseau ought to include such issues as Tolstoy's depiction of women and sexual difference, the generic structure of the adventure narrative and its ideological connections with European expansionism and imperialism of the mid-nineteenth century, even the semiotic function of names in the text, all of which can be seen to revolve around a master dichotomy between Nature and Culture. A reading of the interrelationships between these issues in the text of *The Cossacks* will suggest a very different view of the Rousseauian tradition in Tolstoy's work. It may not be much of an exaggeration to say that, from a certain point of view, the most interesting "lesson" of the text is not that Olenin cannot turn his back on Culture and return to the simple innocence of the state of Nature: we already knew that. Rather, Tolstoy's text can be seen to subvert the philosophical tradition which constructs reality through an imaginary and unstable dichotomy between Nature and Culture.

Despite its generally high standing in the canon of Tolstoy's works, *The Cossacks* has always posed special challenges to readers. For if *The Cossacks* presents an almost complete inventory of those binary oppositions which can be said to characterize the Rousseauian tradition--country/city, periphery/center, spontaneous/self-conscious, natural/artificial, virtuous/corrupt, ignorant/educated, happy/unhappy, poor/rich, peasant or worker/aristocrat, and female/male--the nature of Rousseau's influence on the author of *The Cossacks* is still contested, still in a state of development and flux. That the young Tolstoy was attempting to follow a master text supplied by Rousseau in depicting noble savages, who possess the secret of the "right relationship" to reality is a popular and plausible reading,² but one that must ignore some obvious inconsistencies in Tolstoy's

¹Noting the obvious influence of Pushkin and Lermontov, contemporary critics interpreted the conflict in the text between nature and civilization as an anachronistic polemic with Romanticism. Opul'skaia 341-42.

²Cf. Berlin, Mirsky, and Greenwood.

appropriation of Rousseau.³ At the same time, it is impossible to support the prevailing Soviet view that *The Cossacks* maps the process by which the materialist, realist and even proto-Marxist Tolstoy come to reject Rousseau, and with him the entire idealist ideology of Romanticism.⁴ According to this view, Olenin represents a naive Rousseauian, flawed by the "idealist" belief that character, a category ultimately determined by class and economics, can be changed by a conscious act of will (Opul'skaia 345-47).

One way to illustrate the extent to which any reading of *The Cossacks* is dependent upon the Nature/Culture dichotomy is to look briefly at a recent article that analyzes Tolstoy's use of personal names from a semiotic perspective. In "The Semiotics of Names and Naming in Tolstoy's *The Cossacks*," Lewis Bagby and Pavel Sigalov argue that the central theme of Tolstoy's text--the narrative of a young nobleman who rejects his social class and attempts to discover a more natural and harmonious way of life among the Cossacks of the Caucasus--is played out on the semiotic level as well as the level of plot. In the personal names of the story's characters, the authors see Tolstoy moving from a semiotic code based on a conventional or arbitrary relationship of signifier (personal name) to signified (character), to a natural, iconographic code based on a motivated resemblance between signifier and signified. Building on Krystyna Pomorska's argument in "Tolstoy contra Semiosis," Bagby and Sigalov characterize Tolstoy's aesthetic as an attempt "to reduce the verbal sign to as close an unmediated object orientation as possible"(473). They conclude their discussion of what they call Tolstoy's "name generation" with the comment that "the central dramatis personae of *The Cossacks* bear names freed from literary-cultural encumbrances"(478).⁵ What is most interesting about this conclusion is how it directly contradicts the essay's own rich documentation of the complex ways in which Tolstoy's names are, in fact, overdetermined by cultural, linguistic, biographical and historical codes. The contradictions in this argument may actually confirm our contention that Tolstoy's text refuses to be contained within the limits of a facile

³Even as sophisticated and sceptical a reader as Edward Wasiolek has difficulty in unraveling Tolstoy's relationship to Rousseau. Although he quite rightly recognizes that the Cossacks are Rousseauian "noble savages" only in Olenin's native imagination, Wasiolek cannot avoid structuring his reading around the traditional Rousseauian poles of positive and negative signs: heart versus mind, the authentic personal versus the inauthentic social, direct primary experience versus the distorted reworking in reason. Wasiolek 51-55, 62-63, et passim.

⁴For example, Zaborova 138-39. For a more sophisticated reading of the Caucasian stories as Tolstoy's attempt to overcome the Romantic tradition in Russian literature, see Eikhenbaum 75-98.

⁵Compare this to the Proustian "Cratylism of the name" analyzed by Roland Barthes in "Proust and Names": "I also want to insist on the Cratylean character of the name (and the sign) in Proust: not only because Proust sees the relation of signifier and signified as a motivated relation, one copying the other and reproducing in its material form the signified essence of the thing (and not the thing itself), but also because, for Proust as for Cratylus, "the virtue of names is to teach": there is a propaedeutics of names which leads, by paths often long, various, and indirect to the essence of things [....] This realism (in the scholastic sense of the term), which insists that names be the "reflection" of ideas, has taken a radical form in Proust, but we may speculate if it is not more or less consciously present in every act of writing and if it is really possible to be a writer without believing, in some sense, in the natural relation of names and essences" (Barthes 67-68).

deployment of the Nature/Culture dichotomy.

The various ways in which Bagby and Sigalov support their controversial thesis are instructive. For example, having traced the etymology of Eroshka to the Greek names Epifanii and Erofei, "one hallowed by god," they assert, curiously, that "Tolstoy was disinterested (sic) in actual etymologies, and in tracing these two variants it is clear that both have very little to do with Eroshka's character"(477). The authors then proceed to suggest several linguistic references which provide the kind of direct access to his character that they are seeking: *erokha* (slovenly person), *vz'eroshennyi* (wild, sloppy), *ershisty* (quarrelsome), *eropa* (braggart), *erofeich* (alcoholic beverage). They conclude in the following way: "Eroshka and his name indicate each other directly, without the mediation of other (literary) phenomena, and thus fulfill the quest for compactness of *signans* and *signatum* at plot and authorial levels"(476). It is difficult, however, to agree with the authors that the associative logic and philological reasoning which allow them to connect Eroshka with *Erokha*, *ershisty*, *vz'eroshennyi*, *eropa*, and *erofeich* are not quintessentially "literary" techniques which precisely mediate between the signifier and the signified. Conversely, their analysis can be seen as an example of *mise en abyme*, where the signifier "Eroshka" is situated in a chain of signifiers which, rather than providing direct access to his character, endlessly defers the promised moment of contact between signifier and signified. On the level of plot and character, Eroshka himself is not a stable signified, one which can be adequately summed up by the sort of associations generated by his name: Tolstoy is quite clear in showing us how Eroshka signifies different things to different people in the text. If, to Olenin, Eroshka personifies the quintessential Cossack virtues, to the other Cossacks, he is an almost comical figure, a drunken wanderer who happens to be a hunter of genius.⁶ But even if one could ignore this problem, the author's assertion that the historical and cultural associations with the Greek etymology of the name Eroshka play no role in Tolstoy's naming process would still have to be contested. A reading of Eroshka which sees him as a figure "hallowed by God" is certainly conceivable.

The thesis that personal names provide direct and privileged access to the Cossacks is least convincing, however, in the cases of the young Cossacks Luka and Mar'iana. For example, in discussing Eroshka's references to Luka as Marka, Bagby and Sigalov admit, with poorly disguised ill humor, that "the direct use of the Apostles' names suggests a cultural burden inhering in the character and his name. Tolstoy is something of a hindrance here"(476). Further, despite their own admission that spiritual, textual and historical references reside in the name Mar'iana -- a traditional religious name that combines the name of the Mother of God with that of her own mother, Anna -- the authors

⁶See Wasiolek, for example: "Tolstoy makes it abundantly clear that Daddy Eroshka is not representative of Cossack life, and that he is not fully part of Cossack life any longer. In the village he is a useless old man, an object of indifference and occasional mockery, someone given to drunkenness, slovenliness, and long stories. Eroshka romanticizes his past and Olenin romanticizes his present and future. But there are two Eroshkas: the Eroshka of the village, where he is something of a pathetic figure, and the Eroshka of the woods. Tolstoy mocks Eroshka in the village, but he does not mock Eroshka of the woods, suggesting that the elemental sensuousness, which has taken perverted forms in his drunkenness, carousing, and sensuality, has its pure and true form in the woods and away from its civilized forms"(60).

are intent on restoring the Cossacks to a state of primordial and privileged innocence. They insist that, since Olenin is the principal bearer of the cultural codes needed to decode these names, the "cultural burden" that the names seem to represent resides exclusively in his perception. They invite readers to dissociate themselves from Olenin's unnatural reading of Cossack names and reality: "The reader is in effect being asked to separate himself from Olenin's romantic expectations and thereby free Luka from the reading of his character made by Olenin"(477).

This strategic separation of Olenin from Tolstoy is an ingenious, but ultimately unsatisfying, act of repression. In fact, on a theoretical level, Bagby and Sigalov's blindness to the evidence of the text may be seen as characteristic of the entire semiotic project. For, as de Man has written, in its attempt at "grammatical decoding," a semiotic reading will always remain blind to "those elements in all texts that are by no means ungrammatical, but whose semantic function is not grammatically definable, neither in themselves nor in context"("Resistance to Theory" 15-16). The quasi-Rousseauian dichotomy between Nature and Culture in Tolstoy's use of names may be an example of such a grammatically undefinable function.

Reviewing the critical literature on Tolstoy and Rousseau, one finds numerous similar acts of repression and blindness to those textual elements which tend to break down the traditional dichotomy between Nature and Culture. For example, almost all the critics agree, in spite of much textual and linguistic evidence to the contrary, that simplicity, spontaneity, harmony, and the absence of self-consciousness and of social hierarchy constitute the essence of the Cossacks, and represent a way of life superior in most respects to that of the civilized, and therefore unnatural, Russians. Isaiah Berlin, for example, has written that:

Tolstoy constantly defends the proposition that human beings are more harmonious in childhood than under the corrupting influence of education in later life [...] that simple people, peasants, Cossacks, and the like have a more 'natural' and correct attitude than civilized men towards these basic values and that they are free and independent in a sense in which civilized men are not.(37)

In a direct reference to *The Cossacks*, Berlin writes that: "The Cossacks Lukashka or uncle Yeroshka [...] are morally superior as well as happier and aesthetically more harmonious beings than Olenin. Olenin knows this"(37-8). Mirsky summarizes Tolstoy's ideological position in the following way:

The main idea is the contrast of [Olenin's] sophisticated and self-conscious personality to the 'natural men' that are the Cossacks. Unlike the 'natural man' of Rousseau, and of Tolstoy's own later teachings, the 'natural man' in "The Cossacks" is not an incarnation of good. But the very fact of his being natural places him above the distinction of good and evil. The Cossacks kill, fornicate, steal, and still are beautiful in their naturalness, and hopelessly superior to the much more moral, but civilized and consequently contaminated, Olenin"(257).

Yet another critic has called *The Cossacks* "an impressive example of Tolstoy's constant tendency to seek the secret of happiness in Rousseauistic terms of following the 'natural' and turning from the artificial"(Greenwood 45).

If "coherence in contradiction expresses the force of a desire" (Derrida 279), then the history of the critical readings of *The Cossacks* may tell us more about the critics than about Tolstoy's text. Specifically, the "coherent contradiction" in these critical readings tells the story of the critics' overwhelming need, in the face of much evidence to the contrary, to assert the existence of a privileged, natural way of life, one which might contain the solution to the alienation and discontents of modern social life. For this solution to work, however, the dichotomy between the natural and the civilized in the text of *The Cossacks* must be preserved intact. And yet, in many places in the text, those oppositions which should constitute the essential difference between the natural Cossacks and the civilized Russians are shown to exist among the Cossacks as well. Indeed, as we learn from Eroshka's constant privileging of the glorious Cossack past over the "fallen" present, they have always existed among the Cossacks. In other words, the difference which critics attempt to limit to the opposition Cossack/Russian is reinscribed as difference within the Cossacks themselves: rather than making the identification of the Cossacks possible, the difference that counts subverts the very notion of total identity with self.⁷ The identity of the Cossacks, defined in terms of the opposition of their natural essence to the civilized and unnatural nature of Russians, is undercut, subverted, or deconstructed, by the very language which Tolstoy uses to present it.

To illustrate this crucial point, one could choose examples almost at random: for instance, the most common description of Lukashka, that epitome of Cossack manhood, is not as natural or spontaneous, but as "self-conscious." His is conscious, not only of his youth and strength, but of his high standing within the Cossack community as well.⁸ A point made in much Marxist criticism is that a crucial source of Cossack superiority derives from their inherent democratic social structure -- specifically, the historical absence of serfdom as an institution (Opul'skaia 342-43). This is contrasted, not surprisingly, to the strict Russian hierarchy of master and man. And yet, both Luka and Mar'iana clearly embody an apparently "natural" hierarchy which reigns in the Cossack community. The authority of their presence, courage, physical beauty, and spiritual qualities, all serve to differentiate them from ordinary Cossacks like their friends Nazarka or Ustenka. Tolstoy is absolutely explicit with regard to Mar'iana's unique status among the young Cossack

⁷As Barbara Johnson has written in *The Critical Difference*: "A text's difference is not its uniqueness, its special identity. It is the text's way of differing from itself.... Difference [...] is not what distinguishes one identity from another. It is not a difference between...but a difference within. Far from constituting the text's unique identity, it is that which subverts the very idea of identity, infinitely deferring the possibility of adding up the sum of a text's parts or meanings and reaching a totalized, integrated whole [...] Difference is not engendered in the space between identities: it is what makes all totalization of a self or the meaning of a text impossible" (Johnson 4-5).

⁸"В его боковой щегольской посадке, в небрежном движении руки, похлопывавшей чуть слышно плетью под брюхо лошади, и особенно в его блестящих чёрных глазах, смотревших, гордо прищуриваясь, вокруг, выражались сознание силы и самонадеянность молодости" (PSS, VI, 130). "The smart way in which he sat a little sideways on his horse, the careless motion with which he barely touched his horse's belly with his whip, and especially his half-closed black eyes, glistening as he looked proudly around him, all expressed the consciousness of strength and the self-confidence of youth."

women. At one point, for example, in order to differentiate her from the other girls, the narrator calls her a "proud and happy queen among them" ("Она гордою и весёлою царицей казалась между другими." PSS, VI, 98). In other words, when he wants to prove the superiority of his "natural" heroine, Tolstoy resorts to the language of civilized, hierarchical society that, in principle, negates the very notion of the natural society of the Cossacks. Rather than relying on a single metaphor, Tolstoy emphasizes this very point in a crucial passage about female morality among the Cossacks.

Nothing, it turns out, proves Mar'ianna's paradoxical "superiority" among the Cossack girls more than her "instinctual" belief in a moral code that would seem to have no place within the Rousseauian system of nature. And, in fact, her sense of morality is perceived as foreign by the other Cossacks, including Eroshka, Lukashka, and Ustenka. This is made perfectly clear when Mar'ianna is talking to Ustenka, a seemingly unambiguous representation of a spontaneous, natural, simple, and unsophisticated Cossack woman. Like Eroshka, Ustenka believes that love cannot be a sin, and that pleasure must be taken when one is young and free, since marriage, children and the hard work of being a Cossack's wife come soon enough.⁹ Contrary to the expectations of readers convinced that the Cossacks represent a lusty and hedonistic amorality in contrast to the sexual hypocrisy of the corrupt Russians, Mar'ianna's response, is that such untrammelled sexual freedom is a sin. And yet, rather than alienating her from the Cossack values of nature, spontaneity, and freedom, her compliance with an external code of morality is precisely the source of her superiority over the other Cossack women. And this superiority is endorsed by everyone involved -- not only by Olenin, Belitskii, Lukashka, Eroshka, and Ustenka, but, apparently, by the author as well. Again, the difference that readers try to limit to the space between Russians and Cossacks is reinscribed by the text itself as a difference within the Cossacks. Sexuality and sexual difference, then, represent one of the main areas where the contradictions of a certain type of reading of the Cossacks are made apparent.

Further, one could argue that the gender-based distinction implicit in Ustenka's own words undercuts the very notions of Cossack freedom and amorality that, on another level, her character embodies. For Ustenka acknowledges that the free and natural, hedonistic Cossack lifestyle is suspended, for the woman at least, by marriage. If Culture can be defined as everything that depends upon a system of norms that regulates social behavior and is capable of varying from one society to another (Derrida 1978: 283), then both Mar'ianna's adherence to a moral prohibition against pre-marital sex, as well as Ustenka's acceptance of the traditional patriarchal structure of marriage, represent direct evidence of the transition from Nature to Culture. Again, in order to establish the "natural," the narrator, and the characters themselves, must use language and concepts which work to subvert that overt intention: language and concepts that reveal the seemingly natural as the product of culture as well. The superior Cossack woman, then, can be defined only in terms of her opposites and inferiors -- the civilized women that Olenin left behind in

⁹"Когда же и гулять, как не на девичьей воле?" (PSS, VI, 113) "When can you have a good time if not when you're single and free."

Moscow. The spontaneous Cossack woman is shown to be a part of a culturally constructed patriarchal society, thereby revealing the mythical status of the state of Nature.

Peter Scotto (1992) and Susan Layton (1986) have recently published important articles on the general problem of Orientalism in Russian culture, thus opening for discussion the problematic relationship between Tolstoy's literary discourse and the political ideology of Russian Imperialism. Tolstoy's personal involvement with the Russian army of occupation in the Caucasus between 1851 and 1854, and the many parallels between Tolstoy's and Olenin's experiences in the Caucasus have been well documented. (Eikhenbaum 91-93; Simmons 74-100; Green 187-88). However, there is more at stake here than Tolstoy's ambivalence towards Great Russian Imperialism. The central action of *The Cossacks* -- the hero's flight from civilization to a more primitive world and the dramatized confrontation between civilization and Nature -- reflects the prototypical plot of the European adventure narrative in the age of Imperialism.¹⁰ In the words of one critic, the adventure narrative was "the generic counterpart in literature to empire in politics" (Green 37). Beginning with the publication of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* in 1720, adventure narratives by writers such as Sir Walter Scott, James Fenimore Cooper and Rudyard Kipling have provided what has been called an "energizing myth" of European Imperialism (Green 3), a blueprint of relationships between civilized Europeans and primitive native peoples.¹¹ The symbolic elements of this mythology and its manifold connections with historical European Imperialism are, by now, largely familiar: Joseph Conrad, perhaps better than anyone else, has captured the complex and contradictory ideology of European expansionism:

Hunters for gold or pursuers of fame, they had all gone out on that stream, bearing the sword, and often the torch, messengers of the might within the land, bearers of a spark from the sacred flame. What greatness had not floated on the ebb of that river into the mystery of an unknown earth!... The dreams of men, the seed of commonwealths, the germs of empire (Conrad 4-5).

What unites the various national manifestations of "imperialism in literature," to put it bluntly, is a common ideological or propagandistic need to put a disinterested, altruistic or romantic face upon the economic and psychological will to power that operates through

¹⁰For an illuminating study of the adventure narrative and the culture of Imperialism, see Green. The connections between the rhetoric of travel writing and the mentality of European Imperialism are explored in Said and Greenblatt.

¹¹In *Orientalism*, Edward Said describes this relationship in the following way: "Being a White Man was therefore an idea and a reality. It meant -- in the colonies -- speaking in a certain way, behaving according to a code of regulations, and even feeling certain things and not others. It meant specific judgements, evaluations, gestures. It was a form of authority before which nonwhites, and even whites themselves, were expected to bend [...] Being a White Man, in short, was a very concrete manner of being-in-the-world, a way of taking hold of reality, reality, and thought" (Said 227).

the institutions and practices of European expansionism and imperialism.¹²

But even if Tolstoy was complicit, to some degree, in the historical project of Great Russian "empire building" in the Caucasus, his treatment of this problem in texts like *The Cossacks* and *Khadzhi-Murat* betrays a striking ambivalence. For example, Olenin has nothing in common with the traditional value system of the imperialist-adventurer. Not only does he not believe in the inherent superiority of Europe and Europeans over native peoples, Olenin assumes the superiority of the Cossack way of life, which he tries to discover by living among them and trying to live like them. In general, Tolstoy's attempt to develop the narrative in terms of the dichotomy between the Noble Savage and the (overly) civilized European proves untenable, as the traditional oppositions break down in the face of a recalcitrant reality. For example, having fled the moral corruption and decadence of life at the center (Moscow) to discover simplicity, virtue and masculine force at the very edge of Russian civilization, Olenin discovers that the corrupting effects of European culture have already been experienced by the Cossacks.¹³ Tolstoy's debunking of the shallow, pseudo-culture of the Cossack cornet (*kazak obrazovannyi*), who is employed, significantly, as a school teacher, works to transform formerly "decadent" Moscow back into the site of "authentic" culture. The Russian officer Beletsky subverts the Nature/Culture dichotomy by exhibiting, simultaneously, the worst vices of Culture (vanity, affectation, lack of moral seriousness, etc.) and the best virtues of Nature (spontaneity, flexibility, a healthy hedonism, etc.). Nevertheless, to Olenin's baffled amazement, the Cossacks immediately recognize and accept Beletsky as a kindred soul:

Белецкий сразу вошёл в обычную жизнь богатого кавказского офицера в станице. На глазах Оленина он в один месяц стал как бы старожилом станицы: он подпаивал стариков, делал вечеринки и сам ходил на вечеринки к девкам, хвастался победами и даже дошёл до того, что девки и бабы прозвали его почему-то дедушкой, а казаки, ясно определившие себе этого человека, любившего вино и женщин, привыкли к нему и даже полюбили его больше, чем Оленина, который был для них загадкой (PSS, VI, 90).

Beletsky immediately entered into the usual life of a rich officer in a Cossack village in the Caucasus. Before Olenin's eyes, in one month he came to be like an old resident of the village; he treated the old men to drinks, organized evening parties, and himself went to parties arranged by the girls; he bragged of his conquests, and things even went so far that, for some unknown reason, the women and girls began calling him grandady, and the Cossacks, who understood a man who loved wine and women, got used to him and liked him better than Olenin, who remained a puzzle to them.

Haydon White has shown how the related concepts of the Wild Man and the Noble

¹²The various ways in which the hegemonic discourse of Orientalism distances the harsh reality of the West's imperialistic appropriation of the East represent, of course, a central theme of Said's *Orientalism*. See also Green 3-37.

¹³"Влияние России выражается только с невыгодной стороны стеснением в выборах, снятием колоколов и войсками, которые стоят и проходят там" (PSS, VI, 16). "Russian influence shows itself only in negative ways -- by interference in elections, by the confiscation of church bells, and by the troops who are quartered there or pass through."

Savage have been generated out of premodern European society's ambivalence towards the burden of civilization:

[...] in the Middle Ages the notion of wildness is constantly projected in images of desire released from the trammels of all convention and at the same time in images of the punishment which submission to desire brings down on us. The Wild Man myth is what the medieval imagination conceives life would be like if men gave direct expression to libidinal impulses, both in terms of the pleasures that such a liberation might afford and in terms of the pain that might result from it ("Forms of Wildness" 175).

This dual image of Wildness as positive and negative alternatives to civilized society may help explain Tolstoy's difficulty in projecting a consistent image of the Cossacks as an alternative to Russian civilization. While Tolstoy tends to idealize the Cossacks for being "as yet unbroken to civilizational discipline" ("Forms of Wildness" 170), he cannot repress completely his own deep allegiance to culture and, we might add, to the concept of nobility itself. And if, as Haydon White has argued, the trope of the Noble Savage "represents not so much an elevation of the idea of the native as a demotion of the idea of nobility" ("Noble Savage" 191), we may come even closer to an understanding of the ambiguities and uncertainties in Count Tolstoy's presentation of the Cossacks' wildness. Perhaps the problem lies in Tolstoy's attempt to telescope two historically distinct and, ultimately, mutually exclusive, visions of wildness and the Noble Savage into one narrative; that is, a Rousseauian, wish-fulfilling fantasy of a return to an Edenic state of innocence and purity, with an adventure narrative that is, inevitably, contaminated by an imperialist ideology that necessarily assumes the superiority of Culture ("Forms of Wildness" 154-57; "Noble Savage" 191-95).

The thorny issue of Tolstoy's depiction of women and sexual difference in *The Cossacks* -- as I have already indicated -- is inevitably implicated in this discussion of the Nature/Culture dichotomy. Women play a contradictory, yet central, role in Tolstoy's vision of modern civilization and its discontents. Although Olenin has left Moscow because of an unhappy love affair and his general dissatisfaction with high society Muscovite ladies, he never wavers in his association of true happiness with the feminine principle: the bosom of Mother Nature or the embrace of a native woman. Not surprisingly, women traditionally play a crucial role in the discourse of the adventure narrative (Zweig 61-80). One of the most common tropes of adventure/imperialistic narratives, historical and fictional, is the seduction (and, usually, the political co-optation) of a native woman by the European adventurer (Hyam 34-89). The story of Cortez and La Malinche, who became his translator, spy, and mistress and helped convince Montezuma to seek the protection of the Spaniards, is an early example of this motif (Todorov 100-102; Greenblatt 118-51). Sexual conquest as a symbol of a more general political and military mastery of the native population is also at work in the story of Captain John Smith and Pocahontas (Lubin 14-21; Young 409-15). For a Russian of Tolstoy's generation, of course, this motif would have been familiar, if not a cliché from

poems and stories by Pushkin, Bestuzhev-Marlinskii, Lermontov, and a host of lesser writers.¹⁴

Another impetus of the adventure narrative in history and in fiction seems to have been the covert or unconscious desire to escape from the society of women to an exclusively male world. In fact, one critic goes so far as to argue that, from a psychoanalytic perspective, all adventurers and explorers act on an impulse to flee from women because they "cannot cope with the erotic and social hegemony of women" (Zweig 6).¹⁵ Interestingly, Tolstoy's text acts out both of these contradictory erotic impulses; while Olenin has fled Moscow and his former lover for the mythical male-centered universe of the Cossacks, once in the Caucasus he immediately becomes obsessed with his desire for Mar'iana. As Olenin leaves the Cossacks and the story comes to its circular conclusion, the question of woman's role in Tolstoy's adventure remains contested. On one level, certainly, Olenin's inability to win Mar'iana may represent Tolstoy's ambivalence about the success of Russian imperialism in the Caucasus; in this way, *The Cossacks* may be read as a covert subversion of the accepted ideology of the adventure narrative. And yet a potentially more interesting and complicated issue concerns Tolstoy's use of the Nature/Culture dichotomy to define and situate the relationship between Olenin and Mar'iana.

Before we can adequately address this issue, we must distinguish between several related problems concerning Tolstoy's use of Rousseauian categories in *The Cossacks*. Most critics -- as we have seen -- agree that Tolstoy depicts the Cossacks as superior representatives of Nature in opposition to the civilized Russians (Opul'akaia 342-43; Berlin 37-38; Mirsky 257; Greenwood 45). The central critical problem, then, concerns Olenin's ultimately unsuccessful attempt to remake himself according to the model of the supposedly superior natural people. We have already described how one Soviet critic reads this theme as Tolstoy's critique of Rousseau and Romanticism. The text's circular structure -- it ends as it began, with Olenin leaving the scene of an unsuccessful love affair -- would certainly seem to suggest that Olenin has not changed and may be incapable of remaking himself.

And yet, as I have tried to show, the notion that the text can support a facile Rousseauian division of the world into the superior natural and the inferior social or cultural is simply not borne out by close reading. Even Olenin has difficulty in deciding what constitutes the true Cossack way of life; is it altruism (the lesson of the stag's lair) or self-assertion (Daddy Eroshka's lusty hedonism)? For most critics, this problem is solved -- reasonably enough -- by observing what happens to Olenin when he acts upon his (apparently flawed) understanding of "true" Cossack values. Thus, for example, we see that altruism is not a Cossack virtue when his gift of a horse to Lukashka arouses in

¹⁴For an interesting discussion of the connections between cultural and sexual conquest, see Sandler's discussion of Pushkin's "Prisoner of the Caucasus" (145-65).

¹⁵Hence the not insignificant motif of homoeroticism in the biographies of, for example, T.E. Lawrence (O'Donnell 107-30), Sir Richard Burton (Rice 128-9, 323-24, 394), and the Russian explorer Nikolai Przhevalskii (Karlinsky 3: Green 199-200).

the Cossacks, not gratitude and affection, but rather suspicion and unease (*PSS*, VI, 88-90). But while this ironic approach can tell us what the Cossacks are not, it cannot present an independent positive point of view on *The Cossacks* precisely because it is limited to the Cossacks' reactions to Olenin's actions.

By contrast, another way to articulate the problematic meaning of *The Cossacks* is to look closely at the ethnographic section of the text (*PSS*, VI, 14-18), in which Tolstoy attempts to situate his Cossacks within the political, social and religious context of the Caucasus in the first half of the nineteenth century.¹⁶ Here Tolstoy complicates the usual dichotomy between civilized Russians and primitive Cossacks by introducing a third ethnographic group into the narrative. The independent Muslim tribes of the hills, called Tatars or Chechens by Tolstoy, live beyond the Terek river, the border of Russian military and political authority, in a state of more or less constant, if low-level, warfare with the Cossacks and their Russian allies. Despite the military alliance with the Russians, the Cossacks' ties to the Chechens are deep and significant:

Очень очень давно предки их, староверы, бежали из России и поселились за Терекон, между чеченцами на Гребне, порвом зребте лесистых гор Большой Чечни. Живя между чеченцами, казаки перероднились с ними и усвоили себе обычаи, образ жизни и нравы горцев: но удержали и там, во всей прежней чистоте, русский язык и старую веру [...] Ещё до сих пор казацкие роды считаются родством с чеченскими, и любовь к свободе, праздности, грабежу и войне составляет главные черты их характера (*PSS*, VI, 15-16).

A long long time ago their Old Believer ancestors had fled from Russia and settled among the Chechens of the Greben, the first range of forested mountains of Greater Chechnia. Living among the Chechens the Cossacks intermarried with them and adopted the manners and customs of the mountain tribes, although they still retained the Russian language in all its purity, as well as their Old Believer faith [...] Even today the Cossack clan still claims relationships with the Chechens, and the love of freedom, of leisure, of plunder and of war, still form their chief characteristics.

In several important ways, the Cossacks are closer to their wild Muslim neighbors than to the Russians:

Казак, по влечению, менее ненавидит джигита--горца, который убил его брата, чем солдата, который стоит у него, чтобы защищать его станицу, но который закурил табаком его хату. Он уважает врагагорца, но презирает чужого для чего и угнетателя солдата. Собственно русский мужик для казака есть чуждое, дикое и презренное существо ... (*PSS*, VI, 16).

A Cossack is less inclined to hate the *dzhigit* hillsman who has killed his brother, than the soldier who has been quartered on him to defend his village, but who has defiled his hut with tobacco-smoke. He respects his enemy the hillsman and despises the soldier, who is an alien and an

¹⁶Compare Susan Layton's conclusion concerning *Khadzhi-Murat*: "Tolstoy takes care to establish the cultural identity of his hero, rather than insist upon 'nature' as a determinant of character [...] While Tolstoy characterizes Khadzhi Murat as culturally distinct, his text undercuts traditional notions of the mountain tribesman as an exotic other" (6).

oppressor. In reality, from the Cossacks' point of view a Russian peasant is a foreign, savage, despicable creature....

The specific ethnographic situation of the Orthodox Christian and Russian-speaking Cossacks, located midway between Russian allies (and occupiers) and Chechen enemies (and relatives), is another reason for the instability of any reading of the text that relies on a traditional Rousseauian division between Nature and Culture. In this way, Tolstoy reveals the essentially relational and differential status of the Nature/Culture dichotomy: for if, from a Russian point of view, the Cossacks represent "Nature," the extent to which they have themselves been "contaminated" by civilization becomes immediately clear when they are compared to the Chechens.¹⁷ There are numerous additional examples that show how Tolstoy breaks down the Nature/Culture dichotomy in his portraits of the other characters of *The Cossacks*. For instance, when Tolstoy wants to show the negative effects of Olenin's upbringing in Moscow society, the text clearly reveals that his problems result not from the traditional Rousseauian problem of the artificial and unnatural conventions of social behaviour,¹⁸ but rather from the total absence of moral restrictions. Tolstoy writes that:

В восемнадцать лет Оленин был так свободен, как только бывали свободны русские богатые молодые люди сороковых годов, с молодых лет оставшиеся без родителей. Для него не было никаких--ни физических, ни моральных--оков; он всё мог сделать, и ничего ему не нужно было, и ничего его не связывало" (PSS, VI, 7).

At the age of 18, Olenin was as free as only rich young Russian men of the 1840s orphaned at an early age could be. For him there were no physical or moral fetters; he could do anything he wanted, he needed nothing, and nothing tied him down.

The dualism at the heart of freedom is mirrored by a curious dualism within Olenin himself: his contradictory relationship to freedom splits his personality in half. In the city, for example, he is alienated because of his intuitive nature, his reliance on an inner, Socratic voice for moral guidance at crucial moments.¹⁹ But in the country, Olenin reverts to the opposite extreme: he is alienated from the Cossacks because of his intensely

¹⁷At the same time, a larger issue is at stake here: knowingly or not, Tolstoy has identified an essential connection between the expansionist ideologies of the 19th. century European Romanticism and Imperialism. As the Romantic imagination comes to know the primitive through travel, ethnographic, and fictional narratives, it inevitably transforms the "natural" into its opposite: simultaneously, it posits the existence of another, more authentically natural people who exist beyond the borders of European knowledge and power. The logic of European political expansionism, constantly moving from one site of "virgin territory" to another, in a never-ending "will to power" over so-called primitive societies, is essentially identical to, and often conflated with, the "will to knowledge" expressed in the ideology of Romanticism.

¹⁸As they do, for example, in Tolstoy's *Detstvo* (*Childhood*).

¹⁹"Вспомнил он [...] и общую неловкость, и стеснение, и постоянное чувство возмущения против этой натянутости. Какой-то голос всё говорил: *не то, не то*, и точно вышло не то" (PSS, VI, 9). "He recalled [...] the general awkwardness and restraint and a constant feeling of rebellion against that tension. Some voice would always whisper: 'That's not it, that's not it,' and so it had turned out."

self-conscious, rational, and intellectual nature.

One passage that can serve to illustrate Tolstoy's paradoxical relationship to Rousseau, while simultaneously serving as an allegory for the power of language to subvert the totalizing intent of logic, occurs early in the text. Olenin is travelling to the Caucasus and dreaming of what awaits him there, dreams that revolve around a young beautiful native woman:

Есть ещё одна, самая дорогая мечта, которая примешивалась ко всякой мысли молодого человека о будущем. Это мечта о женщине. И там она, между гор, представляется воображению в виде черкешенки--рабыни, с стройным станом, длинною косой и покорными глубокими глазами. Ему представляется в горах уединенная хижина и у порога *она*, дожидаящаяся его в то время, как он, усталый, покрытый пылью, кровью, славой, возвращается к ней, ему чудятся её поцелуи, её плечи, её сладкий голос, её покорность. Она прелестна, но она необразована, дика, груба. В длинные зимние вечера он начинает воспитывать её. Она умна, понятлива, даровита и быстро усваивает себе все необходимые знания. Отчего же? Она очень легко может выучить языки, читать произведения французской литературы, понимать их. *Notre Dame de Paris*, например, должно ей понравиться. Она может и говорить по-французски. В гостиной она может иметь больше природного достоинства, чем дама самого высшего общества. Она может петь, просто, сильно и страстно (*PSS*, VI, 11-12).

One other dream, the sweetest of them all, mingled with the young man's every thought of the future. This was the dream of a woman. And there, among the mountains, she appeared to his imagination as a Christian slave, a shapely figure with a single long plait of hair and deep submissive eyes. He imagined a lonely hut in the mountains, and on the threshold *she* stands awaiting him when, tired and covered with dust, blood and glory, he returns to her. He imagines her kisses, her shoulders, her sweet voice, and her submissiveness. She is charming, but uneducated, wild crude. During the long winter evenings he begins to educate her. She is intelligent, quick to understand, talented and she quickly masters all the necessary knowledge. Why? She learns languages very easily, can read and understand French literature. *Notre Dame de Paris*, for example, is sure to appeal to her. She can even speak French. In a drawing room she would possess more innate dignity than a lady from the highest society. She can sing, simply, powerfully, and passionately.

Eventually, the fantasy collapses under its own weight as Olenin comes to his senses and cries out "Oh, what nonsense!" ("Ах, какой вздор!" *PSS*, VI, 12). To an educated Russian reader, this passage represents an obvious reference to Pushkin's story, "*Baryshnia-krest'ianka*" ("The mistress-maid"), in which an aristocratic young woman impersonating an uneducated peasant girl feigns the cultural transformation that Olenin fantasizes. In Pushkin's version, after a few days of tutoring, the "peasant girl" is "civilized" and is already reading Karamzin, the leading Russian Rousseauian! In its sophisticated examination of the theatricality of everyday life and of the complex interplay between everyday, "natural" behaviour and cultural codes borrowed from literary models, Pushkin's text is clearly related to the problematic of Tolstoy's *Cossacks*.²⁰

²⁰For two sophisticated analyses of the complex ways that literary conventions influence the behaviour of individual characters in Pushkin's prose, see Todd 106-36, and Bethea and Davydov.

If the passage quoted above parodies Olenin's infantile romanticism, it also foregrounds the problematic status of the Nature/Culture dichotomy within the text of *The Cossacks*. Although in flight from civilized society women, Olenin cannot help but transform his uncivilized Cossack woman into her opposite, a civilized-and therefore, presumably, inferior-woman, one who speaks and reads foreign languages and is able to appreciate high culture. The very act of imaginatively possessing Nature transforms it into its dialectical opposite, Culture. The operation of cultural assimilation is thus seen as a double-bind, in which it is impossible to sustain the presumed superiority of Nature to Culture. For, if by assimilating the master culture, the primitive native loses the critical difference that was its primary source of value (at least in the eyes of the representatives of civilization), the native's inability or refusal to assimilate the cultural code of the master illustrates another, perhaps even more familiar, aspect of the "inherent inferiority" of the primitive.

While Tolstoy is obviously laughing at the inanity of Olenin's romantic dreams, there is a sense in which, throughout the entire text, he appears unable to avoid Olenin's errors. Thus, in asserting the superiority of the natural, Tolstoy cannot help but dress up his "natural" heroes in civilized clothing. This parallel between Olenin and the author is more important than the external biographical similarities that critics have noted: it undercuts the claim of several critics that Tolstoy successfully separates Olenin's consciousnesses from his own (Wasiulek 51-64; Opul'skaia 341-48). In this sense, the text can be said to prefigure or anticipate the various critical misreadings discussed above, as well as my reading.²¹ The blindness of Olenin and his critics, leads to the insight that everyone and everything in the text is, in some essential way, both spontaneous and self-conscious, natural and artificial, the product of both Culture and Nature. But if the anthropology of *The Cossacks* can be shown, on rhetorical grounds, at least, to be untenable, the opposition between Nature and Culture is, apparently, inescapable and everywhere present in the language and in the consciousness of the characters, the author, and, we might add, the readers.

If we define "logocentrism" as a hermeneutic strategy which attempts to restrict, limit, and otherwise control the infinite play of meaning in literary texts through a systematic privileging of spoken voice and presence over written text and absence, one might be tempted to call the premises of *The Cossacks* "logocentric."²² Similarly, Tolstoy can be implicated, along with many of the central figures of the Western literary and philosophical tradition, in an attempt to control the ever elusive and constantly receding dichotomy between Nature and Culture. A more productive approach, however,

²¹"Accounting for the 'rhetoricity' of its own mode, the text also postulates the necessity of its own misreading. It knows and asserts that it will be misunderstood. It tells the story, the allegory of its misunderstanding" (de Man, "Resistance to Theory" 136).

²²Wasiulek emphasizes the importance of the "nostalgia for origins" in Tolstoy. See, for example, the following passages: "What Tolstoy is groping for is some definition that escapes the dichotomous oppositions of sense and consciousness, of civilization and primitiveness, and even that of pleasure and pain"(62); or "What is insistent [in Tolstoy's early works] is the conviction that something good, true, and real exists before it is spoiled by human manipulation"(63).

might be to see Tolstoy as the subject, rather than the object, of this "deconstruction" of the Nature/ Culture dichotomy. While Olenin goes to the Caucasus, not merely because that's where the Cossacks are, but also because of his abiding belief in the special privilege attached to presence and to voice, Tolstoy clearly separates himself from this delusion. Further, the version of romanticism that is ridiculed in Olenin's dream is based on literary texts supplied by Russian authors such as Bestuzhev-Marlinskii, Pushkin and Lermontov. In other words, Olenin's journey from Moscow to the Caucasus is not only a journey through space: it is also a journey from mute text to living voice, from absence into the presence of the Cossacks. But if Olenin, like many of Tolstoy's critics, can freely admit that the literary version of romanticism is a fantasy, he seems unable to stop believing in the Caucasus as a world beyond the contradictions of civilized society, a world of absolute origin and truth, where signifier and signified are identical, and where the critical difference between Nature and Culture can be isolated, suspended, and controlled. But the reading of *The Cossacks* that I am suggesting would go beyond a critique of Olenin's (mis)perceptions to the central problem posed by the theoretical dichotomy between Nature and Culture. In other words, the language and logic of *The Cossacks* not only reveal the untenable and mythical nature of Olenin's romantic vision of the Caucasus, but also undercut the very possibility of the Nature/Culture dichotomy. Viewed from this perspective, the contradictory presentation of Rousseauian motifs in *The Cossacks* should not be seen either as the sign of the author's artistic or philosophical immaturity, or of the unresolved struggle in Tolstoy's early works between Romanticism and Realism. Rather, it should be read as Tolstoy's heroic attempt to think through, and even to transcend, the limitations of the philosophical and linguistic culture into which he was born.

WORKS CITED

- Bagby, Lewis & Pavel Sigalov. "The Semiotics of Names and Naming in Tolstoj's *The Cossacks*." *Slavic and East European Journal* 1987, 475-89.
- Barthes, Roland. "Proust and Names." Tr. Richard Howard. *New Critical Essays*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1980. 55-68.
- Berlin, Isaiah. "Tolstoy and Enlightenment." Ed. Ralph Matlaw, *Tolstoy: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967. 28-51.
- Bethea, David and Sergei Davydov. "Pushkin's Saturnine Cupid: The Poetics of Parody in The Tales of Belkin." *PMLA* 96.1(1981): 8-21.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. New York: Norton, 1971.
- de Man, Paul. "The Rhetoric of Blindness: Jacques Derrida's Reading of Rousseau." *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Press, 1983. 102-41.
- , "The Resistance to Theory." *The Resistance to Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986. 3-20.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Signature Event Context." *Glyph* 1(1977): 172-97.
- , "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." *Writing and Difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978. 278-93.
- Eikhenbaum, Boris. *The Young Tolstoy*. Ann Arbor: Arids, 1972.
- Green, Martin. *Dreams of Adventure, Deeds of Empire*. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvellous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Greenwood, R. *Tolstoy: The Comprehensive Vision*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.
- Hyam, Ronald. "Empire and Sexual Opportunity." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 14(1986): 34-89.
- Johnson, Barbara. *The Critical Difference*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Karlinsky, Simon. "Przhevalsky: The Russian Livingstone." *University Publishing* 5(1978): 2-3.
- Kornblatt, Judith Deutsch. *The Cossack Hero in Russian Literature: A Study in Cultural Mythology*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.
- Layton, Susan. "Imagining the Caucasian Hero: Tolstoj vs. Mordovcev" *Slavic and East European Journal* 30(1986): 1-17.
- Lubin, David M. "Ariadne and the Indians: Vanderlyn's Neoclassical Princess, Racial Seduction, and the Melodrama of Abandonment" *Smithsonian Studies in American Art* 3.2(Spring 1989): 3-21.
- Mirsky, D.S. *A History of Russian Literature*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1949.
- O'Donnell, Thomas J. *The Confessions of T.E. Lawrence: The Romantic Hero's Presentation of Self*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1979.
- Opul'skaja, L.D. "Povest' L.N. Tolstogo Kazaki." In L.N. Tolstoj, *Kazaki*. Moscow: Akademiia Nauk, 1963. 341-351.

- Pomorska, Krystyna. "Tolstoy contra semiosis." *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*, 25/26(1982): 383-90.
- Rice, Edward. *Captain Sir Richard Francis Burton*. New York: Scribner's, 1990.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Sandler, Stephanie. *Distant Pleasures: Alexander Pushkin and the Writing of Exile*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1989.
- Scotto, Peter. "Prisoners of the Caucasus: Ideologies of Imperialism in Lermontov's 'Bela.'" *PMLA*, 107.2(1992): 246-60.
- Simmons, Ernest. *Leo Tolstoy*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1946.
- Todd, William Mills. *Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Tolstoy, L.N. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. 90 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1929-58.
- Wasiolek, Edward. *Tolstoy: The Major Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- White, Haydon. "The Forms of Wildness: Archaeology of an Idea." *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978. 150-82.
- , "The Noble Savage Theme as Fetish." *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978. 183-96.
- Young, Philip. "The Mother of Us All: Pocahontas Reconsidered." *Kenyon Review* 24(Summer 1962): 391-415.
- Zaborova, R.B. "Povest' Kazaki." Ed. D. Blagoi. *L.N. Tolstoi: sbornik statei*. Moscow: 1955. 135-61.
- Zweig, Paul. *The Adventurer*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

PARDONING WOMAN IN ANNA KARENINA

DRAGAN KUJUNDŽIĆ, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

We could scarcely hope for a more promising exercise than the study of excuses.

J.L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*

What is the object of a pardon? Offenses, certainly, all moral and physical wounds, and, ultimately, death.

Julia Kristeva, *The Black Sun*

In his classic study, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*, Northrop Frye quotes William Blake's famous statement about the mythical origin of all literature: "The Old and The New Testament are the Great Code of art" (Frye 55). It is certainly profitable to read Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*. Its epigraph, the Biblical quotation discussed by numerous critics, refers to both lines of tradition --Old and New Testament-- constituted by the "Great Code." Few of the novel's interpreters fail to recognize the fact that the epigraph "Vengeance is mine, I will repay" is a reference to both the Old Testament (Leviticus 32: 35) and the New: Paul's Epistle to Romans (12: 19), from which Tolstoy, via Schopenhauer, adopts his quotation. But fewer critics seem to have agreed upon the actual meaning of this quotation. Whatever the discrepancies between interpretations (Strakhov, Gromeka, Eikhenbaum, Gilford, Jackson), all of them seem to believe that the motto may be utilized as some kind of key which can account exhaustively for all of the novel's semantic components (Gromeka 801). This approach, even though it respects the motto's undisputed importance, reads the novel within the frame of metaphysical *closure*, and, by preserving the transience of its (Biblical) meaning, fails to notice the dynamic, and often competing and mutually exclusive lines of narration that stem from this quotation.

Another blindness shared by critics concerning the notorious epigraph is their tendency to read it as if it represented a comprehensive, indivisible and non-ambiguous identity with an unequivocally transparent, obvious and indisputable meaning. This analysis will read the epigraph in the context of Old and New Testaments and will attempt to highlight its radical and conflicting, mutually transgressive discrepancies. These discrepancies establish the rhetorical set of those oppositional and intertextual forces of Tolstoy's novel itself that program its rhetorical, semantic and representational violations, violences and conflicts.

The position of the ambivalent quotation (both from the New and the Old Testament), the fact that it serves as the epigraph to the novel, makes it even more difficult to interpret. It is thus neither inside the novel (as an epigraph it is *outside* of the text), but not totally outside, for some of the dominant themes and semantic and rhetorical gestures of this novel repeat the epigraph within the text of the novel (especially those regarding pardoning). These repetitions dispose critics to treat the motto as *the* structural

matrix (Riffaterre), the *siuzhet*, or, indeed, the Great Code, that is, the law which programs the prevailing thematic, rhetorical, semantic or intertextual (in this respect genealogic) strategies of this text. The motto is thus set on the *borderline* of the text; it at once envelops the text and sets up its laws (of genre: the novel of adultery, intertextual genealogy, marriage, etc.). Its repetitions inside the text codify the institutional laws of both writing and marriage, being simultaneously rhetorical or performative, a *promise*, and semantic, adultery being the theme of the novel. In that respect the epigraph is at the same time transgressed, betrayed or failed by the text which follows the epigraph.

This ambivalence of the epigraph simulates or repeats in a rhetorical manner the representational gestures of this text, especially those concerning the status of the feminine. It is this undecidable structure that makes it so hard to interpret both the motto and the woman to whom it refers, or with whose name it shares the privileged position in/outside of the text ("Anna Karenina" is, also, a title). In its radical undecidability, the motto sets up the law of genre which is, as Derrida says, "in the feminine" (Derrida 73), thus both promoting the law (of marriage, genre, sex, gender, text), while traversing and transgressing the borderlines it establishes. Anna brings with her the limit, and that paradoxical limit is what constitutes her ("her," again: both the novel's and the character's) sexuality and eroticism.

The epigraph of Anna Karenina operates as a subtext spinning conflicting rhetorical forces and thus serves not as a unified source, but as one of the texts in its turn complex and contradictory at work within the novel. Since the novel's major theme is adultery, our analysis will naturally deal with the rhetorical performances of pardon and vengeance induced by the adulterous transgressions of law and contract. It will also address the distribution of guilt and pardoning along sexual lines. The economics of pardoning in *Anna Karenina*, in response to adultery, strongly favors men and disfavors women, without much hesitation and ambivalence, thus allowing us to see clearly the logic with which this novel (or more precisely: its representation of a specific law) treats the feminine. My reading of the motto is prompted by T. Tanner's statement: Old Testament and New Testament methods of confronting adultery may both be found operating within the same book, as I suggest are in *Anna Karenina*. It seems indeed arguable that it is *just such a tension between law and sympathy* that holds the great bourgeois novel together (Tanner 14, emphasis mine).

THE GREAT CODE OF PARDONING

In the Old Testament, adultery is accurately codified within the Mosaic law, and interpreted as a deadly sin:

22. If a man be found lying with a woman married to a husband, then they both of them shall die, both the man that lay with the woman, and the woman: so shalt thou put away evil from Israel (Deuteronomy 22).

Mosaic law views adultery as a transgression against the absoluteness of the law that

shatters the spiritual foundations of the whole society ("Israel"). "There is no appeal against these categories, and the transgression of the imperatives that organize the relationship between these categories is punished by death" (Tanner, 19). The logic of the Mosaic law is the "either-or" that has no tolerance for the transgression, and punishes without exception. The law given by Moses and Torah, "has total authority, and within it individuals have total responsibility" (Tanner 19). The transgression takes place "in plain view" and does not allow for any privacy or internalized guilt related to it. The law is that vengeance which strikes mercilessly, yet it is at the same time the all-seeing eye that penetrates all attempts to hide. Nobody is out of eyeshot or earshot in the Mosaic city (cf. Tanner 19-20).

In The New Testament, on the other hand, adulterous transgression results in pardoning. The blind application of the law does not occur, the impersonal prescription of a punishment that punishes the transgression, rather an "individualized" application of the law enacted: a pardon that absolves the adulterous woman of her sin by inducing and absolving the internalized guilt.

3. And the scribes and the Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery; [...]

5. Now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?

6. [...] But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as if he heard them not.

7. So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her [...].

10. When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, Woman where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?

11. She said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more. (John 8, 3-10).

Christ's re-spelling the Mosaic law "completely alters the terms and premises of the debate" (Tanner 21). Mosaic vengeance or its "monolithic generality" (Tanner) is abandoned for a more personalized application of the law. In Christ's interpretation, the law is actualized by inducing guilt. His pardoning of the adulteress demonstrates that her transgression is not to be read in terms of cosmic tragedy but more as a social deviation which is atoned for by the mechanism of pardoning. In this respect, pardoning is an empty gesture deprived of ethical "content": we can pardon because everyone is guilty.

It is interesting to compare the different ways in which the two Biblical texts interpret transgression, in the light of their mode of production of discourses. "Mosaic law" is being spoken to the people of Israel, and implies a direct connection between the law and logos. Such a link governs the immediacy between transgression and punishment. The New Testament, on the other hand, punishes by inducing guilt or shame in everybody. It is in the institution of pardoning that it restores or recuperates the initial plenitude of justice. This is accomplished by the prolonged effects of writing which are conspicuously

out of reach of the law-giver ("Go away and sin no more"). Christ writing in the sand is a law-giver who counts on the repetitive machine of pardoning which works beyond his immediate control. His is also the role of restoring social balance not by exclusion (like Moses), but by inclusion into society. (Inducing guilt and internalizing the law are the structural part of this performative). These differences are of importance for our reading of Tolstoy's novel, since "both of these patterns of action are very clearly pursued by *Anna Karenina*" (Tanner 23).

The oppositions and differences between the two interpretations of adultery established by the Biblical texts are at work in the motto of Tolstoy's novel as well. A brief look at the two contexts from which the lines about vengeance are taken will prove that the possible meanings of the motto stand in absolute opposition. These oppositions then serve to guide the two modes of reading, both the motto and the text of the novel itself.

The line about vengeance ("Mine is the vengeance..." (Deuteronomy 32: 32), appears in one of the closing chapters of the Torah and follows the laws regarding adultery (these verses appear in the same book, just a few chapters before). It is thus a commentary on the laws that primarily interests us here, as adultery is generally taken to be the "theme" of *Anna Karenina*. By dint of their position in the closing chapters of the Mosaic books, these lines have a privileged and dominant position in the Mosaic cycle and shed some retrospective light on the nature of the laws. What is the vengeance promised by God? It is a punishment to all those among the people of Israel who do not follow his words. Everybody outside of the circle circumscribed by his voice will be punished by destruction (41:2). The vengeance will literally dismember anyone who does not obey or follow the words passed from God to His people. The pattern of the immediacy of the vengeance and of its imminent terror is kept in these passages as well. For our purposes, the image of the dismembered body should be kept in mind, since Anna's body is dismembered in a similar way.

The New Testament's statement about vengeance is placed in a very different kind of context. Its genre is not that of a sermon, but of the epistle, and its rhetorical mode is that of seduction and persuasion, not of terror and threat. Much in the same way as Christ writing in the sand stands in opposition to the hortative Moses, so St. Paul's epistles are, by the same token, set against Moses. The immediate context of the line is also utterly different. Instead of the Mosaic threat, there is the invitation for compassion (15. Rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep), pardon (17. Never return evil for evil; 14. Bless those who persecute you;) and, most of all, restrain yourselves from vengeance (19. Do not avenge for yourself, ... Mine is the vengeance). The immediate context, as much as the whole Epistle, represents a call to give up vengeance, since it is the proper role of God, who is merciful. The God of the epistle, as is explicitly stated at the beginning, (12, 1) is a pardoning, "merciful God."

ANNA KARENINA AS THE PARDONING MACHINE

The text of *Anna Karenina* that follows the motto, immediately takes up this evangelistic interpretation by setting up a model of transgression and pardoning which constitutes the cornerstone of the novel's mechanism. "The wife had discovered an intrigue between her husband and their former French governess, and declared that she would not continue to live under the same roof with him," and the whole drama hinges on the uncertainty whether Dolly will pardon him or not: "his guilt rose up in his imagination. 'No, she will never forgive me, she can't forgive me'" (Tolstoy 2). In Tolstoy's novel the pardoning structure is represented by Dolly's and Stiva's marriage, in which the transgression is soothed and cured by the endless repetition of pardons and pardoning. It is precisely this mechanism of transgression and pardoning that, for this couple, keeps the marriage-machine running. The major mistake to which Stiva admits is not to have actually committed the crime, but, rather, not to have acted well enough. Furthermore, he complains of not fitting properly into the pardoning machine: "Instead of taking offence, denying, making excuses, asking forgiveness, he...smiled his...silly smile. He could not forgive himself that silly smile" (Tolstoy, 2). The subsequent chapters describe Stiva's and Anna's attempts at reconciliation. "Dolly, what can I say?...Only forgive me, forgive me! ... Punish me--make me suffer for my sin! ... I am the guilty one. I have no words to express my guilt.... But Dolly forgive me! ... No, she will not forgive me" (Tolstoy, 10-11). Anna, during her mission of reconciliation, keeps repeating to Dolly Stiva's words: "'No, no, she will not forgive me....' How can I forgive him.... Forgive it utterly..." (Tolstoy 65).¹ In the end Anna's mission succeeds with Oblonsky "having obtained forgiveness" (Tolstoy 68).

Subsequent chapters in the novel will, as a rule, entail a scene of pardoning in one way or another. Such pardoning, in actual fact, forms part of the social ritual holding society together. In a scene that redoubles and parodies Anna's successful attempt to reconcile Stiva and Dolly, Vronsky reconciles a German gentleman with the officer who attempted to seduce his wife. "We are in despair...we beg to be forgiven for our unfortunate mistake...I ask you to forgive their fault. ... I am willing to forgive them, but...." (Tolstoy 120). Vronsky succeeds in obtaining the pardon, and the matter is settled.

No one is spared from this pardoning machine, not even children. One of Dolly's sons, Grisha, disobeys his governess, and it was decided to punish him. "This was too sad, and Dolly decided to speak to the governess and get her to forgive Grisha.... But as she was passing through the dancing room she saw a scene which filled her heart with

¹The novel's beginning chapters also set up the scene for Anna's transgression. The novel thus begins anew and generates a new frame for reading Anna's sin. A scene between Levin and Stiva entails a discussion about the fallen woman and the evangelistic interpretation of Christ's pardoning, thus explicitly invoking The Gospel According to John (Tolstoy 38). These chapters introduce another woman, Mary Nikolaevna, whose sins Nicholas Levin pardons: "I took her out of a bad house.... But I love her and respect her..." (Tolstoy 80).

such joy that tears came to her eyes and she pardoned the little culprit herself" (Tolstoy 240). An almost identical scene occurs between Anna and Serezha. But at the same time it is a scene during which the two modes of pardoning suggested by reading the motto are actualized and put into play. "Serezha... seems to be guilty. Guilty, how?" The transgression is quickly recuperated: "'Serezha...it was wrong, but you won't do it again?... You love me?'" (Tolstoy 264). The immediate context is, of course, Jesus's "Go away and sin no more," the proviso for transgression and pardoning offered by the New Testament. The episode is crucial for an understanding of the thoughts it provokes in Anna about "them" pardoning her sins: "Is it possible that they will not forgive me... she felt that they would not forgive...I cannot speak of my fault and my repentance, because..." (Tolstoy 265). Anna refuses to enter the machine of pardoning, by "not mentioning [Karenin's] generosity," and as much as she anticipates that she will not be pardoned, she herself refuses to participate in the social ritual. Her commitment to her love is beyond the empty repetition of the convention of pardoning, and she refuses to partake in the easy social remedy for her transgression. To accept the pardon is to perceive herself as guilty, to internalize the guilt, something that she does not want to participate in. However, her refusal to "say anything to her husband" and not to appeal to his generosity does not take her out of guilt and transgression, into a realm in which this ethical structure could be rewritten or be said not to be at work, but, instead, it takes her back to the realm of Mosaic law programmed by the motto. The vengeance of the text seems to announce itself here. Her transgression is the transgression of the law of genre, her refusal to partake in the same pardoning structure which seems to rule society. It should be mentioned that at several points in the novel it is said that there are women of Anna's rank who are considerably "looser" than she is, yet still enjoy the full respect of society. Anna's crime seems to amount not so much to mere adultery as such, but, rather, to her refusal to comply with the mores of the day. For her, the horror of conventional pardon is greater than actual fear for her life: "He is a Christian, he is magnanimous. Yes, a mean, horrid man.... If he killed me--if he would have killed me,--I would have borne anything. But no, he will [pardon]" (Tolstoy 267). For Anna it is the suggestion that she repent ("I am perfectly convinced that you have repented," Tolstoy 259), that she comply with the emptiness of the pardoning mechanism, that induces deepest horror in her. She prefers death to Karenin's pardon (which amounts to the same thing, since Karenin can pardon only a dead or dying Anna).

It is precisely this refusal to partake in the pardon-machine, her attempt to exclude herself from the space of the Christian law, that works to Anna's detriment, and finally kills her. Her resistance also points out that the Christian law of pardoning can be equally deadly if applied to those who refuse to participate in it. On the other hand, so many pardons in the novel result in turning pardon into an empty, phatic, token movement which structures the overall relationships of society. Pardoning is the corrective mechanism which has the power to restore the initial imbalance and repetitively supply guilt with its resolution. Since it works like writing, in the mode of iteration, pardoning provides an easy remedy for any social disturbance or disbalance. As so many pardons in this novel testify, the movement of pardoning works in the mode of gramophony, an endless

repetition of convention regardless of the intention accompanying the act. Excuses and pardons reveal a disjunction between the intention and the mechanism, the machine which produces the pardon, a rupture which marks a "radical estrangement between the meaning and the performance of any text" (de Man 298). It is exactly the intention, true love, the presence of meaning, that Anna demands from pardoning, the relations with her husband and Vronsky, and the constant failure for these realms to coincide. That is exactly why she resists so harshly Karenin's attempt to pardon her ("horrid man, Christian"): the empty movement of language induces in her the deepest horror. This mechanical movement may be epitomized by George Korsunsky, "the famous *dirigeur* and Master of Ceremonies." His movement through the dancing hall is a constant repetition of excuses and pardons addressed to women: "And Korsunsky waltzed toward the left of the room, gradually diminishing his step and repeating 'Pardon, *mesdames*, pardon, pardon, *mesdames*... Pardon, pardon, a waltz, a waltz'" (Tolstoy 71-3). Korsunsky may be the paragon of that "text-machine's infinite power to excuse" (de Man 299).² The society which Anna resists is the one that automatically repeats senseless words of forgiveness.³ The reunion of Levin and Kitty is another chance for Tolstoy to stage a scene of pardoning. The lovers' first sight is an anticipation of their later reconciliation in the bliss of pardon. "There was, it would seem, nothing unusual in what she said, but for him what a meaning there was, inexpressible in words... There was a prayer for forgiveness [*pros'ba o proshchenii*]..." (Tolstoy 350). This anticipation is, of course, fulfilled, when the two start playing secretaire.

'Well then, read this. I will tell you what I wish, what I very much wish!' and she wrote these initial letters: T, y, m, f, a, f, w, h. This meant, 'that you might forgive [*prostit*'] and forget what happened.' ... 'I have nothing to forget or forgive...I never ceased to love you' (Tolstoy 362).

The scene in which Levin pardons Kitty comes right after the scene in which Dolly tries to convince Karenin to pardon Anna and he refuses ("I cannot forgive; ...I cannot forgive

²The pardoning scenes display the necessary betrayal involved in any promise or a pardon. The "authority of the first person" (Felman), that is, of God, who stands as a model for this authority, and who promises pardon or vengeance, is precisely what the text of the novel subverts, "by parasitizing the performative through the infinite repetition" (Felman 1983, 51). It is significant that this betrayal is carried out through the feminine principle, i.e. seduction, and transgression of the borderlines, but also adultery (Don Juan in Felman's analysis is the agent of transgression), and that it functions as a subversion of the origin, paternal principle and genealogy. "If Don Juan subverts the uniqueness of the promise by repeating precisely the promise of uniqueness--the promise of marriage, the supremely unique act--it is in order to ruin not the performance of language, but its authority" (Felman 1983, 50). In a similar way endless repetitions of pardons performed in *Anna Karenina* contaminate the original purity of the Biblical pardoning authority and corrode, from the inside, the authority of marriage, promise and apology.

³The multiplication of pardons is repeated, not without parodic overtones, in the scene when Levin awaits Kitty's delivery: "'Lord have mercy! Pardon and help us!'; 'God pardon and help us!'; 'Lord pardon and help us!'; 'Lord pardon and help us!'; 'The thought of God made him at once pray for forgiveness and mercy'" (Tolstoy 641, 644, 646). It is significant that these pardons frame again the feminine body delivering a baby, and thus contain Kitty both ideologically and sexually.

her.'" At which point Dolly responds "'Love those who hate you'" (Tolstoy 359), invoking, again, the evangelic message. Karenin is thus explicitly depicted as opting for Mosaic, rather than Evangelic, law. The following scene with Levin and Kitty reinforces, by contrast, his refusal to pardon. I would argue that this scene in a masterly way, re-writes Gospel while repeating all its constitutive elements. Levin almost literally writes in the sand: he writes his pardon to Kitty with a piece of chalk (Russian: "mel"), thus leaving a sandy trace on the table leading straight to the Gospel According to John. To write in the sand, like Christ, or with chalk, is to write something which can be easily forgotten and erased ("go and sin no more"; "pardon and forget"). (Unlike Moses, whose laws are fixed on tablets, unchangeable and unalterable). To write in the sand is to simultaneously erase, something like Freud's *Wunderblock*. And, significantly enough, Kitty and Levin write only initials, not even words, making the erasure already built into their writing, and all the easier. "Mel" also comes from the same root as "mel'" (written with the soft sign), one of the meanings of which is "shoal," a sandbank. And "mel" also means a "whitewash," that which cleans, erases, but also absolves one from blame, that is pardons. Furthermore, the whole scene is set up as a mystery, a secret, known only to Levin and Kitty, since they are playing *secrétaire* ("Playing 'secretary'?" said the old Prince approaching them" Tolstoy 363). This adds to the pardon written with chalk a dimension of mystery, (as the narrator has it elsewhere: "something sacramental, a mystery binding a couple in the sight of God"), indeed a *Mysterium Tremendum*, the evangelic majesty of both pardon, absolution from sin, marital secret and sanctity, and revelation.

Levin's pardon of Kitty immediately finds its parallel when Levin, "with the permission of the Old Prince," decides to confess to Kitty his previous love-life, and lets her read his diaries.

'Take, take those dreadful books back!' she cried,... 'Why did you give me them?' ... But no, it's best after all.... His head drooped and he remained silent, unable to speak. 'You will not forgive me?' he whispered. 'Yes, I have forgiven you, but it is dreadful!' ... His happiness was so great after this confession... She forgave him..." (Tolstoy 372).⁴

PARDONING DESTINATIONS: WOMEN GUILTY, PREGNANT AND DEAD

There is another aspect of pardoning in *Anna Karenina* which has not been discussed so far, and which is important for the functioning of pardoning in the novel: the distribution of pardons along sexual lines. The distribution of pardons reveals the hypocrisy of the pardoning structure, and may be said to expose Tolstoy's (or at least the

⁴One is reminded here of George Sand's dictum from her book *Elle et lui* (1859), which can be said to apply to *Anna Karenina* as well: "It seems that pardoning begets pardoning, until the point of saturation, until the point of imbecile weakness" (Sand 166).

novel's) vengeance on the mores of society.⁵ Women in *Anna Karenina* systematically pardon the promiscuity of men: Dolly pardons Stiva: "Dolly forgive me!"; "Yes I can, I can. Yes, I should forgive. I should not remain the same woman--no, but I should forgive, and forgive it as if it had never happened at all" (Tolstoy 10, 65). Levin, too, begs Kitty to pardon him for being jealous (afterwards he throws Veslovsky out of the house): "Kate, I have been tormenting you! My darling, forgive me!" (Tolstoy 521). Kitty pardons him for his utter despotism and phallocracy. Kitty also pardons Levin his sexual adventures (before the marriage): "Yes, I have forgiven you, but it is dreadful" (Tolstoy 372). Levin also pardons Kitty, but the economy of the pardon in this case works to construct guilt as the structural part of feminine subordination. Levin forgives Kitty not her transgression, but the fact that she disposed freely with her desire, even though her relationship with Vronsky never turned into a sexual, or marital relationship. Her desire for another man from the start is loaded with guilt and in need of a pardon: "'If you can forgive me, please do,' pleaded her look. 'I am so happy.'" (Tolstoy 49). Kitty is guilty of being happy as a woman who chooses her lover, and she will dearly pay for this "transgression." To Levin, it seems "natural" that she be seen as guilty, (it is Levin who perceives the look in her eyes as begging for forgiveness), and that his forgiveness is necessary before any relationship with her could be continued: "And I should come magnanimously to forgive her, to have pity on her! I stand before her in the role of the one who forgives" (Tolstoy 294). So, the forgiveness between Levin and Kitty is not reciprocal, but bears a heavily misogynous mark. Only a woman who is almost killed by guilt, as Kitty is, can be pardoned for a sin she never committed.⁶ As de

⁵This ambivalence is aptly formulated by Mary Evans: "She [Anna] is a figure who represents the sexual potential and personal autonomy of all women, but she is a woman whose sexuality and autonomy are distorted by the social order that has formed and structured her" (Evans 24). It has been argued that this ambivalence in representing the feminine is constitutive for the "realist" novel in general: "What function, if any, is served by the representation of female libido within the economy of the realist text? By focusing on the detail of the foot, chained and/or unchained, I am led to conclude that the binding of the female energy is one of (if not) the enabling conditions of the forward movement of the 'classical text.' Realism is that paradoxical moment in Western literature when representation can neither accommodate the Otherness of Woman nor exist without it" (Schor xi). It is this paradoxical un/chaining energy of writing and representation that is unleashed by the structure of pardoning woman in *Anna Karenina*.

⁶Only a dead woman can be pardoned. That is how Karenin can pardon Anna. Later on, he feels sorry that she has not died, that she has stayed alive, and that he has pardoned her: "He forgave his wife.... The mistake Karenin made...[is that] he had not considered the possibility of her recovery" (Tolstoy 381). Anna is well aware of the destructive force of pardoning which kills and dismembers her body: "My God! *Forgive me!* She felt so guilty, so much to blame, that it only remained for her to humble herself and *ask to be forgiven*; but she had no one in the world now except him, so that even her *prayer for forgiveness* was addressed to him.... Looking at him she felt her humiliation physically, and could say nothing more. He felt what a murderer must feel when looking at the body he has deprived of life.... That body *must be cut into pieces* and hidden away.... Then, as the murderer desperately throws himself on the body, as though with passion, *and drags it and hacks it*, so Vronsky covered her face and shoulders with kisses" (Tolstoy 135-6, my italics). The sacrifice of the feminine body is the assumption of pardoning woman in this novel. Of course, the sacrifice is what structures the possibility of pardon in general. The parallelism between Anna and Christ is discussed below.

Man would say, her "guilt is forgiven because it allows for the pleasure of revealing its repression. It follows that repression is in fact an excuse... Excuses generate the very guilt they exonerate" (de Man 286). Levin can pardon Kitty because she is already accepting his pardon/guilt, and in that sense "No excuse can ever hope to catch up with such a proliferation of guilt" (de Man 299).

Levin's pardons are also performed within a strongly misogynous paradigm, and are, therefore, directed against the free circulation of feminine libido. As a matter of fact, Levin can deal only with the feminine strictly confined by the law or her own biology. Levin's misogyny betrays both his fear of the feminine and a certain impotence and fear of masculine competition (both with Vronsky, and later on with Veslovsky). Women with uninhibited sexuality physically disgust him. They are for him "spiders" and "*gadiny*," a Russian word indicating something truly repulsive (trash, muck, vomit, excrement could be referred to as "*gadiny*," "*gadost*"). They, naturally, are not to be pardoned (but men are):

'As to that you must *pardon me*. You know that for me there are two kinds of women... or rather, no! There are women, and there are... I have never seen any charming fallen creatures, and never shall see any; and people like that painted Frenchwoman with her curls out there by the counter, are an abomination to me ("*gadiny*"), and all of these fallen ones are like her.'

'And the one in the Gospels?' [asked Oblonsky].

'Oh don't! Christ would never have spoken those words had he known how they would be misused! They are the only words in the Gospels that seem to be remembered. However, I am not saying what I think, but what I feel. I have a horror of a fallen woman. You are repelled by spiders and I by those creatures (Tolstoy 38, emphasis mine).

Levin does not only deny pardon to "fallen" women, but implies that Christ was not quite right in pardoning the woman, because his words have been misused. (How a pardon to a "fallen" woman can be misused is something Levin does not explain. The pardon of a sin, lending a helping hand to someone who has "fallen," by definition, cannot be misused if performed within the evangelic paradigm or even any paradigm of social morality. His own brother, for example, pardons a "fallen" woman, takes her out of a "bad house," and they live unmarried as husband and wife. Levin has no problems perceiving her as "*gadina*," muck. When visiting his dying brother he prevents Kitty from meeting with her. Levin, on the other hand, pardons the sin that Kitty never committed, thus both repeating and making a travesty of the evangelic performance. Levin's words also betray a fear of his own castration, a "horror," "a Medusa like effect" (Freud, Kofman), when facing feminine sexuality. That is actually what Levin cannot pardon, since he can stand only women who are either permeated by the guilt of their own sexuality, like Kitty, and thus in need of his pardon, or those whose sexuality and libido are thoroughly inscribed within the cycle of biological reproduction. He perceives animals in anthropomorphic terms, and women in animal terms, when referring to feminine sexuality. He thinks of sheep with lambs as "bleating mothers" (Tolstoy 139), of "*Pava*'s [the cow's] three-month-old calf" as her "daughter" ("*Pavina doch*") (Tolstoy 139), and is in general obsessed with insemination, sowing and "swelling buds" (Tolstoy 142). The

only femininity he can actually deal with, for him the essence of the feminine, is that of reproductive glands and ovaries.

What pleased Dolly most was the woman's evident admiration for the great number of children she had, and their loveliness....

Surrounded by her children ... Dolly was pleased to see the familiar figure of Levin... On this day she was more pleased [to see him] than ever because he would now see her in all her glory. No one could understand the dignity of her position better than Levin. On seeing her he found himself confronted by just such a picture of family life as his fancy painted.

'You are like a brood hen ["*nasedka*"], Darya Alexandrovna!'

'Oh, I am so glad!' said she, holding out her hand (Tolstoy 242-243, translation slightly modified).

Levin's marital phantasm is that of a wife who is a pregnant or fertile cow, a brood hen or a bleating mother.⁷ This phantasm is in stark contrast to Anna's femininity: "'But she [Anna] has a child; I suppose she is occupied with her?' said Levin. 'I think you see in every woman only a female ["*samka*"], *une couveuse*!'" (Tolstoy 629).⁸ As a matter of fact there are only two situations in the novel in which Levin is depicted as showing masculinity and potency, a symbolic erection. When he is casting a phallic, triumphant gaze ("burning eyes") down at the guilty woman begging for and submitting herself to his pardon: "Kitty with the chalk in her hand, looking up at Levin with a timid, happy smile, and his fine figure bending over the table, with his burning eyes fixed now on the table, now on her." She, naturally, asks "that he might forgive" (Tolstoy 362, *italics mine*). The other symbolic erection the narrator depicts is when Levin is hunting, and enjoying the total submission of his female dog, Laska: "Laska walked beside her master... He stroked her, and whistled a sign that she might now set off... 'Eh Laska dear, will things go right?' When, having reloaded, Levin went on again... [etc]" (Tolstoy 539). It is also significant that "laska," a word meaning "endearment, caress," here the name of the dog, was in Kitty's eyes when she begged Levin for pardon. Thus Kitty is equated by the narrative association and contiguity with Levin's faithful dog:

There was, it would seem, nothing unusual in what she had said, but for him what a meaning there was, inexpressible in words, in every sound and every movement of her lips, her eyes, and her hands as she said it. There was a *prayer for forgiveness*, and trust in him, and a caress ["*laska*"]--a tender, timid caress ["*nezhnaia, robkaia laska*"], and a promise, and a hope and a love for him in which he could not believe and which suffocated him with joy (Tolstoy 350, *emphasis mine*).

Levin can pardon, love, "shoot and reload" only in the presence of total feminine

⁷When he marries Kitty she is referred to in the church as a "lamb decked for the slaughter" (Tolstoy 415).

⁸"Samka" in Russian means a she-animal, a female animal. Oblonsky is right: "*une couveuse*," French word for "brood hen" is the same as "*nasedka*" used by Levin addressing Dolly, which in Russian literally means "a hen sitting on eggs" and therefore in an even more static, oppressive way determines or immobilizes and castrates feminine sexuality.

submission, which fulfills his master-slave masculine fantasy, "and which suffocates him with joy."⁹

The way Levin is depicted in the novel makes one wonder if his family should be the one that is "happy" and resembling all other happy families.¹⁰ Lev Shestov was probably the first to point out the violence in Kitty's and Levin's marriage. In his *Dostoevsky and Nietzsche*, he points out that this marriage cannot serve in any way as an epitome of happiness:

The story about the marriage and the family happiness of Levin on the one hand, and the story about Ivan Ilich and Pozdnishev are, in the final analysis, one and the same story told differently, accented differently or, if you want, evaluated differently. In order to see this, one only needs to read and compare *Anna Karenina* and "The Kreutzer Sonata." Levin and Kitty had the same relationship as Pozdnishev and his wife did--there can be no doubt about it. Levin's family life is recommended to us as a model, and Pozdnishev says of himself: "we lived like swine." Why does the story about Levin hide that which is stressed and made explicit in the story about Pozdnishev? (Shestov 219).

Vronsky has an entirely different attitude towards women and female animals. He is someone with an aesthetic, and pragmatic fascination with the feminine. He races Fru-Fru, the horse, and loves Anna, until they are killed. (Fru-Fru and Anna die similar deaths, with their spines broken). The novel thus depicts the feminine as either contained within a certain phallocratic structure and dismembered by pardons, enslaved by its own reproductive sexuality, or, when the feminine is fascinating and beautiful, and outside of these two economies (Fru-Fru is a racing, not a breeding horse, and, we are repeatedly told, a beautiful one; Anna though pardoned and accepting guilt continues to sin, and uses contraception), inevitably destined for death.¹¹

⁹Even after being almost killed by thunder, Kitty has to beg Levin to forgive her: "'Really, it was not my fault... We had hardly...' Kitty began excusing herself" (Tolstoy 735).

¹⁰It is also significant that Tolstoy, throughout the novel, depicts Levin as somewhat of an idiot (in Gogolian and Dostoevskian terms), as socially inept, as someone who often cannot understand a simple social situation, who makes blunders and social scandals, is late for his marriage, etc. This is more than obvious in the scene/scandal with Veslovsky, or during the elections when he both makes a faux pas and does not understand a simple election procedure and cannot grasp its meaning. He also repeats the words of another famous madman in Russian literature, from Gogol's "Diary of a Madman." When talking to Koznishev, he says "Don't, don't, don't speak" [*Nichego, nichego, molchanie*] (Tolstoy 363). The narrator thus gives a lot of signals to make us suspicious about Levin as the epitome or embodiment of Tolstoy's privileged ideas or ideals.

¹¹Anna is both the phantasm or ghost of a mother, already dead, or twice dead, a constantly absent, guilty, and finally a dead mother (she abandons her son, neglects her daughter, and commits suicide).

Anna's delivery is contained by numerous pardons and parallels the scene of Kitty's childbirth. These pardons work to contain the woman, or, in Anna's case, to almost kill her. Just the mere enumeration of guilt and pardoning surrounding this scene is overwhelming in its violence. After delivering the baby, she writes to Karenin: "I am dying, I beg and entreat you, come! I shall die easier for your forgiveness"; "Alexey would not have refused me. I should have forgotten and he would have forgiven..."; "You say he won't forgive me"; "Forgive me, forgive me completely!"; "O, you cannot forgive me!"; "Give him your hand. Forgive him!"; "But I saw her and I forgave her. And the joy of forgiving has revealed my duty to

It seems that *Anna Karenina* depicts no happy family at all. The narrative of this novel is so heavily loaded with inter-personal violence revealed by the incessant pardoning machine, that not much is left of the high Christian ideals preached by Levin at the end of the novel. The interpreters of the novel, and, more important for our topic, of its epigraph, often juxtapose Anna's dismembering, as apocalyptic, to the idea of unity, ecumenic reconciliation, and so called *sobornost'* in Russian society, as if this novel leads to some harmonious synthesis.¹² But the ammount of pardoning and constant societal guilt disseminated through the novel, makes one wonder if there is any *sobornost'* left towards the end of *Anna Karenina* which, in Shestov's words, betrays the fact that "monsters live at the bottom of Count Tolstoy's soul" (Shestov 95).

ANNA AS CHRIST/CHRIST AS ANNA

The problem of *sobornost'* is certainly crucial for this novel, and is closely related to the epigraph and the problem of pardoning. A general and mutual pardon, unconditioned historically, is what, in essence, constitutes *sobornost'*, a term referring to the early Christian gatherings, established as the ideal within the Slavophile movement.¹³ Levin represents one aspect of Tolstoy's interests in the Slavophile debate. Some of Levin's acts and deeds may be seen as Tolstoy's attempt to respond to and in a way continue the tradition of Kireevski and Khomiakov, and their understanding of Christianity as, to use the analysis of Boris Groys,

a pre-reflexive and extra-historical mode of existence of the Russian peasant masses. One can say that these thinkers theologized the unconscious and that here we have a complete reversal of the

me"; "I have wholly forgiven"; "I only pray to God that the joy of forgiving may not be taken from me"; "above all the joy [of Karenin's] forgiving"; "He forgave his wife"; "He forgave Vronsky"; "your husband has accepted that and forgiven you [Oblonsky to Anna]"; "And having connected his [Karenin's] words with his forgiveness..."; (Tolstoy 373, 374, 375, 376, 389, 392, 459). And later, referring to the scene: "You have performed a great act of forgiveness [Lydia Ivanovna to Karenin]"; "Granted that you have forgiven her, and do forgive her"; "He could not at all reconcile with his recent forgiveness..." (Tolstoy 459, 463, 471). One hardly needs to comment on the violence of pardoning containing, dismembering, or being performed on Anna's (dead) body. (Karenin pardons because he thinks that Anna will die, and later regrets both his pardon and the fact that she has not died). The body of *Anna Karenina*, its textual space, and the body of Anna Karenina, are dismembered by endless pardons long before the train actually mangles Anna's body at the end of the novel. Whenever a pardon is directed at Anna, another cut is delivered to her body, but it is precisely this wounding that moves the narrative forward and makes the text of the novel. The endless (failure of) pardoning is what makes Anna Karenina's (and *Anna Karenina's*) hysteria, history and story.

One should also note in relation to this the hesitance of the text between the two Evangelic subtexts, the two Maries: Mary the virgin, the virgin mother (Kitty), and Mary the prostitute, the whore (Anna).

¹²See Robert Jackson, "The Ambivalent Beginning of *Anna Karenina*."

¹³"A pardon is ahistorical," says Kristeva. "It erases the chain of causes, punishments and crimes, it suspends the time of the acts" (Kristeva 210-211).

usual relationship between the conscious and the unconscious, as perceived traditionally in the West (Groys, 192).¹⁴

Anna Karenina is written at the same time as Solov'ev's "The Crisis of Western Philosophy. Against the Positivists" (1874) which Groys sees as an attempt to translate Schopenhauer's philosophy into "teaching about the inwardly transformed matter, or Divine Sophia, which he associates with Russia, and which should give birth to the 'new Word' i.e. new Christ" (Groys, manuscript). Tolstoy's interest in Schopenhauer is, of course, well documented. The epigraph of *Anna Karenina* is actually taken from Schopenhauer.

In Tolstoy's teaching, Schopenhauer's theme of giving up the individual will in order to unite oneself with the universal will, presents itself not in a form of denial of life as such, but in a form of merging with the formless, material life of Russian peasantry (Groys, manuscript).

But *Anna Karenina* seems to also undermine the ideological credo that it proposes in the body of Levin, and betrays Tolstoy's deep suspicion of the possibility of *sobornost'*. Shestov for example, claims that "Tolstoy comes to the conclusion that everything can be reduced to egoism" (Shestov 82) in spite of his professed ideology. On the other hand, the novel shows what price has to be paid to despotism, in order for *sobornost'* to function. And if "the suicide of Anna--her dismembering--is apocalyptic for all Russia" (Jackson 345), it shows that at least one woman (a Divine Sophia?) has to be offered and sacrificed for this ecumenical fantasy (which Tolstoy both promotes and undoes in this novel) to come to life. Boris Groys actually goes so far as to relate the violence of *sobornost'* to Soviet communism, which he sees as its logical outcome.¹⁵ Tolstoy's depiction of the violence of *sobornost'*, possibly even against Tolstoy's proclaimed beliefs, may be said to also anticipate its totalitarian possibilities. (Levin is indeed depicted as the despot of his family and estate). Shestov discusses this duality between the ideologically professed and the represented as embodied in Levin in Tolstoy's novel: "*Anna Karenina* is not a naive thing. 'The man of a pure soul!' Dostoevsky did not praise Levin for nothing: a raven sensed the smell of a rotting corpse and could not hide his joy" (Shestov 86). That is the vengeance of Tolstoy's text which finds faith in neither *sobornost'* nor in evangelic mercy and pardoning. As Shestov says, "Tolstoy wants faith, but is constantly testing it and thus killing every faith... He pays his dues to the [Dostoevskian] underground" (Shestov 80).¹⁶

¹⁴Julia Kristeva also notices the relationship between pardon, religion, and the unconscious, in relation to the structure of pardoning in Dostoevsky's novels: "Pardon rejuvenates the unconscious because it inscribes the right for a narcissistic regression in the History and the Word" (Kristeva, 215).

¹⁵See also Kristeva: "the theophany of the land guides the idea of Moscow as the 'third Rome' [in relation to *sobornost'*], after Constantinople, but also that of the Third International, to be sure" (Kristeva 223).

¹⁶In Dostoevsky, "Dostoevsky: the Writing of Suffering and Pardon" ["Dostoievski, l'écriture de la souffrance et le pardon"], Julia Kristeva discusses extensively the question of pardoning, suicide, violence and suffering in Dostoevsky, and points to the fact that all writing which could be termed "modern," focuses

There is one other aspect of this novel, nevertheless, which comments upon the possibility of evangelic reconciliation and pardoning, (indeed pardoning woman), and relates Anna Karenina to the Gospels. It is the allegory of Anna as Christ, and can be related to Anna's encounter with the representation of the Gospel According to John in Mikhailov's picture. It is of crucial importance, of course, that the picture represents not any Gospel, but precisely the one in which Christ pardons the adulterous woman, that is, the one which in a profound way re-writes the Mosaic law. The picture depicts the scene with Christ and Pilate with John in the background, in which Christ encounters the law, and anticipates his own death. Anna is immediately fascinated with Christ and she herself reads the scene within the prism of evangelic reconciliation:

'How wonderful Christ's expression is!' said Anna. That expression pleased her more than all else she saw and she felt that it was the centre of the picture... 'One sees he is sorry for Pilate.' [...] She said he was sorry for Pilate. In Christ's expression there should be pity because there was love in it, a peace not of this world, a readiness for death, and a knowledge of the vanities of this world. Of course there was an official expression in Pilate's face and pity in Christ's... (Tolstoy 430).

Christ is just about to be prosecuted by a state official (a Karenin of sorts), and Christ is well aware that he is to die. Yet there is in his expression a pity for and a pardon of Pilate and a readiness to die which the Gospel itself at one point refers to as suicidal. Anna looking at Mikhailov's picture establishes a reflective, symmetrical relationship between the sacrifices of Christ and Anna. First of all, they are the only two persons who are portrayed in paintings in this novel, therefore doubly framed, reduplicated, and established as models of both beauty and sacrifice. There is a fascination with Christ in Anna, ("How wonderful Christ's expression, is!") as much as everybody else is fascinated with Anna's framed beauty. Furthermore, the same painter who painted the scene from the Gospel

on or polemicizes with pardon and pardoning: "Actually, modern imprecations against christianity--until and including that of Nietzsche-- are imprecations against pardon" (Kristeva 200), concluding that "the idea of pardon totally inhabits the oeuvre of Dostoevsky" (Kristeva 201). She also relates pardoning in Dostoevsky also to the tradition of "*sobornost*," and early Christian gatherings, to the theophany of the land, the Russian Orthodox hypostasy of tenderness ("*umilenie*"), and suffering ("*strastoterptsy*"), (Kristeva 223). We cannot possibly summarize here the complex argument of this rich study, which addresses topics like "apology of suffering," "suicide and terrorism," "death: ineptitude of pardon," "the object of pardon," "atemporality of pardon," "the esthetic pardon," and "the spoken pardon," among others (Kristeva 185-223). What emerges from her study, which also relates the theme of pardon in Dostoevsky to the Orthodox tradition, is the central place that pardon occupies in Dostoevsky, and which is something I want to claim for *Anna Karenina* as well. The centrality of the theme signals an urgency to relate *Anna Karenina* to Dostoevskian pardoning, and Tolstoy's modernity to his subversion of pardoning (already suggested by Shestov). Kristeva focuses particularly on Holbein's picture "Dead Christ," which hangs in Rogozhin's apartment, (and under which another "fallen woman," Nastasia Philipovna, is killed), to discuss Dostoevsky's "imaginary self-consumption," and a "violent attachment to pardon" (Kristeva 226). Dostoevsky's attention to pardon, and the similarities between Anna's and Nastasia's destinies, (which Kristeva does not address), offer a rich field of analogies with Anna Karenina and her relation to Mikhailov's representation of Christ. This "violent attachment to pardon" governs the literary space of *Anna Karenina*, and the novel's self-consuming obsession with pardon which dismembers and devours the text.

According to John paints the portrait of Anna, and thus not only reflects Anna's gaze back to her from the Gospel picture, but inversely creates a reflection from her portrait back to the scene with Christ (thus setting in a reflective, mirroring motion and repetition all the themes of pardon and sacrifice). This establishes an abyssal structure of representation, which displays the repetition-compulsion mechanism of this novel (pardon, sacrifice), creating an

effect which is familiar enough: an illusion of infinite regress can be created by a writer or a painter by incorporating within his own work a work that duplicates in a miniature the larger structure, setting up an apparently *unending* metonymic series. This *mise en abyme* simulates wildly *uncontrollable repetition* (Hertz 311, emphasis mine).

The two paintings set next to each other stand in a supplementary relation, and reflect back and forth onto each other (and, arguably, to the rest of the text), the themes of a "fallen woman," Christ's pardon, his encounter with and persecution by the law and his suicidal sacrifice and thus, in an endless mirror reflect, engender and display the rhetorico-semantic strategy of this novel which results in an unending, uncontrollable structure of pardoning, guilt, and sacrifice.

When the narrator of the novel depicts a painter painting the scene from the Gospel, and then painting Anna's portrait, he is also writing/painting on a palimpsest ("painting in sand"!?), on which the motifs of Christ's sacrifice are being written/painted over and which blur the distinction between Anna and Christ. But the two texts (the Gospel and *Anna Karenina*) have similarities which are more explicit and redundant than that. Christ's sacrifice is seen by this particular Gospel as explicitly suicidal: "Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself? because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come" (John 8:22). Furthermore, as much as Anna's name, arguably, can be seen as being anagrammatically repeated in the father's, Christ is the one who says: "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me;" (John 14:11). Very much like Anna, Christ has to be sacrificed because "The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil" (John 7:7). This evangelic quality was perceived by readers almost immediately after the novel was published. A.A. Fet, for example, wrote to Tolstoy that

Everybody feels that this novel is a stern, honest *judgement* passed on our entire way of life, from the peasant to the beef-like prince. People feel that an eye watches them from above which is equipped differently than their blind-since-birth little peepers. *What they consider indubitable, honorable, good, desirable, excellent, enviable is shown to be dull, gross, senseless, ridiculous* (in Tolstoy 750, emphasis mine).

Towards the end of the novel, just before she dies, Anna, not unlike Christ, bears witness to the evils of the world:

"Are we not flung into the world only to hate each other, and therefore to torment ourselves and others? [...] Where did I leave off? At the point that I cannot imagine a situation in which life would not be a torment; that we all have been created in order to suffer, and that we all know this and try

to invent means of deceiving ourselves. But when you see the truth, what are you to do?" [...] She had been reading that book filled with anxieties, deceptions, grief and *evil*... (Tolstoy 691, 693, 695 emphasis mine).

And she ends up in a suicidal sacrifice which testifies to these evils, her deed being the ultimate confirmation of the evils of the world. Anna Karenina stands in relation to the novel as Christ could be said to stand to the Gospel: their suicidal sacrifice testifies to the evils of the world. The sacrifice is necessitated by the structure of the book, which requires sacrifice for the testimony to be true. But the novel itself stands in relation to the Gospel in a similar way as the Gospel stands to the Mosaic law and the Old Testament (and as Anna stands to Karenin). Could we even say that, by writing Anna's face over Christ's sacrifice and sacred face, Tolstoy is grafting (*malgré lui meme*) onto the Bible a feminine principle, re-making Christ after a fallen woman, Anna, and vice versa, thus setting a specular relationship of uncontrollable transgressions, deconstructing the Biblical message and subverting its phallogocentric law? Is that the novel's purloined letter, hidden in plain view?¹⁷

Mosaic law is in need of sacrifice so that the law can be performed, (Christ is "actually" killed by the Jews), but this sacrifice simultaneously bears witness to its insufficiency, so that the sacrifice both annuls and re-writes the Mosaic law, as Christ goes back to the name of his father. *Anna Karenina* allegorically repeats the inter-textual conflict between the Old and the New Testaments, while itself accepting and cutting off (re-writing, erasing, writing with chalk, whitewashing) the Biblical intertextual link and its own relationship to the Bible.¹⁸

Anna's suicide, nevertheless, brings no redemption, or transcendent consolation. Anna's sins, and incessant pardoning could be seen as a pessimistic reinterpretation of the Gospels and witness to Tolstoy's deep suspicion of the possibility of faith or the usefulness of sacrifice. As Konstantin Leontiev said, *Anna Karenina* testifies that "there will never be 'heavenly Jerusalem' on the earth as we know it" (Leontiev 89). And as Shestov

¹⁷As much as Levin's writing in sand can be said to repeat in writing the message of the Gospel (which is itself writing and re-writing the Mosaic law), in the face of Karenin's refusal to pardon, it also sets up a "deconstructive" scene which opposes voice (Karenin and Moses, God), to writing (Levin, Christ), and via Levin, Tolstoy. *Anna Karenina* is thus itself a giant machine rewriting the Biblical tradition, with a vengeance. It is the "work of remembering and forgetting" (Armstrong 192), that is repeating and erasing the tradition within which it leaves its paradoxical trace.

¹⁸The relationship of the New to the Old Testament, in its acceptance and denial or betrayal of the law (of genre, genealogy, etc), can be seen as paradigmatic of all intertextuality, memory, tradition, etc. *Anna Karenina* both exposes this intertextual ambivalence between the two books (indeed through the ambivalent structure of pardoning), and thematizes, represents, and performs its own relationship to the Biblical texts in a similar way. And the paradigmatic structure in the novel which represents this relationship is that of pardoning woman on whose body these two tremendously powerful traditions intersect and leave the bruises and wounds of this cross.

pointed out, it may be that for Tolstoy this "heavenly Jerusalem," and therefore *sobornost'*, was not possible anywhere else and thus this "inadequacy of earthly life" (Adelman 91) is profound and final.¹⁹

ANNA AND/AS THE VENGEFUL GOD: THE TRIUMPH OF THE FEMININE DEATH

Anna's suicide testifies to the evils of the world, dismembering Anna and offering her as a spectacle of symbolic wounds.²⁰ In that respect, she is a Christ-like figure, a sacrificial lamb, who atones for and pardons the sins of the world. But she is also a double (and literally cut in two) in that very moment of self-sacrifice, since she is also taking on herself the task of God, that of vengeance.²¹ She appropriates the vengeance, that is her own death, from God possessive of his vengeance, who says "do not avenge, mine is the vengeance." The memory of Anna that haunts Vronsky is that of Anna when he saw her last, and he remembers her being, in her last moments "cruelly vindictive" (*zhestoko-mstitel'noi*) (Tolstoy 707). Anna is thus both, in her suicide, a Christ and a vengeful God (but more than that, the ultimate affirmation of her human self!), whom she looks in the eye, and whom she outdoes, whose power and authority she appropriates, and whom, so to speak, she takes with her to her death. Tolstoy explicitly relates her death to the problems of God and his vengeance, and Anna, taking her death, giving death to herself, making death a gift to herself, outdoes God in his vengeance, and, like Kirilov, as Blanchot says, becomes her "own master in death, master of herself through death, the master also of that omnipotence which makes itself felt by us through death, and reduces it to a dead omnipotence. Kirilov's [Anna's!] suicide thus becomes the death of God" (Blanchot 97). To God who says "Vengeance is mine; I will repay" Anna responds: no,

¹⁹In this respect Tolstoy is seen as closer to the Dostoevskian underground, as Shestov has it, than it is usually believed. It would be interesting to compare *Anna Karenina* with Dostoevsky's *The Possessed* [*Besny*], a novel which starts with an epigraph from the Bible (St. Luke), depicts a little girl's suicide as a vengeance to Stavrogin, and ends up with Stavrogin's suicide, and is in general obsessed with the problem of faith and suicide (Kirilov). (*The Possessed* preceded *Anna Karenina* by only a year, and Tolstoy's novel arguably reads in many ways as a counter-text to Dostoevsky's novel and his treatise of suicide).

²⁰Tolstoy himself went to see the autopsy of an adulterous woman who committed suicide and was cut in half by a freight train near Tula, on January 4, 1872, and who served as a prototype for Anna. This attests to Tolstoy's personal fascination with suicide, but also a fascination, a certain necrophilic voyeurism of the naked dismembered feminine body (See Tolstoy 745).

²¹Anna is an excess of being, her own alterity ("Am I myself or another?"), a transgression or ambivalence of her own borderlines. In her marriage she is adulterous, or could we say *ad*adulterous, the other of herself. "Adultery" is, indeed, in English derived from "ad+...alter, other" (*Webster College Dictionary* 19). Anna is nevertheless a double or other of herself not only in her life, but in her suicide, as well. As Maurice Blanchot says, "The expression 'I kill myself' suggests the *doubling* which is not taken into account. For 'I' is a self in the plenitude of its action and resolution, capable of acting sovereignly upon itself, always strong enough to reach itself with its blow. And yet the one who is struck is no longer I, *but another*, so that when I kill myself, perhaps it is 'I' who does the killing, but it is not done to me" (Blanchot 107, my italics).

vengeance is mine, and I will repay, thus taking the upper hand on the vengeful God, appropriating her own vengeance and thus nullifying the vengeful God, making his promise of vengeance infelicitous, impotent and failed.²² By killing herself, as Blanchot says about (Kirilov's) suicide, she "also kills her companion and double, with whom she had maintained a sullen silence; she has for her last interlocutor and finally for her sole adversary only *the most sinister figure*" (Blanchot 101, italics mine). This most sinister figure is no one else but the vengeful God. By taking her life Anna meets her maker, but also carries out vengeance on him by taking away from him his vengeance, that is his ability to kill. By killing herself in the face of the vengeful God, Anna makes him impotent, takes away his power, kills God by killing herself, becoming the subject, and the object of the final judgement ("Voluntary death makes a final judgement" Blanchot, 97). If sacrifice and pardon belong to her, so does the vengeance. In that respect, Anna's "suicide retains the power of an exceptional affirmation," since, "by the force of her action, she can render death active and by affirmation of her freedom assert herself in death, appropriate it, make it true" (Blanchot 103, 100).²³ The novel makes Anna, a woman, a figure of heroic proportions, one revenging to the vengeful God, something that the novel explicitly denies men. (The two men who attempt and contemplate suicide, Vronsky and Levin, both fail to accomplish it).

We thus have two promises of vengeance, one at the beginning and one at the end of the novel: the God who says "mine is the vengeance," and Anna who is "cruelly vindictive" (*mstitel'naia*), who does not only promise but also does or outdoes the vengeance. She also reads "the book" until the end, and casts a vengeful gaze, in a self-referential manner, at the novel and the Bible simultaneously.²⁴ These two promises

²²The epigraph is also a performative, a promise, which is not necessarily fulfilled by the novel. What the epigraph promises is the vengeance of the subsequent text (it promises for the other), thus creating, as Shoshana Felman in her *Literary Speech Act* has it, an "aporetic space, an interminable dialogue between the voice of the dead master [Moses, God] and the voice of the servant who lacks a master [Tolstoy], answering each other across the abyss, still prolonging their feast of language: a feast of pleasure--and of stone" (Felman 1983, 69). This aporetic abyss is what constitutes the literary space of *Anna Karenina*. This abyssal structure is also reinforced and repeated in a self-referential manner when Anna reads in the train one of Trollope's novels, whose title is also cast in the performative mode, that of the question, and explicitly related to the theme of pardoning woman: *Can You Forgive Her?*. (The title of Anna's train reading, not made explicit in the book, has been independently established by Amy Mandelker and Gary Saul Morson).

In the same way as *Anna Karenina* is adulterous and transgressing in relation to the law, the novel *Anna Karenina* itself is transgressive in relation to the Biblical canon, a text asking to be forgiven ("Can you forgive her?").

²³The whole scene of Anna's suicide can thus be related to all Schopenhauerian and Nietzschean themes of "freier Tod."

In Blanchot's words: "Whoever wants to die does not die, he loses the will to die. He enters the nocturnal realm of fascination wherein he dies in a passion bereft of will" (Blanchot 105).

²⁴At the end of the novel Anna reads, indeed, as Culler would put it, "like a woman," thus becoming "*le féminin*, a force that disrupts the symbolic structures of Western thought" (Culler 49). The symbolic structure that Anna disrupts is nothing but the paradigm of all Western symbolic structures, that of the phallogocentric law, the name of the father. "Phallogocentrism unites an interest in patriarchal authority,

reflected in each other make a perfect, fearful symmetry, a specular, balanced economy of revenge, and a competition of promising vengeance which counter-sign each other and which turn out to be both felicitous, valid, and failed. Anna thus in her death, her suicide, like Christ, goes back to her Father, (she dies a death proscribed to her by the Mosaic law), but unlike Christ, she outdoes the vengeful God, by not pardoning him, by making her death her own, that is by making it the exceptional and fascinating affirmation: her death, her sweet revenge.

Anna's death closes one frame of reading programmed by Mosaic law. As much as this novel has two beginnings, it also has two ends. Anna's death closes one frame of intertextual reference. Vronsky is also submitted to the same logic of punishment, for he goes to war, seeking death. The other end of the novel is represented by the performance of repentance, staged as Levin's prayer: "I shall repent... my life has an unquestionable meaning of goodness...." (Tolstoy 740). Thus, both narrative regimes, modelled after the motto, consequently run from the beginning of the novel to its end.

Anna Karenina is a novel with extremely lucid and disconcerting insights into the mechanisms of pardoning in society and texts, as well as into the violence of the rhetorical logic of any pardoning performance, especially when addressed or performed on the woman. *Anna Karenina* is a text governed by an ideology of adultery ruled over by the vengeful God of that book in which the law and the logos are spoken, the book which Anna (both the novel and the character) betrays, evades, unsettles, transgresses, re-writes, counter-signs and reads until her death.²⁵

unity of meaning, and certainty of origin," (Culler 61), and that is the structure fragmented, challenged and undone by Anna's fragmented reading body. Towards the end of the text Anna is, also, as Elaine Showalter says, "a female reader [who] changes our apprehension of a given text, awakening us to the significance of the sexual codes" (Showalter 50). This makes us believe that the novel *Anna Karenina*, by being read by a woman at the end of the text, is also re-written by a woman, retroactively, and invites therefore a reader to read the novel with a feminist/feminine eye. As Peggy Kamuf put it, "by feminist one understands a way of reading texts that points to the masks of truth with which phallogentrism hides its fictions." That type of reading, for Kamuf, is constitutive of "writing like a woman" (Kamuf 286).

²⁵Several readers would not pardon my errands at the various stages of this essay: Alexander Zholkovsky, Sven Spieker, Brigitte Weltman Aron, Amy Mandelker, Anne Nesbet, Eric Naiman and Harvey Rabbín. I am grateful for their valuable advice and generous help. All the transgressions and errands of the essay, in spite of their efforts, remain mine.

WORKS CITED

- Adelman, Gary. *Anna Karenina: the Bitterness of Ecstasy*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990.
- Armstrong, Judith. *The Unsaid Anna Karenina*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988.
- Blanchot, Maurice. *The Space of Literature*. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1982.
- Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1982.
- de Man, Paul. *Allegories of Reading*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.
- Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre," in *On Narrative*. W.J.T. Mitchell ed., Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Eikhenbaum, Boris. "The Puzzle of the Epigraph," in Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenina, the Maude Translation*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1970.
- Evans, Mary. *Reflecting on Anna Karenina*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Felman, Shoshana. *The Literary Speech Act*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983.
- , "Woman and Madness: the Critical Phalacy." In *The Feminist Reader*. Catherina Belsey and Jane Moore eds., New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Frye Northrop. *The Great Code*. New York: H.B. Jovanovich, 1982.
- Gromeka, M. S. "The Epigraph and the Meaning of the Novel." In Tolstoy, Leo, *Anna Karenina, the Maude Translation*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1970.
- Groys, Boris. "Russia and the West: The Quest For Russian National Identity," *Studies in Soviet Thought* 43(1992): 185-198.
- Hertz, Niel. "Freud and the Sandman." In *Textual Strategies*. Harari Josué V. ed., Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.
- Jackson, Robert Louis. "On the Ambivalent Beginnig of Anna Karenina." In *Semantic Analysis of Literary Text*. Haard D.E., Langerak T. and Weststeijn W.G. eds., Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1990.
- Kamuf, Peggy. "Writing Like a Woman." In *Woman and Language in Literature and Society*. McConnell-Ginet et al., New York: Praeger, 1980.
- Kofman, Sarah. *The Enigma of Woman*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Soleil noir*. Paris: Gallimard 1987.
- Leontiev, Konstantin. *Analiz, stil' i veyanie. O romanakh Gr. L.N. Tolstogo*. Providence: Brown UP, Slavic Reprint, 1968.
- Mandelker, Amy. "Feminist Criticism and Anna Karenina," *Tolstoy Studies Journal*, 3(1990): 82-103
- Shestov, Lev. *Dostojevski i Nice*. Beograd: Slovo ljubve, 1979.
- Tanner, Tony. *Adultery in the Novel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1979.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenina, the Maude Translation*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1970.
- Sand, George. *Elle et lui*. Meylan: Les Editions de L'Aurore, 1986.
- Schor, Naomi. *Breaking the Chain: Women, Theory, and French Realist Fiction*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.
- Showalter, Elaine. "Towards a Feminine Poetics." In *Woman Writing and Writing About Woman*. M. Jacobus ed., London: Croom Helm, 1979.
- Webster College Dictionary*. New York: Random House, 1991.

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

TOLSTOY AND ALICE B. STOCKHAM: THE INFLUENCE OF "TOKOLOGY" ON *THE KREUTZER SONATA*

ROBERT EDWARDS, SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

I. TOLSTOY AND STOCKHAM'S *TOKOLOGY*

At the time of Tolstoy's extended and often interrupted composition of *The Kreutzer Sonata*, several sources from America were an inspiration to him.¹ During this period he felt his views on chastity corroborated by the providential arrival of materials from correspondents around the world.² One of the most important American influences

¹Towards the end of the late seventies Tolstoy had been working for some years on a story based on the theme of a man who murdered his wife «Убийца жены». Sofia Tolstoy notes that she and her husband heard a performance of "The Kreutzer Sonata" by violinist Yuri Liassotta, a pupil of the Moscow Conservatory, and the Tolstoys' son Sergei on piano. July 3, 1887. *The Diaries of Sophia Tolstoy*, trans. Cathy Porter, eds. O.A. Golinenko, et al., (New York: Random House, 1985), p. 84. It is most likely that in Spring of 1888, after hearing another performance of the "Kreutzer Sonata" with his son and Liassotta as musicians, he began composing a story combining elements of his earlier tale with the title and emphasis on music suggested by Beethoven's composition. He completed the story in the fall of 1889. A story by the actor V.N. Andreev-Burlak served as the genesis of the basic narrative frame of the story as Sofia noted in her diary entry of December, 1890, "Yesterday in the drawing-room he [Tolstoy] was telling Lyova about the narrative form he was trying to create when he started writing *The Kreutzer Sonata*. This notion of creating a genuine story was inspired by that extraordinary story-teller and actor Andreev-Burlak. He had told Lyovochka about a man he had once met at a station who told him all about his unfaithful wife and how unhappy she was making him, and Lyovochka had used this as the subject-matter of his own story." p. 99, December 28, 1890. N.K. Gudzy points out that since according to Sofia's diary, Burlak met Tolstoy for the first time at Yasnaya Polyana on June 20, 1887, the version of the story involving the narrator on the train could not precede that date. *Polnoe Sobranie Sochineny Tolstogo* 27: 564 (Hereafter cited as PSS). After a reading organized by A.F. Koni, the tale was read to a gathering at Kuzminsky's house in Moscow, lithographed copies of the story were widely distributed in Moscow and Petersburg, although the prohibition of the censor held up publication of the story until Sofia Tolstoy intervened on behalf of her husband before the Tsar. Sonya was responsible for corrections and took responsibility as censor for objectionable passages. The uncensored version did not appear in Russia until the 27th volume of the Jubilee Edition was published in 1933. For a more detailed account, see Møller's *Postlude to the Kreutzer Sonata* listed in the Works Cited.

I gratefully wish to acknowledge the help given by Morris Humanities Librarians Marta Davis and Angela Rubin, particularly in finding information about Alice Bunker Stockham in preparation for this article.

²He read with enthusiasm materials sent to him by the Shakers in 1889. "I read the Shakers. Excellent. Complete sexual abstinence. How strange that just now, when I'm occupied with these questions, I should receive this." Diary 9 April 1889, PSS 50: 64. After receiving brochures from the Shakers he wrote Chertkov asking, "Знаете ли вы их ученье? В особенности против брака, а за идеал чистоты сверх брака. Это вопрос к[оторый] занимает меня и именно как вопрос. Я не согласен с решением Шекеров, но не могу не признать, что их решение много разумнее нашего принятого всеми брака. Не могу главное скоро решить вопроса, п[отому] ч[то] я старик и гадкий, развращенный старик." 10 April 1889. PSS 86: 224. "Do you know their teaching? In particular, against marriage, but for the ideal of purity. This is a problem which especially concerns me. I don't agree with the teaching of the Shakers, but I can't help but confess that their decision is a great deal more rational than our notion of

was a book received in late 1888 from Alice Bunker Stockham, M.D. (1833-1912)³ a general practitioner, who resided in Evanston, Illinois. This book, *Tokology: A Book for Every Woman*⁴, ostensibly sent to one of his daughters, was a great source of inspiration to Tolstoy. He immediately perceived in her work an affinity with related movements that were gaining momentum, particularly in America at the turn of the century: temperance, anti-prostitution campaigns, the advocacy of hygiene (which at the turn of the century included a wide variety of health concerns such as birth control, sex education, municipal sanitation, inoculation, etc.), and more spiritualized, less carnal relations in marriage as a means of alleviating the plight of many women who suffered as a result of excessive childbearing.⁵

As is well known, at this time Tolstoy was preaching total abstinence even in marriage. Yet he was simultaneously engaged in one of the most painful periods of his interminable and unsuccessful battle to subdue carnal love in his relation with his wife, Sofia Andreevna.⁶ He expressed his approbation of Stockham's views to Vladimir Chertkov, especially pleased, that for a change, a medical doctor, asserting her claims on the foundations of science (and Tolstoy's disdain for science and medicine is well-

marriage for everybody. The main reason I can't solve this problem is because I am an old man, a vile, debauched old man."

³The *Tokology* was translated into several languages including Russian, Finnish, German, and French. Alice Bunker Stockham was born in Cardington, Ohio, November 1833, and educated at Olivet College. She married Dr. G.H. Stockham in 1856 and was a schoolteacher briefly. She graduated from Eclectic Medical College in Cincinnati, practiced in La Fayette, Indiana, and Chicago. She had two children: Cora and William H. She established and was president of the Alice B. Stockham Publishing Company to publish her own works and other "advanced books." Besides the books already listed she wrote *Lovers' World: A Wheel of Life*, *A Visit to a Gnani*, *Boy Lover*, *True Manhood*, and *Parenthood*. She is said to have been instrumental in introducing "sloyd" (a Swedish form of wood-working) into Chicago public schools. Stockham is also listed as an "active worker for social purity, woman suffrage and social reform." She merited mention in Felton & Fowler's flippant *Famous Americans You Never Knew Existed* for having "sung the praises of 'Karezza', a peculiarly motionless, nonorgasmic brand of lovemaking." In 1900 she founded a school of philosophy at Williams Bay, Wisconsin, and later lived at Alhambra, California. She died in 1912. This brief biography was compiled from several sources: *Who's Who in America: Biographical Dictionary of Living Men and Women of the United States 1899-1900*, ed. John W. Leonard, (Chicago: A.N. Marquis & Co., 1900); *Woman's Who Who of America: 1914-1915*, ed. John William Leonard, N.Y., rpt. (Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1976); *Felton and Fowler's Famous Americans You Never Knew Existed*, eds. Bruce Felton and Mark Fowler, (New York, Stein and Day, 1979), pp. 268-269; *A Dictionary of American Authors*, ed., Oscar Fay Adams, 5th ed., (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1904), p. 566; *Ohio Authors and Their Books*, ed. William Coyle, (Cleveland, Oh.: The World Publishing Co., 1962).

⁴(Chicago: Sanitary Publishing Co., 1887).

⁵For a more detailed account, see the article by William Nickell in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal*.

⁶Debunking critics who claimed that Tolstoy wrote an anti-sex story because of "sour grapes", Aylmer Maude said that, "...the year before his death, when he was eighty-one and very ill, that he was able to tell me that he was no longer troubled by physical desire. When he wrote *The Kreutzer Sonata* the grapes were still very tempting to him and remained so for many years." *The Kreutzer Sonata, The Devil, and Other Tales*, rev. ed., (London: Oxford University Press, 1940, from the "Introduction", xviii).

documented both in his fiction and polemical works) supported continence not only outside of, but within marriage.⁷

So great was Tolstoy's enthusiasm for the *Tokology*⁸, that he immediately wrote the author and requested permission to have the book translated into Russian. Stockham assented and the work was commissioned to Sergei Dolgov. Dolgov asked Tolstoy to provide a preface.⁹ Curiously, in the several later editions of the *Tokology* appearing before Stockham's death, no use of Tolstoy's preface was made for a testimonial, although at this time Tolstoy's name commanded great authority among the various American circles of enlightened thought concerning the various progressive movements which advocated non-resistance, pacifism, temperance, celibacy, hygiene, and so forth.¹⁰ He wrote to Stockham to express thanks for sending the book and indicated that he was especially struck by chapter eleven (entitled "Chastity in the Marriage Relation").

Without labour in this direction mankind cannot go forward... Sexual relation without the wish and possibility of having children is worse than prostitution and onanism, and in fact is both. I say it is worse, because a person who commits these crimes, not being married, is always conscious of doing wrong, but a husband and wife, which commit the same sin, think that they are quite righteous.¹¹

Inspired by Tolstoy's enthusiastic response to her work, Alice Stockham traveled to Russia in September 1889, writing to him from Moscow that she would like to see him.¹² Tolstoy was no doubt flattered that Stockham had gone to such lengths to see him, and was genuinely interested in meeting her to exchange views. Thus, after politely

⁷"Радостно видеть, что вопрос давно поднят, и научные авторитеты решают его в том же смысле." "It's heartening to see that, with this problem raised so long ago, even scientific authorities are resolving it in the same sense [that we are]." 17 November 1888. PSS 86: 188.

⁸The term according to Stockham's definition means the science of midwifery from *tokos* - child in Greek.

⁹*Токология или наука о рождении детей*. М. 1892. According to the *Khronologicheskaiia kanva* for 1890, Tolstoy's foreword was written on 2 February 1890, but due to obstacles from the censor, which S.M. Dolgov refers to in a letter dated 28 July 1890, the publication of the book was slowed down. PSS 51: 164, 178, 248. However, N.K. Gudzy places the date of the appearance of Dolgov's translation as 1891, PSS 27: 573-74. K.S. Shokhor and N.S. Rodionov state that Tolstoy's preface did not appear until 1892. PSS 51: 248.

¹⁰Professor I.I. Yanzhul, a follower of Tolstoy found that when he visited America, "...he found that letters from Tolstoy and even the mere fact that he was personally acquainted with the great man, opened any door for him." Ernest Simmons, *Leo Tolstoy*, (Boston: Little Brown, & Co., 1946), p. 436. For a fascinating account of Tolstoy's impact in American intellectual life near the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century see Harry Walsh's "The Tolstoyan Episode in American Social Thought," *American Studies*, 17(Spring 1976) 1: 49-69. Walsh shows how figures as varied as Theodore Roosevelt, Clarence Darrow, and William Jennings Bryan invoked Tolstoy's name in their political and ideological disputes. See also Nickell's article in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal*.

¹¹To A. Stockham. 30 November 1888. Original in English. PSS 64: 202.

¹²N.N. Gusev and V.D. Pestsova state that according to Dolgov's preface to the Russian translation of the *Tokology*, Stockham spent several weeks in Moscow "...trying to acquaint herself with the conditions of Russian life with the aim of adapting the Russian edition of her book to the circumstances of Russian existence." PSS 27: 692.

claiming to be too occupied to come to Moscow, he invited her to Yasnaya Polyana if she could make the trip to Tula. She came to see Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana on October 2, 1889.

Tolstoy wrote in his diary, on first meeting Dr. Stockham, that he perceived in her person that same spirit he felt permeated the rationalistic and humanistic enterprises underlying the various branches and movements of American progressive religious thought in the latter half of the nineteenth century. He found these views exemplified in American publications he regularly subscribed to such as *New Christianity*, a Swedenborgian organ, and the *World's Advance Thought*. He used Stockham's visit as an opportunity to question her about the rich profusion of enlightened and progressive sects and social movements then burgeoning in America. Apparently agitated by conversation with his visitor he spent a sleepless night and rose early the next day, noting a list of these groups in his diary: Universalists, Unitarians, Quakers, spiritualists, Swedenborgians, Shakers, and so on: "All this is moving towards practical Christianity, towards a universal brotherhood and the sign of this is non-resistance."¹³ That day he asked her "to help him collect information about different religions in America." Dr. Stockham, it seems, was well-qualified to comment on such groups since she was of Quaker background and involved in various manifestations of the progressive movements, particularly temperance and hygiene, at the turn of the century. She mentions in the book inspired by her meeting, *Tolstoi: Man of Peace*, Tolstoy's interest in these groups, and his praise for the Universalist pastor Adin Ballou,¹⁴ the American advocate of non-resistance whose works Tolstoy was reading at this time.

Tolstoy further noted in his diary that in his guest's presence he gave a talk at the local Justice Hall to an assembly of peasants about abstention from tobacco and alcohol and received a rebuff. "The people are terribly depraved," he noted bitterly.¹⁵ Stockham mentions this same scene in her account of the visit with Tolstoy, placing it in a wider context. Tolstoy was trying to adjudicate repayment of a loan which he had presided over for the good of the community. The peasants were unable to repay the loan, and this is why he had occasion to give them a lecture on temperance since, as Stockham relates it, the judge ruled that Tolstoy should devote what money was still left in his hands "...to the public use in some way. That lent out to the peasants was to be kept by them."¹⁶ It is amusing that Stockham's version casts a somewhat different light on this scene: "The Count took this occasion to follow with a temperance lecture, telling them if they did not spend their money for vodka, they would have plenty to be comfortable and pay their

¹³"Все это идет к practical Christianity, к всемирному братству и признак этого non-resistance." Diary, 3 October 1889. PSS 50: 153.

¹⁴His *Christian Non-Resistance* was a great inspiration for Tolstoy. (London: Charles Gilpin, 1848); De Capo Press, New York, 1970, published a reprint of the unabridged second edition which was printed in Philadelphia in 1910. His *Autobiography* is also of interest. (Lowell, Mass.: Vox Populi Press, 1896).

¹⁵PSS 50:153-54. "Страшно развращен народ."

¹⁶Alice Bunker Stockham, *Tolstoi: Man of Peace*, (Chicago, Stockham Publishing Co., 1900), p. 51. The book is mostly concerned with Stockham's visit to Yasnaya Polyana and Tolstoy's teachings about non-resistance.

taxes; that life was of too much account to dull the sensibilities in the use of liquor and tobacco. They took this lecture kindly and looked as if a new resolve had entered their souls."¹⁷ Probably, Masha Tolstoy, who was serving as Stockham's interpreter, was content to allow the visitor to perceive that her father's speech had a telling effect upon the peasants.

It seems likely that Dr. Stockham left fairly soon afterwards since Tolstoy's diary entries during this period make no further mention of her, and her own account of her visit ends with the anecdote about the dispute with the peasants. Nevertheless, Stockham's visit freshened Tolstoy's interest in her book and views at a time when he had temporarily laid aside his composition of *The Kreutzer Sonata*. After her visit he set to work on the story with renewed vigor, and perhaps under the influence of his conversations with her and by renewed association with the eleventh chapter of her book which promotes chaste relations during marriage, Tolstoy was inspired to recompose *The Kreutzer Sonata*. Four days after Dr. Stockham's arrival he entered in his diary for 6 October 1889, "I wrote a new version of the *Kreutzer Sonata*."¹⁸

Stockham and Tolstoy shared similar views on sexual relations within marriage.¹⁹ In Chapter 9 of Stockham's *Tolstoi: Man of Peace*, she discusses *The Kreutzer Sonata* in an obvious attempt to enlist the name of the famous author in their mutual campaign to alter commonly held views of sexuality and to aid Tolstoy in the dissemination of the message behind his tale for English-speaking audience. She writes, "Naturally accepting Jesus as his teacher, Tolstoi's prophetic vision discloses a life of the spirit, admitting no marriage, a life free from any desire of marriage or offspring."²⁰ She quotes or

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸PSS 50: 154. In all, there were nine versions of *The Kreutzer Sonata*. It should be noted that the Shakers occupied and influenced Tolstoy's thought at this time as much as the *Tokology*. This is shown in Tolstoy's correspondence with A.G. Hollister, an American Shaker who sent him tracts, books and pamphlets about the movement. Incidentally, the Shaker allusion also arises at the end of chapter 11 in *The Kreutzer Sonata* where the listener observes that the speaker seems to be advocating, in his repudiation of sex in marriage, something along the lines of the Shakers, and he agrees, "'Yes, and they are right,' he said. The sex instinct, no matter how it's dressed up, is an evil, a horrible evil that must be fought, not encouraged as it is among us. The words of the New Testament, that whosoever looks on a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery with her in his heart, don't just apply to the wives of other men, but expressly and above all to our own.'" The Maude translation leaves out this reference. Recently two translations by British scholars have recently appeared: David McDuff's version appeared in his *The Kreutzer Sonata and Other Stories*, (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1985). Robert Chandler also translated "An Afterword to *The Kreutzer Sonata*" for A.N. Wilson's collection of Tolstoy's religious writings in *The Lion and The Honeycomb*, (London: Collins, 1987). Both scholars, unlike Maude, had the advantage of using the authoritative ninth redaction which appeared only in the 1933 Jubilee edition. The well-known Maude translation, which first appeared in 1925, was based on Volume 13 of the *Collected Works* which Sofia Andreevna edited, with special permission from the Tsar.

¹⁹However, see below and Nickell's article in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal* for a detailed analysis of where their views diverged.

²⁰*Tolstoi: Man of Peace*, p. 65.

paraphrases extensively from the published version of the afterward to *The Kreutzer Sonata* with apparent approval.

Nonetheless, Stockham's views on sex within marriage do not completely coincide with Tolstoy's as is evident in her extensive discussion of sexual matters in her book *Karezza: Ethics of Marriage*.²¹ Here Stockham asserts that under certain conditions sex is permissible and even desirable in marriage. The bearing of children is seen by her as the summit of life. For this very reason, profligate relations *within* marriage are to be avoided. Stockham proposes a spiritualized relationship between woman and man in marriage wherein sexual relations are not prohibited but must take place under strictly regulated conditions.

For married couples wishing to follow the principle of *Karezza*, according to Stockham, "There should be a course of training to exalt the spiritual and subordinate the physical." As part of this instruction Stockham advocates the reading of such authors as Emerson and Browning. She lists another group of authors who "have revealed the law of spirit and given practical helps in life's adjustment."²² Furthermore, the practice of *Karezza* is achieved through meditation which consists in "an act of giving up of one's will, one's intellectual concepts, to allow free usurpation of kosmic intelligence. In obedience to law, common or finite consciousness listens to kosmic consciousness. Daily, hourly, the listening soul awakens to new ideals." Stockham's depiction of actual physical relations between a couple when they have submitted themselves to "the kosmic intelligence" shows what she envisions as a remarkable transformation of the sexual act in both the spiritual and physical dimension:

At the appointed time, without fatigue of body or unrest of mind, accompany general bodily contact with expressions of endearment and affection, followed by complete but quiet union of the sexual organs. During a lengthy period of perfect control, the whole being of each is merged into the other, and an exquisite exaltation experienced. This may be accompanied by a quiet motion, entirely under subordination of the will, so that the thrill of passion for either may not go beyond a pleasurable exchange. Unless procreation is desired, let the final propagative orgasm be entirely avoided.

With abundant time and mutual reciprocity the interchange becomes satisfactory and complete without emission or crisis. In the course of an hour the physical tension subsides, the spiritual exaltation increases, and not uncommonly visions of a transcendent life are seen and consciousness of new powers experienced.²³

²¹*Karezza: Ethics of Marriage*, new and revised edition, (Chicago: Stockham Publishing Co., 1896), rpt. 1903, as an edition in the series *Sex, Marriage, and Society*, ed. Charles Rosenberg, Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, (New York: Arno Press, 1974).

²²Stockham mentions, for example, W.F. Evans, and R.W. Trine. Warren Felt Evans (1817-1899) wrote books illustrating the power of suggestion for curing physical and psychological diseases such as *The Mental Cure: Illustrating the Influence of the Mind on the Body, both in Health and Disease, and the Psychological Method of Treatment*, 1869. A Swedenborgian, he later opened a sanatorium in Salisbury, Massachusetts. Ralph Waldo Trine (1866-1958) was an American writer of a series known as "The Life Books." He wrote *In Tune with the Infinite*, and *In the Hollow of His Hand*, and *What All the World's A-Seeking*.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 25-26.

Here, Stockham describes the physical manifestation of what she calls *Karezza*: "...a symbol of the perfect union of two souls in marriage, it is the highest expression of mutual affection, and gives to those practicing it revelations of strength and power. It must be experienced upon a higher plane than the merely physical, and may always be made a means of spiritual unfoldment."²⁴

There is no record of Tolstoy having read *Karezza*, but it seems plain that he would have had difficulty in accepting Dr. Stockham's prescription. It is hard to believe that he would have been able to perceive the act of sex in the passive, benign, or spiritualistic light that she does. *Karezza*, however, was the book length amplification of her views on the chaste marriage relationship that so impressed Tolstoy as prescribed in Chapter 11 of the *Tokology*. From Tolstoy's point of view, *Karezza* would have seemed a peculiarly unsatisfactory solution to the problem of sex in marriage: a pseudo-spiritualized sexual intercourse, yet just as much intercourse, even without orgasm, with willful disregard that Tolstoy considered to be one of Christ's most urgent injunctions: "Lead us not into temptation." *Karezza*, however ethereal it might render the sex act, would constantly present those who practiced it with "an occasion to stumble", i.e., to experience physical pleasure, and to gratify their own person (and this seems to be at the heart of what so vehemently troubled Tolstoy about sex) through the selfish use of another person. Nevertheless, if this was what lay behind Dr. Stockham's prescription for chaste relations in marriage, Tolstoy was still able to discern much good in the eleventh chapter of *The Tokology*, "Chastity in the Marriage Relation".

II. THE COMPOSITION OF *THE KREUTZER SONATA*

Setting aside Dorothy Green's rather puzzling statement about *The Kreutzer Sonata*, that "...it is not at all certain that the intention of the story is to persuade one to follow a doctrine,"²⁵ it seems to me incontestable that here is a work where didactic message and artistic form are intrinsically and perfectly meshed. Green's article correctly emphasizes the relation between Beethoven's Sonata and the struggle for mastery between Pozdnyshev's spirit and flesh. Using *The Kreutzer Sonata* as a cautionary tale to illustrate the dangers of following the desires of the flesh even within the bonds of matrimony, the story is entertaining as art, but is ultimately a forthright summons to celibacy. The story succeeds as a work of art, but it is art with a message. Art for pleasure, like the seductive music of the sonata, is analogous to sex for pleasure. For Tolstoy, art without a message is like sex without the goal of procreation. His tale serves as a counterbalance to the music of the sonata itself, which is an invitation to carnality. Art without message is equivalent in Tolstoy's to sex without reproduction a mutual act of onanism for the pleasure of the artist and the audience, pleasure that has no goal but individual satisfaction. Tolstoy sees

²⁴Ibid., p. 27.

²⁵Dorothy Green, "The Kreutzer Sonata: Tolstoy and Beethoven," *Melbourne Slavic Studies* 1 (1967), quoted from Katz, p. 437.

Pozdnyshev's character as virtually driven mad by the inevitability of the man's enslavement to carnal desires, woman's enslavement as an object of pleasure for man, and the concomitant abasement of self for both.

The aspiration toward chaste relations between the sexes, for Tolstoy, at least inasmuch as he sees the ethical and aesthetic messages of the tale as integrated, is a way of stopping the seductive power of sex/music which falsely leads people to believe that they can abandon themselves by satisfying themselves, that they can shed their identities and share states of ecstasy with others when actually they are merely pursuing self-gratification. Saying no to sexual relations would have been a way of stopping the story, interrupting the sequence of the inevitable fast, slow, fast rhythm of the sonata,²⁶ of preventing the inevitable interplay and consequence of function of the physiological relations between male and female body parts when they are joined. The whole "inevitable" tale of Pozdnyshev's obsession and eventual murder of his wife is ineluctable. The train itself, on which the story is told, a vehicle moving between two fixed points on a prescribed schedule, serves as an emblem of this inevitability. The murder of his wife is an act he had countless times before practiced in the dehumanizing act of sex. Likewise, this mirrors the many hours of practice the musician must undertake in order to be able to weave a web of enchantment/delusion for the audience. The true audience is one which has likewise spent many hours attuning itself to appreciate the artist's work. Had Pozdnyshev heeded the promptings of his innocent heart when his friends first took him to a prostitute, he would have avoided the first step that permitted him to view women, and later his own wife, as objects for his pleasure.

Within months of completing *The Kreutzer Sonata*, Tolstoy began *Resurrection*, a novel whose plot is concerned with redressing the effect of yielding to the flesh. It further interrogates "common" wisdom concerning sexuality. The phrase "Vsegda tak, vse tak" (roughly: "This is how it always is, every one does it like this")²⁷ seems to hum incessantly in Nekhliudov's ears as he seduces Katyusha Maslova. He yields to temptation, Katyusha succumbs to his advances, and years later, when confronted with the responsibility for Maslova's life as a prostitute and the death of their child, he attempts step by step to redeem her and himself. With the earlier story, *The Kreutzer Sonata*, Pozdnyshev has been subjected to and yielded to the same social education as Nekhliudov concerning women and sex. Unlike Nekhliudov, Pozdnyshev realizes, too late, (*slishkom pozdno*) the error of such thinking,²⁸ and can only relate to a horrified, yet hypnotized listener, how step by step he yielded to the inevitable process of murdering his wife by

²⁶Green notes, "The word 'sonata' in general refers to instrumental music arranged usually in three or four movements in different speeds: for instance, fast, slow, fast, sometimes with a brief, slow introduction." p. 442.

²⁷Л.Н. Толстой, Собрание сочинений в двадцати томах. *Воскресение*. Москва, Художественная литература, 1964, стр. 74.

²⁸Stephen Baehr has also pointed out, "As Pozdnyshev's name suggests, he becomes aware of this result [of the violence or deception that inevitably results from contracting a counterfeit marriage] too "late." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 10 (Spring 1976) 1: 39-46. Cited on p. 450 of *Tolstoy's Short Fiction*. The article is reprinted there on pp. 448-456.

accepting at face value what society had been telling him from boyhood about the necessity of sex and the desirability of romantic love. By assenting to the rationalization lurking behind the phrase "vsegda tak, vse tak", he abnegates the use of his individual conscience. Having dispensed with personal responsibility in his actions with women, and justifying those actions as being dictated by biological necessity, and accommodated by the necessary social institutions of marriage and prostitution, he does indeed think and act as everyone else does. He is profligate with prostitutes and women of easy virtue before marriage, and having found a pure young woman, uses her for his exclusive pleasure as he had done previously with other women. As Green justly remarks about *The Kreutzer Sonata*, "Behind the whole argument is the detestation of the idea that one human being should be used by another for his own purposes."²⁹ Tolstoy, in his capacity to argue a position to its extremes, proposed that sex has been used throughout all time for man's enjoyment. He could not see a compromise solution that would be less than immoral because, he felt, sex for the purpose of pleasure only, without the goal of procreation, even within marriage, reduced it simultaneously to prostitution and onanism. Indeed, the practice of sex by married couples was worse, since the legal status of their relation, conferred on them by society through religious rites that in fact ignored and obscured the true teaching of Christ (not to look with lust upon a woman-- *especially* one's wife), hid their sin from them.

Reviewing the eleventh chapter of the *Tokology* it is easy to see why Tolstoy saw Stockham's arguments to be supportive of his own views of chastity in marriage. Before laying out some of those views, a brief word about the book as a whole should be made. No matter how specious or quaint Stockham's views on sexual relations in marriage might seem, one has to see her work in the context of the time it was written, as a sensible and useful work, providing vital information on a topic that was virtually completely neglected in print. The fact that Stockham was unique in describing the process of reproduction in understandable language from the perspective of a physician who was a female and a mother, makes her work noteworthy. Because of her ethical sense of responsibility to disseminate this vital information, she founded a publishing house at her own expense to print and distribute the many editions of *The Tokology*.³⁰ She talks accurately and sensibly about how pregnancy occurs, its physiological aspects, what to expect during pregnancy, diseases of pregnancy, fetal development, "hygiene" in pregnancy (dress, bathing, and diet), labor and childbirth, post partum diseases, nursing and problems of breast feeding, infant care and diseases, diseases of women, and so forth. Everything is discussed in a clear and rational manner, and I cannot help but believe that her educative work in disseminating information about sex must have performed an inestimable service

²⁹Green, p. 440.

³⁰In an advertisement printed in the back of the 1892 edition of the *Tokology* quoted from *The Union Signal*, 19 February 1891, "The book is in its 160th thousand [copy], an average of 20,000 a year having been sold, which gives a good idea of how successful this 'women's' enterprise' has been. An agent having this book in her hands finds no 'dead' territory." unnumbered page (483). 1892 edition.

in dispelling misinformation and ignorance about the basic processes of reproduction at the turn of the century.

In "Chastity in the Marriage Relations," Stockham makes recommendations about sex for married couples based upon her observations as a physician. Ernest Simmons was the first investigator to make the observation that *The Tokology* had an influence on the composition of *The Kreutzer Sonata*.³¹

In Chapter XI of this work on chastity in married life, Tolstoy was delighted to find his own views echoed. In fact, it would be more correct to say that he obtained ideas from the book, for not only his thought on the subject of chastity in married life in *The Kreutzer Sonata*, but even the very form of their expression suggest clearly the influence of *Tokology*.³²

Dr. Stockham comes out squarely against sexual relations except for procreation. She feels impelled to speak out because "the agonizing cries of heart-broken, suffering women, the terrible death rate of little children [which] have proven that in the marriage relation there is such a perversion of nature, such grievous wrongs committed, that one needs a pen of fire to express the living, burning thoughts, and carry the conviction of truth into the very lives of men and women."³³

³¹According to Gudzy a note authored by "M" drew first drew the connection between Tokology and Tolstoy's story in *Nedelia*, No.4, 1892, pp. 127-130. [Kommentarii k "Kreutserovoi sonate"]. Peter Ulf Møller identifies "M" as Mikhail Osipovich Menshikov (1859-1919) as Nedelia's "leading contributor" during the 1890s, and claims that he had a reputation of being "more Catholic than the Pope himself..., at any rate as regards his work as a propagandist for Tolstoj's ideas on sexual morality in the 1890s." (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988), p. 205. Møller also provides an extensive bibliography of the discussion of *The Kreutzer Sonata* in the contemporary Russian press from January 1890 to January 1892. pp. 314-328.

³²Simmons, pp. 439-440. Indeed, it should be noted that Tolstoy's teaching about the celibate life has strong precedence in the teachings of the early Church fathers, both Greek and Latin, as A.N. Wilson points out in *Tolstoy*, p. 376. Tertullian, for example, in both Catholic and Montanist stages of thought maintains that it is better not to marry, if married, not to have sex, and if one's spouse dies, remarriage (as he claims while a Montanist) is tantamount to adultery. Adherents of Montanism, an ascetic movement of the second century started by Montanus of Phrygia (fl. ca. 156), expected the imminent return of Christ. Montanism was condemned as a heresy by the Church, and Justinian I, the Byzantine emperor, ordered the sect's extinction in the sixth century. There are interesting parallels between Montanism's radical insistence on perfection, its lack of tolerance for institutions, and its expectation of an early *parousia* and Tolstoy's views on celibacy, anarchy, his brand of "parousia": i.e., the human race coming to an end through the perfect practice of chastity). According to the eminent patrologist Johannes Quasten, for example, using the work *De exhortatione castitatis* (*An Exhortation to Chastity*) which falls within Tertullian's works before he was classified a heretic, the three stages of chastity sound remarkably like Tolstoy's ideal of relations between the sexes: "The first degree is to live a life of virginity from the time of one's birth; the second, to live a life of virginity from the time of one's second birth, that is to say, one's baptism, whether by the mutual agreement of husband and wife to practice continence in marriage or by the determination of a widow or widower not to remarry; the third degree is that of monogamy, which is practiced when, after the dissolution of a first marriage, one renounces all use of sex from that time on." *Tertullian: Treatises on Marriage and Remarriage*, eds. Johannes Quasten and Joseph C. Plumpe, trans. William P. Le Saint (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1951), p. 42.

³³*Tokology: A Book for Every Woman*, p. 151.

She claims that, "Unless by some divine miracle, the eloquence of a thousand inspired pens can not stay the floodtide of wrong and injustice now done to women and children under the cover of the marriage law." She points out that among all other animals besides human beings, ("except in rare instances under domestication") ... "the female admits the male in sexual embrace only, only for procreation."³⁴ In a disdainful phrase which presages Tolstoy's disparagement of sex for pleasure she notes, "It remains for civilized people, boasting of their moral and religious codes, to hold, teach and practice that sexual union shall occur in season and out of season, averring this to be the fulfillment of nature's law." According to Stockham people hold three premises about sexual relations:

First. Those who hold that sexual intercourse is a 'physical necessity' to man but not to woman.

Second. Those who believe the act is a love relation mutually demanded and enjoyed by both sexes and serving other purposes besides that of procreation.

Third. Those who claim the relation should never be entered into save for procreation.³⁵

She then describes in greater detail the claims of each view and the premises on which they are based, and discusses the merits and liabilities of each point of view. The first view, that sex is a "physical necessity for man" but not for woman, is based on the notion that "woman naturally has not so much passion as man, has not so much secretion, also has an outlet in menstruation, consequently has not the same demands nor the same injury if not gratified."³⁶ Stockham disputes the validity of this claim, explaining the male's greater sexual appetite is due to the fact that "We teach the girl *repression*, the boy *expression*, not simply by word and book, but the lessons are graven into their very being by all the traditions, prejudices and customs of society." Women are taught to be modest and repress their sexual appetite while men are taught to pursue theirs. In her view this accounts for the social institution of prostitution: "Women, licensed by men, make a business of prostitution, seeking their bodies that this demand-- this necessity-- of the male shall be supplied."³⁷ Men are simply following their nature in indulging their appetite for prostitutes, but the women who are licensed to supply their needs are deemed social outcasts.

Stockham, affronted by the hypocrisy underlying this socially sanctioned logic poses the question, "Can the fact that men are upheld, their crime even condoned, while

³⁴Tolstoy expresses the same sentiment in *The Kreutzer Sonata*, "The animals seem to know that their progeny continue their race, and they keep to a certain law in this matter. Man alone neither knows it nor wishes to know, but concerned only to get all the pleasure he can. And who is doing that? The lord of nature-- man! Animals, you see, only come together at times when they are capable of producing progeny, but the filthy lord of nature is at it any time if only it pleases him! And as if that were not sufficient, he exalts this apish occupation into the most precious pearl of creation, into love. In the name of this love, that is, this filth, he destroys-- what? Why, half the human race!" *Great Short Works of Tolstoy*, p. 384.

³⁵*Tokology*, pp. 151-52.

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 152.

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 153.

women, as partners in this terrible evil, are not only ostracised but irretrievably lost, be explained in any other way?"³⁸ Then she asks a question that coincides very closely with the most disconcerting part of Tolstoy's message in *The Kreutzer Sonata*, that marital relations are in fact really only the extension of prostitution into the realm of "normal" sexual relations under the cover of law and religion:

Witness the effect of this same theory in the marriage relation! The man who has been accustomed to gratify his passions promiscuously, seeks and marries a lovely, virtuous girl. She is not supposed to have needs in this direction, neither has she learned that her body is her own and her soul is her Maker's. She gives up *ownership* of herself to her husband, and what is the difference between her and the life of the public woman? She is sold to one man, and is not half so well paid. Is it too strong language to say she is the one *prostitute* taking the place, for one man, of many, and not like her, having choice of time or conditions? In consequence she not only suffers physically, but feels disgraced and outraged to the depths of her soul.³⁹

Pozdnyshv's period of courtship with his future wife, as depicted by Tolstoy, resembles a client looking over a madame's offering of girls at a brothel. Though he admits that arranged marriages are unfair, the modern method of courtship "is a thousand times worse!", "...but here the woman is a slave in a bazaar or the bait in a trap."⁴⁰ Whereas, most of the world has arranged marriages, debauched modern European society pretends that romantic love alone justifies marriage. Thus, young girls cultivate the arts, and knowledge about science, in order to trap a husband, (i.e., sell themselves to a man), as Pozdnyshv sardonically points out:

'Ah, the origin of the species, how interesting!' 'Oh, Lily takes such an interest in painting! And will you be going to the exhibition? How instructive!' And the troika-drives, and shows, and symphonies! 'Oh! how remarkable! My Lily is mad on music.' 'And why don't you share these convictions?' And boating ... But their one thought is: 'Take me, take me!' 'Take my Lily!' 'Or try-- at least!' Oh, what an abomination!

Pozdnyshv sees clearly through the gauze of sublime feeling known as romantic love to male lust, which denies the personhood of woman for the pleasure of the man. Romantic love is fostered in an aura of cultivated appreciation for the arts. It is this patina of "art" that serves as a legitimizing sanction for forming relationships between the sexes in the educated classes in a post-religious society.⁴¹ In courtship,

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Ibid., pp. 153-154.

⁴⁰In the discussion following I refer to the Louise and Aylmer Maude translation of *The Kreutzer Sonata* in *Great Short Works of Tolstoy*, ed. John Bayley, (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 373. Cited hereafter as *KS*.

⁴¹Stephen Baehr points out in "Art and *The Kreutzer Sonata*" that what Tolstoy sees as the infection of art which legitimizes romantic love, is itself a symptom of the depraved mentality of the educated classes. "In *The Kreutzer Sonata*, the sinister power of bad art is illustrated in the performance of Beethoven's "Kreutzer Sonata" by Trukhachevsky and Pozdnyshv's wife-- a musical liaison that legitimizes their sexual duets." p. 451. Moreover, as Baehr notes, "the central problem in Tolstoy's story is that the piece infects

...the men walk about, as at a bazaar, choosing. And the maids wait and think, but dare not say: "Me, please!" "No me!" "Not her, but me!" "Look what shoulders and other things I have!" And we men stroll around and look, and are very pleased. "Yes, I know! I won't be caught!" They stroll about and look, and are very pleased that everything is arranged like that for them. And then in an unguarded moment-- snap! He is caught!"⁴²

It is only after the murder that Pozdnyshev is able to see things with this clarity. Stephen Baehr separates Pozdnyshev into the narrator (Pozdnyshev II), a man apart (*osobniak*) who knows, who understands, and is a genuine artist who represents what Tolstoy sees as true art, that which serves to unite all human beings in self-abnegating love, from the earlier Pozdnyshev (Pozdnyshev I) who had been "like all others of his circle": liable to be infected by the false art, exemplified in such a music that "makes me forget myself and my true situation; [and] it carries me into a new situation that is not my own. Under the influence of music it seems to me that I am feeling things which I, myself, am not really feeling or that I can do things which I really cannot."⁴³

If art might momentarily envelope relations between the sexes in an alluring and elevated mist of high tone, still Tolstoy recognizes that women of the educated class quite frankly proffer their bodies to men in a manner scarcely distinguishable from prostitutes. For him this is proof that the lofty subjects the wealthy pretend to be interested in are simply used to incite men's passion in order to procure a permanent attachment. This relationship is callously based on a carnality. For Tolstoy, what is most shocking is that both marriage (sanctified by religion and legitimized by the state) and the casual engagement of the prostitute, use the same enticements. This is a manifestation of society's recognition of Alice Stockham's first point, that it believes that men enjoy sex, that it is a necessity for them, but that the sexual urge is very weak or absent in women, and that therefore there should be a class of women permitted by society to serve men's

Pozdnyshev with the wrong kind of feelings, and makes him act immorally and irrationally, as if in a hypnotic trance..." p. 452.

⁴²KS, pp. 372-373.

⁴³Baehr, p. 453, quoting from *The Kreutzer Sonata* (in Katz's edition of *The Kreutzer Sonata*, p. 217). This state of intoxication through music seems to be akin to what Nabokov identifies as happening in Gregor Samsa when his sister Grete plays her violin: "...its stupefying, numbing, animallike quality." *Lectures on Literature*, ed. Fredson Bowers, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980), p. 278. In "Lev Tolstoj: Esthetics and Art", Rimvydas Silbajoris traces Tolstoy's hatred for counterfeit art through his early works, as *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*, *The Kreutzer Sonata* and *Resurrection* using the essay "What is Art?" as a pivotal statement on the topic of esthetics. He states, "There is a self-destructive tension in Tolstoy's work, arising from the juxtaposition of his emerging convictions on esthetics and the continued use, with growing uneasiness, of the very same artistic devices which Tolstoy was coming to regard as counterfeit." *Russian Literature* 1: 68-69. Møller discusses Tolstoy's "unmasking of love" and how he uses *The Kreutzer Sonata* as an example of "good contagious art": "He had a simple and well-meant piece of brotherly advice to give his fellow human beings, advice that would be of great significance for their daily lives. Through a tragic example of modern marriage, told by a repentant husband, he wished so to affect his readers' minds that they themselves would repent, become converted and strive for chastity." *Postlude to the Kreutzer Sonata*, p.11.

satisfaction. Tolstoy comes to the conclusion that marriage is a disguised form of prostitution:

The mothers know it, especially mothers educated by their own husbands-- they know it very well. While pretending to believe in the purity of men, they act quite differently. They know with what sort of bait to catch men for themselves and for their daughters.

You see it is only we men who don't know (because we don't wish to know) what women know very well, that the most exalted poetic love, as we call it, depends not on moral qualities but on physical nearness and on the coiffure, and the colour and cut of the dress. Ask any expert coquette who has set herself the task of captivating a man, which she would prefer to risk: to be convicted in his presence of lying, of cruelty, or even of dissoluteness, or to appear before him in an ugly and badly made dress-- she will always prefer the first. She knows that we are continually lying about high sentiments, but really only want her body and will therefore forgive any abomination except an ugly tasteless costume that is in bad style.

A coquette knows that consciously, and every innocent girl knows it unconsciously just as animals do.

That is why there are those detestable jerseys, bustles, and naked shoulders, arms, almost breasts. A woman, especially if she has passed the male school, knows very well that all the talk about elevated subjects is just talk, but that what a man wants is her body and all that presents it in the most deceptive but alluring light. If we only throw aside our familiarity with this indecency, which has become second nature to us, and look at the life of our upper classes as it is, in all its shamelessness-- why, it is simply a brothel.⁴⁴

The second view of sexual relations is, according to Stockham, "more human." This is a "*love relation*, mutually demanded and enjoyed by both sexes, and serving other purposes besides that of procreation." As Tolstoy explains it, after a time, the once innocent female becomes infected with her husband's feeling of enjoyment for sex. Stockham dwells on this view much less than the others, but her treatment of it in contrast to Tolstoy's is of interest. Here, "... if the lives of married people accorded to this theory the demand of the man would be no more frequent than that of the woman."⁴⁵ For Stockham this is an intermediate position between total depravity in married relations, where the man exercises his exclusive will to the prostitute he exclusively owns-- his wife, and abstinence or near total abstinence in marriage. Stockham presents this position in the form of advice she had given to a woman who had asked her how to prevent conception. Stockham asked how great was the danger. "'She said: 'Unless my husband is absent from home, few nights have been exempt since we were married, except it may be three or four immediately after confinement.'" (She had had five children within five years). Stockham advised her: "Tell him I will give you treatment to improve your health, and if he will wait until you can respond, *take time for the act, have it entirely mutual from first to last*, the demand will not come so frequently."⁴⁶

While for Tolstoy this would be an untenable compromise, which would lead to the corruption of a pure female, inducing her to regard physical relations with the same

⁴⁴KS, pp. 370-371.

⁴⁵Tokology, p. 155.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 156.

enjoyment as a male (as Pozdnyshev's wife, having suffered terribly during her honeymoon period and afterwards, having fallen from purity, comes to enjoy carnality, is "primed" for the adulterous relationship she is set to enjoy with Trukhachevsky⁴⁷), for Stockham, this stage is a door leading to the exact opposite position, that of chaste relations in marriage. Her assumption is that once sex is had as often as the female desires it, it is but a short step to having sex only when children are desired (something close to the parallel in the animal kingdom, where sexual relations are had only when progeny may result). When sex is confined to this purpose alone, as Stockham sees it, the element used in procreation is

...retained in the system, the mental powers being properly directed, is in some way absorbed and diffused throughout the whole organism, replacing waste, and imparting a peculiar vivifying influence. It is taken up by the brain and may be coined into new thoughts-- perhaps new inventions-- grand conceptions of the true, the beautiful, the useful, or into fresh emotions of joy and impulses of kindness, and blessings to all around. It is a procreation of the mental and spiritual planes instead of the physical. *It is just as really a part of the generative function as is the begetting of physical offspring.*⁴⁸

Stockham claims that eminent persons of science and letters have adhered to this principle. She cites "Plato, Newton, Lamb, our own Irving, Whittier, and always remembering the humble Nazarene." Consequently, this third conception of relations between the sexes, the highest, devolves to the woman "'the creative power,' that she must choose when a new life shall be evolved, and only in adhering to this law can she be protected in the highest function of her being-- the function of maternity."⁴⁹

Stockham does not go as far as Tolstoy in her idea of perfection in sexual practice between married couples-- total abstinence.⁵⁰ However, with the practice of *Karezza*, she demands an asceticism within physical relations that places sexuality in a dimension beyond anything Tolstoy was capable of suggesting (let alone of practicing). But in

⁴⁷Although it is unclear to me just to what extent his wife's putative infidelity or propensity to infidelity is cast in the light of the jealous narrator's state of mind. Tolstoy seems to pose this ambiguity on purpose.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, 157. Stockham sent Tolstoy a copy of her *Koradine Letters* in 1893. Tolstoy read with approval a supplementary pamphlet published and enclosed with the book entitled *Creative Life: A Special Supplement to Young Girls*. Tolstoy wrote Chertkov that he was impressed with her premise that sexual energy could be channeled into higher manifestations of creativity. 18 October 1893. PSS 87: 227. Alice B. Stockham and Lida Hood Talbot, *Koradine Letters: A Girl's Own Book* and *Creative Life: A Special Letter to Young Girls*, (Chicago, Alice B. Stockham, 1893).

⁴⁹*Ibid.*

⁵⁰In the second, intermediary stage that Stockham describes, where sex is had on the basis of the woman's desire, it would occur about once a month. In the third, and highest plane, it would only take place with the express purpose of having children. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that during the illegal circulation of the earlier versions of the Afterword to *The Kreutzer Sonata* Sonya, suspecting that she might be pregnant, wrote in her diary, "It would be terrible to become pregnant, for all would learn of this shame and would repeat with malicious joy a joke just now invented in Moscow society: 'There is the real Afterward of The Kreutzer Sonata.'" *Dnevnik Sofii Tolstogo* T. I: 1860-1891, ed. S.L. Tolstoj, (Leningrad: izd. M. i. S. Sabashnikovskh, 1928), p. 158. Quoted in Simmons, p. 446.

theory, if not in practice, Tolstoy was ready to admit the possibility of the extinction of the human race to serve the ideal of perfection in the relations between the sexes, as he explained in his "Afterword to *The Kreutzer Sonata*."

Whereas the Shakers abstained from sex in expectation of the *Parousia*, Christ's second coming, Tolstoy averred that once human nature had developed that level of purity and self-renunciation that would mean the end of the human race, it would at that moment have achieved the true *Parousia*-- the realization of the purity of Christ-- at the moment of its supreme annihilation.

WORKS CITED

- Baehr, Stephen. "Art and *The Kreutzer Sonata*: A Tolstoian Approach," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 10.1(Spring): 39-46. Also in Katz, pp. 449- 456.
- Green, Dorothy. "*The Kreutzer Sonata*: Tolstoy and Beethoven." *Melbourne Slavic Studies* I(1967). Quoted from Katz, pp. 436-448.
- Gusev, N.N. i V.D. Pestsova. Kommentarii. "Predislovie k d-ra meditsiny Alisy Stokgem "Tokologiiia ili nauka o rozhdenii detei". *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenij Tolstogo* 27: 691-92.
- Gudzy, N.K. Kommentarii. "Kreitzerova sonata". *Polnoe Sobranie Sochineny Tolstogo* 27: 563-624.
- Maude, Aylmer. "Introduction." *The Kreutzer Sonata, The Devil, and Other Tales*. London. Oxford University Press, rev. ed., 1940, vii-xxi.
- Menshikov, Mikhail Osipovich. "Kommentarii k "Kreutzerovoi sonate." *Nedelia* 4(1892): 127-130.
- Møller, Peter Ulf. *Postlude to the Kreutzer Sonata: Tolstoj and the Debate on Sexual Morality in Russian Literature in the 1890s*. Leiden. E.J. Brill, 1988.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lectures on Literature*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 1980.
- Quastens, J.J., and Joseph C. Plumpe, eds. *Tertullian: Treatises on Marriage and Remarriage in the series Ancient Christian Writers: The Works of the Fathers in Translation*. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1951.
- Silbajoris, Rimvydas. "Lev Tolstoj: Esthetics and Art." *Russian Literature* 1(1971): 58-72.
- Stockham, Alice B. *Karezza: Ethics of Marriage*, new and rev. edition. Chicago. Stockham Publishing Co. 1896, rpt. 1903. [reprinted in Charles Rosenberg, Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, eds. *Sexual Indulgence and Denial: Variations on Continence In the Sex, Marriage and Society Series*. New York. Arno Press. 1974].
- . *Tokology: A Book for Every Woman*. Chicago: Sanitary Publishing Co. 1887.
- . *Tolstoi: Man of Peace with The New Spirit* by Havelock Ellis. Chicago. Alice B. Stockham & Co.1900.
- Stockham, Alice B., and Lida Hood Talbot. *Koradine Letters: A Girl's Own Book* and supplement, *Creative Life: A Special Letter to Young Girls*. Chicago: Alice B. Stockham & Co.1893.
- Shokhor, K.S. and N.S. Rodionov. "Dnevnik 1890: Kommentarii i primechaniia" *Polnoe Sobranie Sochineny Tolstogo* 51: 163-249.
- Simmons, Ernest J. *Leo Tolstoy*. Boston. Little, Brown and Co. 1946.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *The Great Short Works*. ed. John Bayley. trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude. New York. Harper & Row. 1967.
- . *The Kreutzer Sonata and Other Stories*. Trans. David McDuff. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books. 1985.
- . *Polnoe Sobranie Sochineny*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura. 1928-1954.
- . *Sobranie Sochineny v dvadsati tomax*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1964.
- . *Tolstoy's Short Fiction*. ed. rev. trans. Michael R. Katz. New York. Norton. 1991.

- Tolstoy, Sophia. *The Diaries*. trans. Cathy Porter, eds. O.A. Golinenko, S.A. Kozanova, B.M. Shumova, I.A. Pokrovskaya, and N.I. Azarova. New York: Random House. 1985.
- . *Dnevnik Sofii Andreevny Tolstoy* (t.1), 1860-1891, ed. S.L. Tolstoy, Leningrad: izd. M.i. S. Sabashnikovykh. 1928.
- Walsh, Harry. "The Tolstoyan Episode in American Social Thought." *American Studies* 17.1(Spring 1976): 49-69.
- Wilson, A.N. ed. *The Lion and the Honeycomb: The Religious Writings of Tolstoy*. Trans. Robert Chandler. London: Collins. 1987.
- . *Tolstoy*. New York: Norton, 1988.

PREFACE TO *TOKOLOGY, OR THE SCIENCE OF CHILDBIRTH* BY DOCTOR OF MEDICINE ALICE STOCKHAM

LEO TOLSTOY¹

The present book does not belong to the great majority of any kind of books from philosophical and scientific to belletristic and practical which, in other words, in other combinations and replacements, interpret, and repeat all the same familiar and overfamiliar general passages. This book is one of those rare books which does not deal with what everybody talks about and nobody needs, but about what nobody talks about and everybody needs to know. It is important for parents to know how to behave so that they can produce, without needless suffering, unspoiled and healthy children, but it is even more important for the children themselves to be born under the best of conditions, as it is also stated in one of the epigraphs of the book: "to be well born is the right of every child."

This book is not one of those which people read so that they won't have to say "I haven't read this book", but one which leaves traces, forces one to change one's life, to emend that which is wrong in it, or at least, to think about it. This book is called *Tokology, the Science of Childbirth*. There are some very strange sciences, but this is not one of them. After all, next to learning how to live and die, this is the most important science. The book has had great success in America and has had an important and great impact on American mothers and fathers. In Russia it ought to have an even greater influence. Questions about abstention from tobacco and all kinds of stimulating beverages, from alcohol to tea, questions about nourishment without the murder of living creatures, vegetarianism, questions about sexual continence in family life and much else, have been already partly decided, and partly are in the process of being reformulated, and have a huge literature in Europe and America, while we have still scarcely even touched upon these problems, and this is why Stockham's book is especially important for us: it immediately transports the reader into a new world of living human activity.

In this book every thoughtful woman reader-- since this book is especially intended for women readers-- will find first of all an indication that there is no necessity whatsoever to live as absurdly as our grandmothers and grandfathers did, and that it is possible and appropriate to find other ways of life using science, and the experience of people and their

¹Translated and annotated by Robert Edwards. This translation is from Предисловие к книге Д-ра Медицины Алисы Стокгэм «Токология, или наука о рождении детей» in *Полное собрание сочинений*, 27: 267-68. An earlier English translation of this is Nathan Haskell Dole's version, "Introduction to A. Stockham's Tokology" in *Shakespeare, The Christian Teaching, Letters and Introductions*, V. 12, 195-196, *The Complete Works of Lyof N. Tolstoi*, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1928). Haskell dates the preface 14 February 1890.

free thought. As a first model of such usage, she will find in this book much valuable advice and instruction which will make her life, as well as her husband's, and that of her children's, easier.

2 February 1890

A HISTORY OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE "AFTERWORD TO *THE KREUTZER SONATA*"

ROBERT EDWARDS, SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

The Afterword to *The Kreutzer Sonata* was begun at the end of October 1889 at the time the eighth and next to last manuscript of *The Kreutzer Sonata* was being completed. V.G. Chertkov had advised Tolstoy to write an Afterword so that his readers would understand the meaning of his tale more clearly. Tolstoy assented to do this claiming that he agreed that an Afterword would be a good idea. The date on the manuscript of the first redaction is December 6, 1889. It therefore took Tolstoy about a month to finish this first redaction. By 7 November, while in the process of writing the Afterword, he wrote in his diary that he was receiving letters with opinions about *The Kreutzer Sonata*. The Afterword, therefore, was partially an attempt to address the issues raised by those letters. Chertkov had sent him extracts from readers with questions concerning the tale.¹

In the first redaction, following Chertkov's advice, Tolstoy sets chastity as an ideal, not a strict rule to be observed between the sexes, even within marriage. He then set the redaction aside as a rough copy. On 25 December Chertkov again wrote asking him to write an Afterword. On 15 January Tolstoy wrote that he had tried with great effort but was unable to write an Afterword. Chertkov then wrote asking him to make corrections to the redaction he had already written, but Tolstoy was dissatisfied with it and rewrote the entire thing. This rewriting composed the second redaction. It was also unfinished and is not used at all in the final redaction. This redaction was probably begun soon after the copy of the first rough draft was corrected but not earlier than 17 January.

Many diary entries and letters to Chertkov attest to Tolstoy's difficulty in writing the second redaction. But in it he forthrightly voices his commitment to total continence, even within marriage. He notes in his diary that the Gospel did not support the institution of marriage, that marriage was not mentioned in it. "Nothing except the absurd miracle at Cana, which establishes marriage as much as the visitation of Zacchaeus establishes the profession of tax collecting."²

Tolstoy was sick a great deal during February and composition of the second redaction lost momentum. It is extremely interesting though that when he begins work again he mentions in his diary being happily obsessed with "Koni's tale", which was to serve as the basis of his last great novel, *Resurrection*.³ In this same entry he writes a thought which contains imagery and phrasing that is later incorporated in the final redaction of the afterword. "Reason is a lamp, hung near the heart of every person. A person cannot walk-- cannot live other than in the light of this lamp. The lamp always

¹In *Postlude to The Kreutzer Sonata: Tolstoj and the Debate on Sexual Morality in Russian Literature in the 1890s*, Peter Ulf Møller provides a bibliography of the considerable reaction of contemporary Russian press to Tolstoy's tale. E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1988, pp. 314-328.

²*Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii* 51:17. Diary entry, 5 February 1890.

³This theme had been gestating in Tolstoy mind at least since 18 April 1888, according to the *Khronicheskaia kanva* compiled by K.S. Shokhor, PSS 27: 232.

shines the way before that person-- the path along which that person walks."⁴

By 24 February he resumed work on the redaction again, after his illness and having become distracted by other affairs. On 4 March he received a letter from Chertkov again urging him to finish the earlier abandoned and partially corrected version of the Afterword. Then Tolstoy received a letter dated 6 March from a certain V.P. Prokhorov. The letter was addressed both to Moscow and Yasnaya Polyana since Prokhorov did not know where Tolstoy was living. Prokhorov wrote earnestly asking Tolstoy to explain the meaning of the story, assuring him that his answer would have a great bearing on his whole life. On 11 March Tolstoy makes a diary entry, "Thought about the Afterword in the form of a letter to Prokh."⁵

Apparently Tolstoy soon grew disenchanted with this version of the Afterword soon abandoned it. With the help of the Danish translator, Peter Emanuel Hansen, from 1-6 April Tolstoy worked intensively on what was to prove the final redaction. He notes in his diary for 7 April: "Yesterday on the 6th of April in the morning finished writing and corrected the Afterword. Have just gotten immersed in it and completely made it clear to myself."⁶ Hansen then took what he believed to be the final corrected version to St. Petersburg in order to make lithograph and hectogram editions from it. Tolstoy, however, from 7 to 24 April went on correcting the manuscript and sent Hansen a large supplement with new corrections. During this time Chertkov sent a long letter to Tolstoy pleading with him to say something in the Afterword which would recognize "...the lawfulness of a moral marriage for those hundreds of millions of modern people, who still haven't been raised to the level of of a possibly more celibate marriage. If you don't do this, and the Afterword appears without this addition, then millions of *modern* people, still living in the flesh, will be repulsed from the life of Christ, and not attracted to it."⁷ Tolstoy sent a copy of the new redaction to Chertkov on April 25 with a letter begging his pardon but saying that he "could not rehabilitate honorable marriage." "Net takogo braka." "There is no such marriage," he asserted bluntly.

Tolstoy continued to make corrections on the manuscript as late as 23 November 1890. None of these corrections were substantial enough for Gudzy to state that there was a new redaction. The final redaction was first published in Berlin by Walter Zimmerman

⁴Diary entry, 16 February 1890 "рассудок- фонарь, привешенный к груди каждого человека. Человек не может идти--жить иначе как при света этого фонаря. Фонарь всегда освещает ему вперед его дорогу-- путь-- по[которому] он идет.

⁵PSS 51:26

⁶Вчера 6 Февраля утром дописывал, поправлял послесловие. Только что расписался и вполне уяснил себе. Tolstoy's wording in this diary entry is a bit ambiguous. Does расписался here mean that Tolstoy had put his signature to a final version of the redaction since Hansen had left for Petersburg with what both men apparently thought was the final version for the lithograph version? Or is the word used in its less common sense, meaning that Tolstoy had gotten deeply into the problem, and at last made it clear to himself? I believe that given Tolstoy's long struggle with the composition of the Afterword, and that at last after an intense effort having come up with what he considered to be a successful draft, that the word was used in the latter sense.

⁷PSS 27: 631.

and in a second edition by M.K. Elpidina in Geneva in 1890. The Afterword appeared with *The Kreutzer Sonata* in the 13th volume of the Collected Works of Tolstoy in Moscow in 1891. Many errors occurred in the manuscript copied by Sofia Andreevna. In several places she changed the language for the censor. The government censor himself laid a heavy hand on the text. For the 12th edition in 1911, Sofia Andreevna corrected scarcely more than half of the errors she made in her 1891 copy, but all the censor's changes remain. P.I. Biryukov used this 12th edition text for the Complete Collected works that he edited in 1912.

In 1901 the work appeared with some corrections in *Svobodnoe Slovo* in Christchurch, England under the pamphlet entitled "O Polovom voprose. Mysli L.N. Tolstogo, sobrannye Vladimirom Chertkovym." (*On the Sexual Question: L.N. Tolstoy's Thoughts*, Collected by Vladimir Chertkov). Here the censor's emendations are removed but the errors of the previous edition "were not systematically deleted."⁸ In 1906 this same pamphlet appeared in the February issue of the St. Petersburg journal *Vsemirnyi vestnik*.

In the Soviet era the work appeared in 1928 in a collection of artistic works published by Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, and in a supplement to *Ogonek*. Here the text is a combination of the 1891 and the 12th volume of the 1911 edition. The censor's restrictions were not omitted in these editions. Thus, until Gudzy and Gusev's edition which appeared in 1933 in volume 27 of the *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii*, only Chertkov's 1906 edition was free from the censor's restrictions. The authoritative 1936 version was made by comparing the 23rd manuscript (which the earlier foreign editions of the Afterword were based on) with the 25th, the one Sofia Andreevna copied over for the 1891 edition (the 24th manuscript was only one sheet long), and restoring all the omissions made by the censor.

⁸Gudzy, *PSS* 27: 634. My own observations are indebted to N.K. Gudzy's exhaustive analysis in *Kommentarii "Poslesolovie k "Kreitzerovoi sonate"*. *PSS* 27: 625-646.

WORKS CITED

Gudzy, N.K. *PSS* 27: 625-646.

Møller, Peter Ulf. *Postlude to The Kreutzer Sonata: Tolstoj and the Debate on Sexual Morality in Russian Literature in the 1890s*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988, pp. 314-328.

Shokhor, K.S. and N.S. Rodionov, *Kratkaia khronicheskaja kanva zhizni i tvorchestva L.N. Tolstogo za 1888-1889*, *PSS* 50: 231-241.

Tolstoy, L.N. *Dnevnik 1889, 1890*. *PSS* 50, 51.

AFTERWORD TO *THE KREUTZER SONATA*

LEO TOLSTOY¹

I have received, and continue to receive, a great deal of letters from people I don't know asking me to explain in clear and simple terms, what I think about the subject of the story I wrote entitled "Kreutzer Sonata." I will try to do this; that is in brief words, to express, as far as possible, the essence of what I wanted to say in this story, and of the conclusions, which, in my opinion, can be made from it.

First of all, I wanted to say that in our society a firm conviction has been formed, general to all classes and supported by false science, that sexual relations are necessary for health, and that since marriage is not always a possibility, then sexual relations outside of marriage, not obligating a man in any way besides a monetary payment is a completely natural affair and that is why it should be encouraged. This conviction has become so firm and generally accepted that parents, on the advice of their physicians, arrange debauchery for their own children; governments, whose single purpose consists in care for the moral well-being of their citizens, institutionalize debauchery, i.e., they regulate a whole class of women obligated to perish bodily and spiritually for the satisfaction of the passing demands of men, while bachelors with a completely clear conscience abandon themselves to debauchery.

And what I wanted to say here was that it is bad because it cannot be that it is necessary for the sake of the health of some people to destroy the body and soul of other people, in the same way that it cannot be necessary for the sake of the health of some people to drink the blood of others.

The conclusion which, it seems to me, is natural to draw from this is that it is not necessary to yield to this error and deception. But in order not to yield to this, it is necessary not to believe in immoral teachings in the first place no matter how they are supported by sham science, and in the second place, to understand that to enter such a sexual relation in which people either free themselves from its possible consequences--children, or dump the whole weight of the consequences on a woman, or prevent the possibility of the birth of children-- such a sexual relation is a transgression of the simplest demand of morality, it is baseness, and that is why bachelors not wishing to live basely should not do this.

In order for them to practice abstinence, they should, besides leading a natural way of life, not drink, not overeat, not eat meat and not avoid labor (not gymnastics, but exhausting, real work, not play), not to permit thoughts about the possibility of relations with others' women, in the same way that any man does not permit himself such a possibility between himself and his mother, his sisters, his relatives and the wives of his friends.

¹Translated and annotated by Robert Edwards. The source for this translation is Послесловие к «Крейцеровой сонате.» In Полное собрание сочинений 27:79-92, (М.Л. Государственное издательство художественной литературы, 1933).

Any man can find hundreds of proofs that abstinence is possible and less dangerous and harmful for health than incontinence.

This is the first conclusion.

The second is that in our society as a consequence of seeing amorous relations not only as a necessary condition of health and enjoyment, but also as a poetic, and lofty blessing in life, marital infidelity has become a very ordinary phenomenon in all classes of society (in the peasant class especially, due to conscription).

And I think that this is not good. It can be concluded from this that men ought not to behave in this way.

In order for men not to behave this way, it is necessary that carnal love be seen differently so that men and women are educated in their families and through social opinion, so that both before and after marriage they do not regard falling in love and the carnal love connected with it as the poetic and elevated state as they look on it now, but rather as a state of bestiality degrading for a human being, so that the violation of the promise of fidelity given in marriage would be castigated by public opinion at least in the same way that violations of financial obligations and business fraud are castigated by public opinion, rather than praised as it is now in novels, in verse, in song, in operas, and so forth.

This is the second conclusion.

The third is that in our society, again as a consequence of the false significance given to carnal love, the birth of children has lost its significance, and instead of being the goal and justification for relations between spouses, has become an obstacle for the pleasant continuation of amorous relations. And this is why both outside of and within marriage, according to the advice of the votaries of marital science, there has begun a dissemination of the use of means which would deprive a woman of the possibility of childbirth, or there has begun to enter into custom and habit something that previously did not exist, and still does not among the patriarchal families of peasants: marital relations during pregnancy and nursing.

And I think that this is not good. It is not good to employ means to prevent the birth of children, in the first place because this frees people from the care and labor over children which serves as an expiation for carnal love, and secondly, because this is something quite close to an act most offensive to the human conscience--murder. And incontinence during the time of pregnancy and nursing is bad, because it undermines the physical, and, most importantly, the spiritual powers of a woman.

The conclusion which may be drawn from this is that people should not do this. But in order not to do this it is necessary to understand that abstinence, which constitutes

a necessary condition of human dignity during the period of the unmarried state, is even more necessary in marriage itself.

This is the third conclusion.

The fourth is that in our society in which children are considered to be either an obstacle to pleasure, an unfortunate accident, or an amusement (when they are born up to a certain predetermined number within a family), these children are educated without a sense of those tasks of human life which await them as rational and loving beings, but only in the light of the amusement which they may afford their parents. As a consequence of this, the children of people are educated like the children of animals, so that the chief care of parents consists not in preparing them to be persons involved in a life of worthy activity, (in this the parents are supported by false science, so-called medicine), but in how to feed them better, increase their growth, to make them clean, white, satisfied, and pretty (if this is not done in the lower classes, it is only because need prevents it, but their view of the matter is one and the same). And in pampered children, as in overfed animals, there is an unnaturally early appearance of an insuperable sensuality, which is the occasion of the terrible sufferings of these children in adolescence. Clothes, reading, plays, music, dancing, sweets, the whole environment of their lives, from the pictures on candy boxes to novels and tales and poems, even more inflame this sensuality; as a result, the most terrible sexual vices and diseases are the norm for children of both sexes, which often persist into maturity.

I think that this is bad. The conclusion which might be made from this is that we need to stop educating the children of people as though they were the children of animals, and to set other goals for the education of human children besides an attractive, well-tended body.

This is the fourth conclusion.

The fifth is that in our society, where falling in love between a young man and a woman has as its basis, essentially, a carnal love that is elevated into the highest poetic goal of people's aspirations, (all the art and poetry of our society serve as evidence of this), young people consecrate the better part of their lives, if men, in the searching and hunting for, and possessing of the finest objects of love in the form of an amorous relationship or marriage, and if women and girls, in the enticement and alluring of men into an affair or marriage.

And because of this, people's best energy is wasted not only on unproductive but on harmful work. A great deal of the senseless opulence of our life is a result of this. This is also the cause of the men's idleness and the shamelessness of women, who do not disdain exhibiting, in fashions consciously borrowed from lewd women, those parts of the body which stimulate men's sensuality.

And I think that this is bad.

It is bad because the achievement of the goal of union with the object of one's love, in marriage or outside marriage, no matter how it is made into an object of poetry, is a goal unworthy of human beings in the same way that it is unworthy for human beings to set themselves as the highest good the goal, as many people do, of obtaining for themselves tasty and abundant food.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is that we must stop thinking that carnal love is something especially elevated, and understand that the goal worthy of man, whether it is service to humanity, to country, to science, to art (to say nothing of service to God)--no matter what it is, as long as we consider it to be worthy of man, cannot be achieved by means of union with the object of love in marriage or outside of it. On the contrary, falling in love and union with the object of love (no matter how we try to prove the contrary in verse and prose) will never facilitate the achievement of a worthy goal for man, but will always impede it.

This is the fifth conclusion.

This is the essence of what I wanted to say and what I thought I had said in my story. And it had seemed to me, although one may argue about how to correct the evil indicated in the positions mentioned above, it impossible not to agree with them.

It had seemed to me that it is impossible not to agree with these positions, in the first place, because they are in complete agreement with the progress of humanity, which always advances from dissipation towards greater and greater chastity, and with the moral consciousness of society, with our conscience, which always condemns dissipation and praises chastity; and secondly, because these positions are the only inescapable conclusions to be drawn from the teachings of the Gospel, which we either profess, or at least, albeit unconsciously, recognize as the foundation of our morality.

But this turned out not to be the case.

It is true that no one directly disputes that we should not indulge in debauchery before marriage, that we should not use artificial means to prevent conception, that we should not use our own children as a source of amusement, and that we should not consider an amorous union as the highest good,-- in a word, no one disputes that chastity is better than dissipation. But people say: "If celibacy is better than marriage, then it is obvious that people ought to do what is better. However, if people do this, the human race will come to an end, hence the ideal of the human race cannot be its own destruction."

But setting aside that the destruction of the human race is not a new concept for the people of our world, that for the religious it is a doctrine of faith, and for scientists it is the inescapable conclusion to be drawn from observations of the cooling of the sun, this objection veils a widely prevalent and long-standing misconception.

People say: "If the human race attains the ideal of complete chastity, then it will annihilate itself; this is why the ideal cannot be true." But those who say this, whether

intentionally or unintentionally, are mixing two different things-- the rule or injunction, and the ideal.

Chastity is neither rule nor injunction, but an ideal, or rather-- one of the conditions of this ideal. But the ideal is a true one only when its realization is possible only in an idea, in thought, when it is presented as attainable only in the infinite, and therefore, when the possibility of approaching it is infinite. If an ideal not only could be reached but we could imagine its realization, it would cease to be an ideal. Such was the ideal of Christ, -- the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth, an ideal, foretold by the prophets about how the time will come when all people will be taught by God, will turn their swords into plowshares, and spears into pruning hooks, when the lion will lie down with the lamb, and all creatures will united in love. The whole meaning of human life consists in movement towards this ideal. This is why the aspiration towards the Christian ideal in entirety and towards chastity as one of the conditions of this ideal, not only does not exclude the possibility of life, but on the contrary, the absence of this Christian ideal would have annihilated the forward progress of humanity, and therefore the possibility of life.

The opinion that the human race will come to an end if people with all their strength will aspire to chastity, is similar to the assertion that has been made (indeed is still being made), that the human race will perish if people, rather than engaging in the struggle for existence, will with all their strength strive for a realization of love towards friends, towards enemies, towards every living thing. These opinions also result from a misunderstanding of the difference between two methods of moral guidance.

Just as there are two ways of indicating the path to be traveled to the traveler, so there are also two methods of moral guidance for the person seeking the truth. One method is to point out objects that the person will meet along the way, thus he orients himself according to these objects. Another method is simply to give a person a direction on the compass which he carries with him, by which he continuously reads an invariable direction and can always make note of any degree of variation from it.

The first kind of moral guidance is provided through a set of external precepts, or rules: a person is provided a set of defined norms of behavior, what he should and should not do.

"Observe the Sabbath, circumcise, don't steal, don't drink alcohol, don't kill a living being, tithe, don't commit adultery, perform ritual ablutions, and pray five times a day, be baptized, receive communion, and so forth." Such are the decrees contained in various external religious teachings: Brahmin, Buddhist, Muslim, Jewish, and church, falsely called Christian.

Another means of providing guidance is to indicate to a person that perfection is a state never to be reached, but an aspiration which one recognizes in oneself: the ideal is indicated to the person, and one can always measure oneself by the degree to which one has moved away from it.

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and

with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself. Be ye, therefore, perfect, even as your Father, who is in heaven, is perfect."

Such is the teaching of Christ.

The verification of the fulfillment of external religious teachings is seen in the degree to which behavior coincides with the injunctions involved with these teachings, and that this coincidence is possible.

The verification of the fulfillment of the teachings of Christ is consciousness of the degree of incongruousness one's behavior has in relation to ideal perfection. (The degree of approximation is not perceptible: the degree of variance from perfection that a person has alone is perceptible).

The person who professes faith in external law is like a man standing in the light of a lamp, suspended from a post. He stands in the light of this lamp, it shines on him, and there is nowhere further for him to go. The person professing the teachings of Christ, is like someone carrying the light in front of him on a pole of unspecified length: the light is always in front of him and always spurs him to go beyond himself, freshly opening to himself a new, illuminated space that attracts him.

The Pharisee thanks God that he fulfills everything required of him.

The rich young ruler also fulfilled everything required of him from childhood and did not understand what he might lack. Such people cannot understand it any other way: in front of them there is nothing towards which they might continue to aspire. They have tithed, observed the Sabbath, honored their parents, not committed adultery, nor theft, nor murder. What more is there? For the person professing Christian teaching, the achievement of every stage of perfection elicits a demand of entry to a higher stage, from which a still higher one is opened, and so on without end.

The person professing the law of Christ is always in the position of the publican. He always feels himself to be imperfect, he can't see the path behind him which he has passed; rather, he always sees in front of him the path along which he needs to go and which he has yet to travel.

This is what differentiates Christ's teaching from all other religious teachings. The distinction lies not in the difference of moral demands, but in the means by which people are guided. Christ did not make any kind of injunctions concerning how life should be lived; he never established any kind of institutions, not even marriage. But people who do not understand the special nature of the teaching of Christ, having become used to external teachings and desiring to feel themselves as righteous, as the Pharisee felt himself righteous contrary to whole spirit of the teaching of Christ, have created an external teaching from the letter of the law, which is called church Christian teaching, and they have substituted this teaching for the genuine teaching of the ideal of Christ.

The church teachings which call themselves Christian in relation to all the manifestations of life, instead of the teachings of the ideals of Christ, and contrary to the

spirit of that teaching, set external standards and rules. This is done in relation to the authority of the state, to the judicial system, to the military, to the church, to the ritual of worship; it is done also in relation to marriage, although Christ not only never established marriage, but if you search for external standards, rather denied it ("leave your wife and follow me"). Church teachings, calling themselves Christian, establish marriage as a Christian institution; that is, they set external conditions under which carnal love can be enjoyed without sin by the Christian, and can be completely lawful.

But since in genuine Christian teaching there is no foundation for the institution of marriage, it is as if people of our world have left one shore and not yet reached the other; that is, they essentially don't believe in the Church's definition of marriage, sensing that this institution is not founded in Christian teaching. Moreover, they are not shown the ideal of Christ, the aspiration towards complete chastity which is hidden by the teaching of the Church, and they remain without any kind of guidance with respect to marriage. As a result, a phenomenon occurs which at first seems strange, that among the Jews, the Muslims, the Lamaists and other groups which recognize religious teachings of a considerably lower level than the Christian, but have exact external injunctions concerning marriage, the principle of the family, and the fidelity of the spouses is incomparably more strictly adhered to than among so-called Christians.

These religions have a fixed type of concubinage, a polygamy limited according to known boundaries. Among us exists complete dissipation and concubinage, polygamy and polyandry, not subject to any kind of rules, hidden under the appearance of a fictitious monogamy.

There cannot be and there never was Christian marriage, as there never was and never can be a Christian ritual of worship (Matthew 6: 5-12; John 4: 21), there are no Christian teachers and fathers (Matthew 28: 8-10). There is no Christian property, no Christian army, no judicial system, no government. This has always been understood by genuine Christians of the first and last centuries.

The ideal of the Christian is love toward God and one's neighbor. This constitutes renunciation of self and service for God and one's neighbor. Carnal love and marriage are forms of service to oneself, and that is why in every case these are a hindrance to the service of God and to people; this is why, from the Christian point of view, carnal love and marriage are a degradation and a sin.

Getting married cannot promote the service of God, even in the case of marriage for the purpose of continuing the human race. It would be infinitely simpler if these people, rather than getting married to produce children's lives, would support and save those millions of children who are perishing around us from a lack of material (to say nothing of spiritual) sustenance.

Only in this case might a Christian without consciousness of degradation, or sin, enter into marriage, if that person could see and know that the lives of all existing children were provided for.

It is possible not to accept the teaching of Christ, that teaching which has permeated all our life and on which our whole morality is based, but if a person does

accept this teaching, it is impossible not to recognize that it points toward the ideal of complete chastity.

In the Gospel, of course, it is stated clearly and without any possibility of misinterpretation, that in the first place, a married man should not divorce his wife in order to take another, but should live with the one originally married (Matthew 5: 31-32; 19: 8); secondly, that consequently, a man in general, whether married, or unmarried, who looks at a woman as an object of pleasure, is sinning (Matthew 5: 28-29), and thirdly, that it is better for the man who is unmarried, to remain unmarried entirely, that is, to be completely chaste (Matthew 19:10-12).

For a great many people these thoughts appear to be strange and even contradictory. And they actually are contradictory, but not within themselves; these thoughts contradict our whole way of life. Thus, a doubt involuntarily occurs: Who is right? These thoughts, or the lives of millions of people including my own? This is the very feeling I experienced most intensely when I was in the process of coming to those convictions which I am expressing now: I never expected that the path of my thoughts would lead me to where they have led. I was horrified by my own conclusions, I did not want to believe them, but it was impossible not to believe them. And no matter how contradictory these conclusions are to the whole structure of our life, no matter how they contradict what I earlier thought and even expressed, I have been forced to recognize them.

"But these are all general considerations which perhaps are correct; they relate to the teaching of Christ and are obligatory for those who profess it; but life is life, and it is impossible, having shown in advance the unreachable ideal of Christ, to abandon people facing one of the most urgent problems, one so universal, and responsible for the most immense calamities, without any kind of guidance.

"At the beginning a passionate young man will be attracted to an ideal, but will be unable to sustain it, then will fall, and now recognizing no moral laws whatsoever, will fall into complete depravity."

So runs the usual argument.

"The ideal of Christ is unreachable, therefore it cannot serve us as a guide in life; it is possible to discuss it, to dream about it, but it cannot be applied to life, and this is why it necessary to abandon it. We don't need an ideal, but a rule, a guide set according to our strengths, according to the average level of moral capacity in our society: the honorable marriage by Church definition, or even a not entirely honorable marriage, in which one of the partners, as is the case with us, the man, has already had intimate relations with many women, or if only a marriage with a possibility of a divorce, or if only civil, or (extending the same logic) if only in the Japanese style, just for a specified time,-- why not extend the notion of marriage all the way to the brothels?"

People say that this is better than street debauchery. This is just where the trouble lies; in permitting oneself to lower the ideal to one's own weakness, it becomes impossible to find the limit at which one must stop.

But of course this reasoning is false from the very start; it is false, first of all, to claim that the ideal of infinite perfection cannot serve as a guide in life, and that taking this ideal as a guide, one must to throw up one's hands, saying that "I don't need it, since I also will never reach it, or to lower the ideal to the level my weaknesses can tolerate."

To reason in this way is to be like the navigator who tells himself, "Since I cannot reach a certain destination according to that line which my compass indicates, I will throw out the compass or stop looking at it, that is, I will reject the ideal or I will rivet the arrow of the compass to that place which will correspond in a given moment to the path of my vessel, that is, I will lower the ideal to my weakness." The ideal of perfection given by Christ is not a dream or an object of rhetorical sermons, but is the most necessary and universally accessible guide for the moral life of people, like the compass is a necessary and easily understood tool for the guidance of navigators; it is only necessary to believe in one as it is in the other. No matter what the situation may be, the teaching given by Christ will always be sufficient for a person to receive the truest indication of what actions one should or should not perform. But one must believe this teaching completely, and in this teaching alone, and must stop believing in all the others, exactly in the same way that the navigator needs to believe in the compass, must stop looking at and being guided by what he sees on either side of his craft. One needs to know how to be guided by Christian teaching, as one needs to know how to be guided by a compass. In order to do this one must understand one's own position. One needs to learn how not to be afraid to define with exactitude how far one has moved away from the ideal of the direction given. No matter what level a person occupies, it is always possible for one to come closer to the ideal, and no position can be attained where one may say that the ideal has been reached and that a person cannot aspire to come even closer to it. Such is the aspiration of human beings towards a Christian ideal in general, and towards chastity in particular. If you can imagine the many various positions of people in regard to the sexual problem-- from an innocent childhood to marriage --, in which chastity is not observed, in each stage between these two positions the teaching of Christ with the ideal it represents will always serve as a clear and definite guide of what a person ought and what he ought not to do at each of these stages.

What should the pure young man or woman do? They should keep themselves free of temptations, and in order to be in the position of rendering all their strength to the service of God and people, they should strive towards an ever greater chastity of thought and desires.

What should the young man and woman do, having fallen to temptations, becoming engulfed by thoughts of aimless love or love for a certain person, and as a result having lost a certain portion of their capacity to serve God and people? They should do the same thing, they should not tolerate a further fall, knowing that such tolerance does not liberate them from temptation, but only strengthens it, and they should still continue to aspire towards an ever increased chastity for the possibility of fuller a service of God and people.

What are people to do when the struggle overpowers them and they fall? They should look at their own fall not as a lawful pleasure, as it is now seen, when it is justified by the ceremony of marriage. Neither should they see it as a fleeting pleasure which it

is possible to repeat with others, nor as a misfortune, when the fall is accomplished with unequals and without a ceremony, but should look at this first fall as having contracted an indissoluble marriage.

Marriage, with the consequence that attends it, the birth of children, defines, for those entering into it, a new, more limited form of service to God and people. Until marriage takes place, a person can spontaneously, and in the most varied forms, be of service to God and people; entering into marriage limits the sphere of one's activity, obligating one to rear and educate the progeny which result from that marriage, who are future servants of God and people.

What are a man and a woman to do who are living in marriage and fulfilling that limited service of God and people, through the raising and education of children, which follows from their situation?

The same thing as before; they should aspire together towards a liberation from temptation, to purify themselves, and to cease from sinning, to replace relations which impede the universal and private service of God and people, to substitute for carnal love the pure relations of sister and brother.

This is why it is not true that we cannot be guided by the ideal of Christ because it is too lofty, too perfect and unreachable. We are not able to be guided by it only because we lie to ourselves and deceive ourselves.

Of course, if we say that it is necessary to have rules more practicable than the ideal of Christ, or that otherwise, having fallen short of the ideal of Christ, we will fall into depravity, we are not saying that the ideal of Christ is too high for us, but only that we do not believe in it, and do not want to define our behavior according to this ideal.

Saying that having fallen once we fall into depravity, we of course are only saying by this that we have already decided in advance that falling with one who is not an equal is not a sin, but is an amusement, an entertainment, for which it is unnecessary to make amends through that which we call marriage. If we had understood that the fall is a sin which should and can be redeemed only by the indissolubility of marriage and with the full activity which results from the upbringing of children born from that marriage, then the fall could in no way be the reason for sinking into debauchery.

Of course this is just as if a farmer did not consider the seeds he planted in one place which failed to grow as seeds at all, but having sown in a second and third place, considered only the seeds which produced a yield to be real seeds. Obviously, this is a man who had spoiled a great deal of land and seed without learning how to sow. Only when chastity is set as the ideal, and one recognizes that each fall, no matter with whom it took place, is a unique marriage that remains indissoluble for life, will it become clear that the guidance given by Christ is not only sufficient, but is the only one possible.

People say, "Human beings are weak, it is necessary to give them a task in accordance with their strength." This is like saying: "My hands are weak, and I can't draw a straight line, that is, the shortest between two points. This is why I have to go

easy on myself. So, rather than drawing a straight line as I would like to do, I will take as my model a crooked or broken one."

The weaker my hand, the more necessary is a perfect model.

It is impossible, once one is acquainted with the Christian teaching of the ideal, to act as though we do not know it, and to replace it with external precepts. The Christian teaching of the ideal has been revealed to humanity because it especially can guide us in the present age. Humanity has already outgrown the period of external religious injunctions, and no one believes in them any longer.

The Christian teaching of the ideal is the only teaching that can guide humanity. It is impossible to replace the ideal of Christ with external rules; rather it is necessary to firmly hold this ideal before oneself in all its purity, and above all to believe in it.

It is possible to say to the person navigating not far from shore, "Steer by that rise, that promontory, that tower" and so forth.

But the time is coming when the navigators have moved away from shore and only the motionless stars and compass should and can serve as a guide, showing direction they should follow. Both have been given to us.

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

THE TWAIN SHALL BE OF ONE MIND: TOLSTOY IN "LEAG" WITH ELIZA BURNZ AND HENRY PARKHURST

WILLIAM NICKELL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

In October, 1890, Tolstoy received a letter from America, printed on the stationery of the "New School of Fonografy" and "Spelling Reform Rooms" of New York City, informing him of the following: "Since your work *The Kreutzer Sonata* appeared in America, many people say '*Diana* explains, fulfills, and renders possible the theories of Tolstoy.'" A booklet entitled *Diana, a psycho-fyziological essay on sexual relations for married men and women* was enclosed with the letter for Tolstoy's perusal. Acknowledging receipt of the pamphlet, Tolstoy reported to its publishers that he had written "a small article on its contents" and gave his conditional approval of the presented doctrine: "Although I do not agree with all your views, as you can see from my epilogue to the «Son[ata of] Cr[eutzer]», I find your work very useful and thank you again for communicating it to me." (Tolstoy, PSS LXV, 181)¹ Considering *Diana* to be evidence of the world-wide support for his program for universal chastity, Tolstoy had indeed reviewed the booklet's contents in an article entitled "*Ob otnoshenii mezhdu polami*" ("On the Relations Between the Sexes"),² which was published in the popular weekly *Nedelia*. Included at the end of *Diana* was "A Private Letter to Parents, Fyzicians and Men-Principals of Schools," which Tolstoy singled out for especial praise, paying it the ultimate compliment of translating it himself, and further seeking to get the piece published in a journal. Thus Tolstoy formed an alliance with Eliza Burnz, author of the "Private Letter" and publisher of *Diana*, and with the anonymous author of *Diana*, later to emerge as Henry Parkhurst.

His initial enthusiasm for the pamphlet, however, was soon countered by doubt and anxiety; as Tolstoy suggested in his reply, *Diana's* program of highly sublimated sensualism was not entirely in accord with the views he had expressed in "*The Kreutzer Sonata*" and its "Postlude," where he had argued against sexual gratification in any form. Parkhurst rejected such stern ascetic principles because he considered them impracticable, and presented an alternative whereby he believed sexual desire could be satisfied through the sublimations of a delicately controlled intimacy--both spiritual and physical. Though *Diana's* advocates believed this program "rendered possible" the practice of abstinence, the satisfactions which it proposed were ultimately unacceptable to Tolstoy. At first he attempted simply to edit out this aspect of the Dianic theory, as he indicated in a letter to A.M. Kalmykova: "В «Диане» есть многое нехорошее, я выбрал то, что, по мне, было хорошо." ("There is much in *Diana* that isn't good; I selected what, in my opinion, was good.") (PSS LXV, 183) His principle of selection, however, did not prove reliable.

¹ The English is Tolstoy's.

² A translation of Tolstoy's "On the Relations Between the Sexes" and Eliza Burnz' letter follow this article.

Tolstoy was later to regret his involvement with *Diana*, fearing that he had not entirely achieved his ends in obscuring its latent sensualism.

Tolstoy was not alone in being confounded by the vagaries of Parkhurst's language; as Parkhurst himself later lamented, "the first edition of 'Diana' had hardly been printed, before it was discovered that the book was liable to misinterpretation." ("Why I Wrote Diana," 8) Parkhurst admitted to difficulty in translating his theories "into conventional language" and confessed that the danger of misapprehension persisted even after attempts to clarify his ideas in later editions.⁽⁸⁾ The novelty of his ideas, which somehow manage to border on both hedonism and asceticism, combined with the elliptical language in which they are described (necessitated by the relatively conservative standards of contemporary discourse), indeed produce a significant potential for misunderstanding. The author's long-standing anonymity, a ruse to which Burnz also resorted (she signed her name "SAXON" in early editions of the pamphlet), only deepened the mystery surrounding the text.

In order to clarify *Diana's* theory, it may be helpful to consider the historical context that produced the pamphlet. American sexual radicalism of the late 19th century is full of eccentricities of the sort characteristic of the social margins which sexual reformers were bound to occupy in that conservative era; Eliza Burnz and Henry Parkhurst, for instance, had no professional training in the field of "fyziology," but had instead made careers as stenographers. Parkhurst was also an inventor and astronomer, while Burnz headed the Leag for Short Spelling (according to whose rules *Diana* was itself printed, as the reader will note below in passages quoted from the text). The idiom in which they spoke of sexual reform was one influenced by an admixture of Spiritualism, communalism, Fourierism, phonography, free love and free speech.

THE AMERICANS: UTOPIAN SEXUALITY IN LATE 19TH CENTURY AMERICA

The unexpected connection between orthography and sexual reform was a result of the introduction of Isaac Pitman's newly developed shorthand method, known as phonography, to an American audience by Stephen Andrews. A radical Fourierist with a pocketful of social reforms in mind, Andrews began utilizing the new orthography in publishing the *Propagandist*, a journal for phonographers which served in large, however, as an organ for Andrews' political views. Henry Parkhurst and Eliza Burnz, counted among his converts to this new method of orthography, would both later display a similar combination of reformist zeal and utopian practicality. Pitman's shorthand system acquired a utopian mien in America, as its advocates saw in it the potential to create a universal writing system that would help to eliminate social boundaries.³ Parkhurst and Theron C. Leland were fellow Fourierists who joined Andrews in promulgating the new writing system, and lessons in phonography are known to have been given at Brook Farm,

³Several of them, including Andrews and Parkhurst, developed their own universal language systems. Andrews' system was called Alwato and is outlined in his *Basic Outline of Universology* (1872).

the well-known Massachusetts commune which adopted a Fourieran program in 1844.⁴ (Guarneri, 286)

In 1850 Andrews joined with yet another typographical enthusiast, Josiah Warren, inventor of the stereotype method of printing, in the organization of Modern Times, a new communal society on Long Island, New York. Warren, an anarchist who had participated in Robert Owen's commune at New Harmony, was concerned primarily with establishing equitable economic relations in the community ("cost the limit of price" was his dictum); Andrews had broader goals in mind, and his propagandizing in the New York papers for "individual sovereignty" and an end to marriage brought to the commune a crowd of followers interested in extending egalitarian principles into the realm of sexual relations.⁵ Within a short period, Modern Times gained notoriety as a center for "free love," a reputation which was reinforced in 1853 by the arrival of Thomas and Mary Nichols, associates of Andrews whose *Nichols Journal* was a mouthpiece for anti-marriage fulminations. According to Thomas Nichols, at Modern Times "Those lived together who chose to do so... The right of the law either to unite or separate was denied, and free love was placed in the same category with all other freedom." (Nichols, 2:42) To Warren's dismay, the Nicholises, in focusing attention on the sexual practices of the commune, brought little more than scandal to the new community, which was under the constant scrutiny of a New York press eager to sensationalize its practices. (Wunderlich, 72-83) A group of New York phonographers--a classification which both Burnz and Parkhurst would have fit at this time--is said to have participated in the commune.

Modern Times was not the only New York community making waves because of its sexual orientation. The most famous of these experimental living arrangements had been established at Oneida, New York, by John Humphrey Noyes in 1848. Noyes founded his commune on the principal of "complex marriage," whereby traditional dyadic sexual relationships were abolished in favor of communal sexual companionship, according to which all members were, with a few exceptions, to make themselves equally available to others for sexual relations.⁶ Crucial to the viability of such relations was the practice of what Noyes referred to as "male continence" (more commonly known by the Latin term

⁴ Charles Fourier's (1772-1837) writings represent one of the major philosophical sources for the ideas that concern us here. He argued for the rational utilization of human desire--as passions ruled the intellect and the body, they should therefore be appropriated into a utilitarian system of governing behavior. The proper society for the fostering of this rationality was the phalanx, a community of 1620 members who would peaceably divide labor and profit according to their natural inclinations. Fourierism was modified and popularized in the United States by Albert Brisbane (with the help of Horace Greeley and the New York *Tribune*) and became the ideological foundation for a number of American communes in the 1840's and 1850's. The popularity of Fourier's ideas was soon eclipsed by that of other social philosophies, and the phalanxes (whose participants were derisively called 'four-year-ites') disappeared by the mid-1850's. (Guarneri, 2-3)

⁵ Andrews is famous as well for his polemic (published in the New York *Tribune* in the 1850's) with Horace Greeley and Henry James Sr., both of whom were also Fourierists. Andrews' was the most liberal voice in the debate, calling for immediate abolition of marriage.

⁶ The chief exception being those males who had not yet mastered Noyes' technique of "male continence" (described below), who were allowed to have relations only with post-menopausal women.

coitus reservatus), wherein the male partner was to engage in sexual intercourse without ejaculating. Noyes firmly attested that this practice could be mastered to the satisfaction of both partners and did not demand "unfulfilling" relations. The legacy of Noyes' pamphlet, "Male Continence," was to outlast the Oneida community itself, as variations on his doctrine became a principle feature in numerous subsequent sexual reform programs.⁷

As suggested by its title, the onus of behavioral modification and self-control fell primarily upon the male partner, who was to avoid the danger, to both the woman and the community (which was initially in economic difficulties and could not support newborn members), of unwanted pregnancy. Noyes advocated *coitus reservatus*, as opposed to the *coitus interruptus* proposed by Robert Dale Owen⁸, because he saw benefit in the retention of the male ejaculate. Popular belief had held for some time that such retention was, on the contrary, injurious. Eliza Burnz would still feel compelled to address this issue some thirty years later in her "Private Letter". The subject of male ejaculation was, in fact, a locus of confusion and contention at the time, raising not only the question of the advisability of "unnecessary expulsion" (related to age-old anxieties over "spilling the seed"), but also that of the fate of unexpelled sperm. Some thought that this sperm was "absorbed," for better or for worse, back into the body. Speculation on this topic was to continue for years; Henry Parkhurst would later take issue with Noyes' practice because he believed that stimulation of "the generative function of the sexual batteries," even if not leading to ejaculation, wasted sperm (which was presumably absorbed internally) and "divert[ed] the sexual batteries from their affectional function..." (*Diana* 16)

Parkhurst's distinction between the generative and affectional functions became common to American utopian sex doctrines of the late 19th century. Noyes initiated the distinction to separate his mode of sexual intercourse from the licentious: "The separation of the amative from the propagative, places amative sexual intercourse on the same footing with other ordinary forms of social interchange." (Noyes, 15-16). A similar distinction had been made by Robert Dale Owen in his birth control manual *Moral Physiology* (1830). Adopting the terms of 19th century phrenologists (assigning certain behavioral propensities to certain portions of the brain), these writers dissociated sexuality from that procreative aspect which many of their contemporaries viewed as its only valid function. While non-propagative intercourse could be denigrated as sinful by their conservative opponents, the reformers believed that sexuality had a secondary, social significance, and saw in highly sublimated sexual relations the embryo of their utopian ideals.

Many, indeed, believed that sexuality was a means of attaining much more than mere physical satisfaction. James W. Towner, a Universalist minister who had become

⁷ "Male Continence" went through four editions between 1849 and 1872; Oneida, which was founded in 1848, abandoned its communal program in 1881.

⁸ Not to be confused with his father, Robert Owen (1771-1858), the wealthy Briton who funded numerous communal ventures, including New Harmony in Indiana, one of the more successful 19th c. communes. Robert Dale Owen (1801-1877) was also involved in the commune, and in 1830 became the first public advocate of birth control in the United States.

a free love advocate at Berlin Heights, Ohio, and later a Perfectionist at Oneida, claimed that "all Free Lovers, with rare exceptions, are Spiritualists." (Ellis (a.k. Towner), 423) Nineteenth century Spiritualism, known primarily for its sensational table-tapping seances which brought communication with the dead, carried implications for the living as well. Once it had been shown that the spirit world could be reached, it seemed that human interrelations could, and should, be wrought upon a higher, spiritual plane. Rather than seeking a mate for propagative purposes, spiritualists searched for "soul mates," and often moved from partner to partner seeking such "spiritual affinities." (Stoehr, 35) This same tendency can be discerned in the writings of the sex reformers, who described the sublimating effect of their programs that spiritualizes the most earthly of human rituals and liberates humanity from the bonds of sexual transgression.⁹ If sexuality could be separated from its purely physical, procreative function, as Noyes and Owen had suggested, then its exaltations could be related to more sublime, metaphysical ends.

There was also a more practical side to the desire to reform sexual relations, stemming from concern over very real social problems which were exacerbated under the conditions of American industrialized society. The subtitle of Parkhurst's tract, "A psycho-fyziological essay for married men and women," reflects the increasing encroachment of medical (and pseudo-medical) science upon the privacy of the individual. Contraceptive methods, aimed at preventing unwanted pregnancy and seen as a valuable tool in dealing with the newly-developing problem of overpopulation, also transformed the discourse surrounding sexual relations. Some early purveyors of contraceptives, such as T. Nichols and E.B. Foote, published books and popular journals as a means of proselytizing for their merchandise, and thus began to popularize a literature that had previously been the esoteric domain of medical professionals. Health enthusiasts such as Sylvester Graham toured the country presenting a series of popular lectures endorsing a daily regimen and dietary prescriptions which aimed, among other things, to eliminate childhood masturbation and improve marital relations.

The linking of these private matters to the general health of the individual, as well as to issues of public health, engendered a more holistic understanding of the significance of sexuality. Drs. Caroline Winslow and Alice Stockham, correspondents of Tolstoy's (see below) were clearly motivated by their experiences as physicians in their efforts to reform the sexual practices which brought so many of their patients to them. Likewise Henry Parkhurst's and Eliza Burnz's reformist zeal was stimulated by their professional experience documenting courtroom testimonies describing the unhappy consequences of sexual relations. Eugenicists (among whom Parkhurst can again be counted) also emerged as spokespersons for a greater selectivity in breeding, which likewise implied reform in the economy of sexual relations. Once under the exclusive rule of the Church and State, sexuality now came under the public scrutiny of a variety of sources which offered all manner of unconventional alternatives to the understanding and practice of sexual relations within and without marriage.

The proponents of these alternatives were not able to undermine the conservative

⁹ See, for instance, the quote from Alice Stockham's *Karezza* below.

reticence on sexual matters without a challenge. Anthony Comstock's censorial reign over the public display and distribution of "obscene" materials, attempted to restrict the liberalization of discourse on sexuality.¹⁰ Despite such efforts, by the time *Diana* was set in type at Burnz's New York publishing office new approaches to sexuality were in the process of being "absorbed" from these cultural margins into the mainstream; Parkhurst's tract was not a program for a Fourierist phalanstery, but was instead intended for "ordinary men and women." In fact, Parkhurst and Burnz were members of a circle of reformers who braved the penalties of the Comstock laws in order to make their various programs for sexual reform known to the general public. Besieged by "Comstockism," they worked tirelessly against his marginalizing pressure. It is not surprising that, in an effort to circulate their ideas more broadly, this group of reformers turned to Lev Tolstoy, who was not only sympathetic to their views, but who also commanded an immense audience.

TOLSTOY'S AMERICAN "COLLEAGUES"

In a letter dated October 23, 1890, some two weeks after Eliza Burnz provided Tolstoy with a copy of *Diana*, Dr. Caroline Winslow sent to Yasnaya Polyana the previous year's edition of *Alpha*, as well as a number of other publications produced by the Moral Education Society of Washington D.C. One of the first American woman doctors, Winslow was head of this Society and edited *Alpha*, which served as its mouthpiece. She reported to Tolstoy, that, as editor of the paper, she had "contended for the right of the unborn child to a proper endowment of health, peace and beauty, and for the recognition of the law of continence except for procreation in marriage." Recognizing a kindred spirit in the author of *The Kreutzer Sonata*, Winslow urged Tolstoy, whom she believed to hold "the largest audience of any living writer," to write another work showing the way out of the dismal situation he had portrayed in Pozdnyshv's story. Winslow herself was always quick to document cases of sexual excess and abuse, and championed the liberation of women from all of the untoward effects of unwanted sexual activity and pregnancy. Tolstoy responded approvingly to *Alpha*, and instructed his daughter Masha to write

¹⁰ Comstock (1844-1915) organized the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, and was the stimulus for state and national obscenity legislation. He often became personally involved in the Society's investigations and sting operations, ruthlessly pursuing his enemies in a vendetta-like fashion similar to that which was later to mark the career of J. Edgar Hoover. His pigeonholing of the work of early sexologists as obscenity sent many of them to jail (see below), and explains the reluctance of Henry Parkhurst to sign his name to *Diana*.

The American translation of *The Kreutzer Sonata* was itself banned from distribution through the mails under the "Comstock laws." Much to his embarrassment, the translator, Benjamin Tucker, had spoken out in 1890 against liberal opposition to Comstock's laws, only to find his own translation censored under a Post Office Department ban. (Sears, 250-1)

Winslow, asking her for references to other material of a similar vein.¹¹ (See Appendix for her reply.) It is not known if Tolstoy was aware that the "Alphism" which gave the journal its name was the same practice which Parkhurst was revising in *Diana* (seeking to make it more palatable by tending to the physical satisfaction of the abstaining partners). He did at least recognize the affinity of Winslow's views with Parkhurst's, however, for in sending *Diana* to A.M. Kalmykova in November of 1890, he included several of the Moral Education Society's publications, indicating that they were "of the same orientation" (того же направления). (PSS LXV, 183)

In the margins of her first letter to Tolstoy, Winslow wrote "I have neglected to say I am a friend of Dr. Alice Stockham of 40 years standing."¹² Alice Stockham was perhaps the first of the American sex reformers to come into contact with Tolstoy. She will no doubt be familiar to a number of readers as the author of *Tokology* (1883), the maternity handbook which was translated into Russian and published under Tolstoy's supervision (1892). One of the chapters in *Tokology* was in fact devoted to "Chastity in the Marriage Relations," as Stockham believed that sexual relations during pregnancy were injurious both to the mother and to the unborn child. It was this chapter in particular that captured Tolstoy's attention when he read the English text in November of 1888. As he wrote to Chertkov:

"О брачной жизни я много думал и думаю, и, как всегда бывало со мной, как я о чем начинаю думать серьезно, так извне меня подстрекают и мне помогают. Третьего дня я получил из Америки книгу одной женщины доктора (она писала мне) под заглавием: «Tokology, a book for every Woman», by Alice Stockham, M.d. (sic) Книгу вообще превосходную, но главное, трактующую в одной главе о том самом предмете, о котором мы с вами переписывались, и решающую вопрос, разумеется, в том же смысле, как и мы. Радостно видеть, что вопрос давно поднят, и научные авторитеты решают его в том же смысле."

("I have thought and am thinking a great deal about married life, and, as it has always been with me, as I begin to think seriously about something, people prompt me from outside and help me. Three days ago I received from America a book by a woman doctor (she wrote to me) under the title: *Tokology, a book for every Woman*," by Alice Stockham, M.d. (sic) A magnificent book in general, but most importantly, dealing in one chapter with that very same question about which we wrote each other, and deciding it, of course, in the same way that we did. It is pleasing to see that the question has long been raised, and that scientific authorities are deciding it in the same way.") (PSS LXXXVI, 188)

Tolstoy wrote to Stockham as well, advising her that sexual relations "without the wish and possibility of having children are worse than prostitution and onanism, and in fact are

¹¹ See his diary entry of Oct. 30, 1890. Tolstoy's approval of Winslow's views is further indicated by his recommendation and forwarding of her material to E.A. Pokrovsky and A.M. Kalmykova in November of that year. (See his letters of Nov. 5 & 17, 1890.)

¹² Winslow and Stockham attended the same medical school at the Eclectic College in Cincinnati, Ohio. Winslow is registered as the 5th woman to become a physician in the United States.

both." (PSS LXIV, 202) Tolstoy proclaimed that *Tokology* was "not only for women, but for mankind," which was in need of enlightenment "especially in the matter treated in your book in chapter XI." (202)

Although Stockham was to collaborate with Tolstoy on the Russian translation of her book, she herself did not entirely agree with Tolstoy's condemnation of non-propagative sexual relations. She instead supported the practice of *coitus reservatus*. *Karezza* (1896), a short book in the genre of *Diana*, is a demystification of an earlier passage in *Tokology* concerning "sedular absorption." In *Karezza*, Stockham endorses the principles of male continence as established by Noyes and his nephew George Noyes Miller,¹³ mixed with elements from the theories of Henry Parkhurst and Eliza Burnz.¹⁴ She in fact shares the anti-intercourse bias of the latter two authors (as opposed to Noyes and Miller), as she believes that, using the methods of *Karezza*, intercourse should occur but every few weeks or, even better, every three or four months. Stockham further advocated equal reserve for both partners, as the female was to stop short of orgasm just as was the male.

While thus delimiting the physical pleasures of sex, she on the other hand increased the promise of spiritual reward. The erotic sublimation of carnal love reaches new heights in Stockham's description of intercourse:

Approaching the event, expressions of endearment and affection, accompanying general bodily contact, is [sic] followed by the complete but quiet union of the male and female organs. During a lengthy period of perfect control, the whole being of each is submerged in the other, and an exquisite exaltation experienced. This may be followed by a quiet motion, entirely under full subordination of the will, so that at no time the thrill of passion for either party will go beyond a pleasurable exchange... In the course of an hour the physical tension subsides, the spiritual exaltation increases, and not uncommonly visions of a transcendent life are seen and consciousness of new powers experienced." (Stockham, *Karezza*, 23-24)¹⁵

Stockham was perhaps aware that her views would not be received well by Tolstoy;

¹³Miller followed his utopian novel *The Strike of a Sex* (1890), in which women give men the choice of continence or abstinence, with a second novel, *After the Sex Struck, or, Zugassent's Discovery* (1895). "Zugassent's Discovery" is none other than the practice of male continence. Alice Stockham distributed both of Miller's books before making her own contribution to the literature with *Karezza*.

¹⁴ Stockham quotes her predecessors liberally--a full two pages, for instance, are lifted verbatim from Burnz's "Private Letter" without proper citation.

¹⁵ This extraordinary passage suggests the possible influence of Ida Craddock, another phonographer/sex reformer, who is not considered here because she had no correspondence with Tolstoy. Craddock maintained a relationship with a heavenly bridegroom, who "can adapt himself to her most delicate fluctuations of sentiment at a moment's warning, and so never fails to be truly her companion." (*Heavenly Bridegrooms*, NY, 1918, p. 121). In the 1890's she quit phonography and dedicated herself wholly to sexual studies, in which she saw three levels of progression toward "Borderland wedlock": beginning with *Alpha*, then following with *Diana* as a transition to *Zugassent's Discovery*, then ending with "psychic wedlock," or union with the Divine. Orgasm without ejaculation brought contact with the "Ultimate Force as the third partner in a sex union." She was celibate, as she believed was required in order to be presentable to her heavenly bridegroom.

though she had maintained her correspondence with him after their partnership working on *Tokology*, and had sent him her 1893 book, *Koradine Letters*, with its supplement "Creative Life: a special letter to young girls" (of which Tolstoy again approved), there is no record of Tolstoy ever having encountered *Karezza*.¹⁶

Stockham was frequently censored under the Comstock laws, including an occasion when another of Tolstoy's correspondents, Moses Harman, attempted to publish passages from *Tokology* in his radical periodical *Lucifer, the Light Bearer*. This latter journal dealt with all manner of radical economic and political ideas, but proclaimed in its masthead that its specialty was "Sexology, or Sexologic Science, believing this to be the Most Important

¹⁶Despite the ultimate disjunction of their views, Stockham's influence on Tolstoy deserves further consideration; Tolstoy's acquaintance with her ideas is coincidental with his first labors on "The Kreutzer Sonata," which continued throughout the period of his assistance in the publication of the Russian translation of *Tokology*. This relationship is explored in the article by Robert Edwards, "Tolstoy and Alice B. Stockham: The Influence of 'Tokology' on The Kreutzer Sonata," in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal*. When Stockham visited Yasnaya Polyana in late 1889, however, it was her spiritualism that fascinated Tolstoy. Of Quaker upbringing, Stockham piqued his curiosity about American sectarianism; Tolstoy made a list of important American sects in his diary, many of which are noted for unconventional sexual practices, and wrote to his daughter Tatiana that "М. Stockham очень мне была полезна, не в медиц[инском], а в религиозном, в сведениях о религиозном движении в Америке, к[оторым] она сама занята" ("М. Stockham was very useful to me, not in a medical, but in a religious [way], in providing information about the religious movement in America, with which she is herself occupied") (Tolstoy, PSS LXIV, 312). Interestingly enough, Tolstoy made the following comment in his diary: "Сток[ам] очень мила--спиритуалистка совершенно того духа, кот[опоро] W[orld] Adv[ance] Thought. Очень это интересно. Вера в связь с миром духов приводит их к истине." ("Stockham is very kind--a spiritualist of exactly the same spirit as World Advance Thought. This is very interesting. Belief in a connection to the world of spirits leads them toward the truth.") (Tolstoy, PSS L, 152-3). He was to praise this tendency again in his reading of *Koradine Letters*, as he wrote to Chertkov: На днях я получил книгу «Koradine Letters». Это мысли о назначении женщины и о духовном лечении, и к книге есть supplement, которое мне очень понравилось «Creative Life». Мысль этой брошюры, обращенной к женщинам и девушкам, --но она также относится и к мужчинам, --та, что в известный период в человек проявляется как бы сверх обыкновенная энергия. Она называет это «Creative power life» -- творческая сила, и человек стремится приложить ее. Половое приложение --низшее. Человек, почувствовав эту силу, должен знать, что ему нужно, и он может творить, и должен тотчас же прикладывать к делу эту творческую силу: строить дом, садить сад, лес, учить, писать, делать что-нибудь новое, чего не было. Я думаю, что это правда, даже отчасти испытал это. Трудность тут для нас только в том, чтобы сбить эту творческую силу с того пути, к которому она привыкла, и наладить на новый. ("Several days ago I received a book *Korradine Letters*. The idea of this brochure, on the calling of women and young girls--but it applies just as well to men--is that in a certain period there arises in a person some greater than usual energy. She calls this "Creative power life"--a creative power, which one strives to apply. The sexual application is lower. Feeling this energy, a person should know what he needs and that he can create, and should at once put this energy to use: build a home, plant a garden or forest, study, write, do something new, whatever it may be. I think this is true, and have even experienced it to some degree. The only difficulty for us is to turn that creative energy away from its usual avenues and to set it upon a new one.) (PSS LXXXVII, 227)

of all Sciences...."¹⁷ Harman was a longstanding and outspoken champion of free speech and radicalism whose publishing efforts spanned thirty years, evolving from early free love newspapers (*Valley Falls Liberal* and *Kansas Liberal*) into the more expansive *Lucifer* and *American Journal of Eugenics*. In 1908, Harman began sending copies of the latter journal to Yasnaya Polyana, and wrote to Tolstoy several months later inquiring as to whether he wished to continue receiving the subscription. It is not at this point known whether or not Tolstoy ever read Harman's journal, but if he did, he might have noticed his own *Kreutzer Sonata* offered for sale in "Lucifer's Book List," alongside *Diana* and *Karezza*.¹⁸

Lucifer had in fact been a sounding board for discussions of the various merits of revisionist sexologies. A frequent contributor was Elmina Slenker, a colleague of Henry Parkhurst and the leading spokesperson for "Dianism" in the years when Parkhurst was still maintaining his anonymity as author of the text. Slenker's praises of Dianism appeared regularly in Harman's journal, as did the comments of other readers, both pro and con.¹⁹ Tolstoy's own contribution to the discussion of Dianism was in fact printed in translation in *Lucifer* as "What Diana Teaches," an off-print of which was subsequently made available to readers through the "Book List."²⁰ Later in the 1890's, Henry Parkhurst contributed regularly to *Lucifer*, including a weekly column of "Sociologic Lessons" discussing the fundamentals of political economy.

¹⁷ Harman's daughter Lillian, 17, "married" Edwin Walker in a free love ceremony that was much publicized in *Lucifer*, after which they were arrested and imprisoned. Walker, who lived in New York and served as Advertising Director and Eastern Representative to the journal, wrote one of the "commendations" of *Diana* which appeared at the front of later editions of the pamphlet. (Similar prefatory comment was contributed by another contributor to *Lucifer*, the utopian novelist and anarchist J. William Lloyd, who later wrote, after Stockham's, another *Karezza*. Lloyd's *Karezza*, which is evidently still in print, is devoted fully to the goal of increased pleasure.)

¹⁸ Harman had from the mid-1880's offered a variety of radical political and literary works for sale, including Russian authors such as Bakunin, Chernyshevsky and Dostoevsky. (Sears, 48) An ardent humanist, Harman dated his publications according to the chronology adopted at the St. Louis Liberal convention of 1882, in which E.M. (Era of Man) became the designation for the period beginning in 1600, when Giordano Bruno was burned at the stake for claiming that other solar systems existed. (Sears, 49)

¹⁹ See for example No. 661 of June 2, 1897. Slenker is more emphatic in her praises than Parkhurst: "Male continence, religious chastity(!), priestly celibacy(!) nunneries, etc., etc.; but at last comes the real sovereign and queen, the Goddess Diana, who points a way out of all these innumerable ills [prostitution, etc.], and shows the flower-bordered path of purity, peace and love." Harman himself had reservations about Parkhurst's theories, and printed E.B. Foote's attacks on Alphism and Dianism.

²⁰ The *Kreutzer Sonata* was also subject to a lively discussion in *Lucifer* in the early 1890's. The commentary in *Lucifer* applauded Tolstoy's forthrightness in exposing the depravity of sexual relations; the editors' response to news of the American censorship of Tucker's translation is typical of the journal's free speech bent--"Bravo, Lyof Tolstoi! that a work of yours is considered worthy of inhibition." (VIII, 7, Aug. 8, 1890)

PARKURST AND BURNZ

Were it not for the fact that he was affiliated with Stephen Pearl Andrews, who himself mixed phonography and other practical pursuits with utopian idealism, Henry Parkhurst might seem a very unlikely author of a guide to "psycho-fyziological" relations for married couples. In a biographical sketch written by his son, Parkhurst is presented as an important figure in two fields--phonography and astronomy. He served from 1848 to 1854 as the first phonographic reporter for the United States Senate (during which period Andrews temporarily hired on with Parkhurst as an assistant) and later performed that same service for the Superior Court in New York City. A very energetic man, he was also Professor of Astronomy at the Brooklyn Academy of Arts and Sciences; he further produced a number of inventions of the most varied sort, wrote papers calling for "A New Currency," "Duodecimal Notation," and English language reform, and published two journals, "The Plowshare" and "The American Reporter." As mentioned above, he was involved in the radical circles of New England Fourierists as well, as a member of their Boston Association and a participant at Brook Farm.

Despite his interest and accomplishments in all these fields, Parkhurst wrote in "Why I Wrote Diana" that he regarded his most important work to be in the field of sexual research. His first writings on sexuality were produced as part of a practical exercise, comprising one of several books he wrote in an effort to learn to "think in phonography." The later project that grew into *Diana* was begun as a similar exercise, when, in 1878, Parkhurst decided to teach himself how to type. His desire to learn typing itself stemmed from a sexual issue, as he was attempting to find a way to deal with the reluctance of female amanuenses in his employ to transcribe blunt courtroom testimony on sexual matters:

...occasionally there would be divorce cases, requiring transcription day by day, and not infrequently containing language which refined women were not accustomed to. There are sometimes cases in which it is absolutely necessary...to use the plainest possible words, as well as to give details of criminal sexual acts." ("Why" 4)

The adoption of the typewriter for transcription allowed Parkhurst to type in those passages which his female employees refused to transcribe, without the noticeable change that would have occurred with handwriting. The circumstances under which Parkhurst wrote *Diana* pervade the text itself, as Parkhurst begins the tract by referring to "the records of our courts" as an indication "that the institution of marriage is losing its hold upon the consciences and lives of our people." (8) In his attempt to salvage that institution Parkhurst would display that same deference to women that he had shown in adopting the typewriter, as in *Diana* women were given the regulatory prerogative in the marital bed. The creation of *Diana* is also typical of Parkhurst's pragmatism--sitting down at the typewriter to deal with a practical problem, he tapped out an argument for the reform of those sexual relations which had caused his dilemma. In producing his reform program Parkhurst refers not only to personal experience, however, but also to the work of his American predecessors in sex reform--to Noyes' *Male Continence* and Winslow's *Alpha*

in particular, both of which he believed had proven inadequate to the cause.

As Eliza Burnz is noted in her biographies as one of the first women to work as a stenographer in New York City, and Henry Parkhurst claims to have been the first to employ women in this capacity, it is quite likely that Burnz's contact with Parkhurst initially stemmed from their common professional, rather than reformist, interests. Burnz was another enthusiast of typography and orthography, and worked diligently throughout her life for the advancement of phonography and spelling reform. She printed a number of pamphlets dedicated to these causes, many of which explicated her own method of phonic shorthand. Like Andrews, her interest in phonography emerged from a fascination with Pitman's shorthand method, which she saw as not only a practical device for reporters and secretaries, but also as a valuable educational aid in mastering the English language. More importantly (and again following the footsteps of Andrews), Burnz early on displayed a tendency to combine this practical sensibility with an eye for social reform.²¹ After the Civil War, for instance, she used her phonetic spelling method in a special literacy program for newly-freed slaves. She likewise used her access to printing resources to work for women's rights, serving as editor of *Woman's Advocate*. Burnz herself certainly had no lack of feminist pluck, and her experiences facing the prejudice of her day regarding the capacity of women to engage in public service no doubt heightened her sensitivity to social injustice. Her particular interest in sex reform might also have been fostered by her stenographic duties, where she likely encountered such cases of sexual transgression and infidelity as described by Parkhurst.

It was Burnz's New York publishing house, the vehicle for her phonographic publications as well as headquarters to the "Leag for Short Spelling," that published six editions of *Diana* in the 1880's and 1890's.²² It was Burnz who sent the pamphlet to Tolstoy in 1890 and whose name appeared at the end of the "Private Letter" in the booklet's closing pages. Parkhurst maintained his anonymity as author of *Diana* until shortly before the 6th edition appeared in 1896. His confessional "Why I Wrote Diana," which was appended to the text in this edition, represented his attempt to come to the aid of the aforementioned Elmina Slenker; she had been arrested under the Comstock laws

²¹ A text called "The Reformer" was included in each edition of Eliza Burnz's textbook, which included the following passage: "All history and all experience teach us that new ideas are unpopular with the masses of men, and that those who advance them must expect opposition and persecution... What then is the duty of the reformer? ...he is but an instrument through which the Great Unknown works out his designs and purposes in the world, and his progression as well as his neighbors' conservation is a necessary condition to the exact and orderly working of the universal and ever-persistent law of progress."

²² A tireless advocate of short spelling, Burnz's orthographical rules were printed in the back pages of *Diana*. Her even-handed devotion to both orthographic and sexual reform is further indicated by her second letter to Tolstoy, in which she attempted to interest him in her Step by Step Primer in Pronouncing Print, which would "enabl foreigners to get the correct pronounciation of English words in spite of our barbarous orthografy." (See Appendix.)

The copy of the brochure sent to Tolstoy must have been the 4th edition, published in 1890. Burnz's letter is signed "SAXON" in the third edition, so that Tolstoy could no have identified the author otherwise (referring to it as "письмо Бёрнс").

while gathering input for Parkhurst from readers of his tract.²³ It is for these reasons that *Diana* came to be associated with Burnz's name over the years, a confusion most significant in the case of a 1910 letter of Vladimir Chertkov to Tolstoy, which will be discussed below.

TOLSTOY READS *DIANA*

As stated above, Tolstoy had significant reservations about the theories presented in *Diana*.²⁴ He in fact introduces these reservations into the very text of his article on *Diana*, which he titled "*Ob otnoshenii mezhdu polami*" ("On the Relations between the Sexes"), by suggesting that Parkhurst's text emerged from a "не христианское, а скорее языческое, Платоновское мирозерцание" ("non-Christian, but rather a pagan, Platonic world-view"), a statement which he admitted, in a letter to Chertkov, was a way of shielding himself from blame.²⁵ (*PSS XXVII*, 287) Indeed the tract's very title elicited this distinction, Parkhurst would later point out that he had chosen it because "in the heathen mythology Diana was the goddess of chastity." ("Why" 8) The title is indeed quite appropriate to Parkhurst's pamphlet, as the Roman goddess Diana (identified with the Greek goddess Artemis) was not only a goddess of chastity, but also of fertility and of the forest.²⁶ True to its title, the text does offer a mix of chastity, eugenics and sensuality that in many ways contradicts the stark, uncompromising asceticism of Christian chastity. With Tolstoy's caveat in mind, then, we can consider what elements are particularly troublesome to him, and can further examine how he transforms the text--how it is "Christianized" by the excision of its "pagan" elements, and, more importantly for our concerns, how it is "Tolstoyanized."

As described by Tolstoy, the main point of *Diana* is that sexual relations should

²³Parkhurst's attack on Comstock and the methods used to entrap Elmina Slenker appears in No. 643 of *Lucifer* (Jan. 27, 1897).

²⁴In his correspondence about *Diana*, Tolstoy was always less equivocal about Burnz's "Private Letter" than about the main text. "Еще получил я статью «Диана» из Америки о поло [вых] сношениях и написал изложение ее. Перевести ее всю было бы хуже и перевел приложение к ней письмо." ("I also received an article "Diana" from America on sexual relations and wrote an exposition of it. To translate the whole thing would have been worse--and I translated the letter appended to it.") (*PSS LXXXVII*, 49) "В Диане есть многое нехорошее, а выбрал то, что по мне б[ыло] хорошо. Аисьмо Борис прекрасно." ("There's a lot in Diana that isn't good, and I chose what, in my opinion, was good. Burnz's letter is wonderful.") (*PSS LXV*, 183)

²⁵Статью Дианы я тоже подправлял и в начале вставил место..., в к[отором] я выгораживаю себя и говорю, что хотя основы этой статьи не христианские, а языческие, она все таки может быть очень полезна. (I also touched up the Diana article and inserted a place... where I shield myself [fence myself off] and say that although the basis of the article is not Christian, but pagan, it might still be very useful.)

²⁶In Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Blithedale Romance*, the character Zenobia, representing the "new woman" in the novel's utopian setting, dresses up as the goddess Diana in a forest masquerade. The novel is based on Hawthorne's experiences at Brook Farm, where Henry Parkhurst was also a member.

be directed as much as possible toward spiritual, rather than physical satisfaction, as physical desire tends to supersede the capacity for its fulfillment. Sexual relations comprise "влечение различных полов друг к другу, могущее принимать форму самого духовного общения только мысли, самого животного общения, производящего деторождение, и всех самых различных ступеней между тем и другим." ("the attraction of opposites for one another, capable of assuming the form of the most spiritual union in thought only, or of the most animal union, causing the propagation of children and all those varied degrees of relationship between the one and the other.") (*PSS XXVII*, 287) The attraction between the two polar opposites represented by the sexes is thus marked by a range of modes of expression which is itself delineated by two poles-- the spiritual and physical (or animal). As Parkhurst argues, physical and spiritual relations are mutually effective, so that the satisfaction of desire in one mode reduces desire in the other. Each individual relationship establishes its own ratio of spiritual to physical interaction--however, Parkhurst finds in the range of these interactions not only a quantitative difference (in sexual versus spiritual intercourse), but a qualitative one as well, with the greater value to be found at the spiritual end of the scale:

...чем форма общения ближе к крайнему физическому пределу, тем больше разжигается желание, и тем меньше получается удовлетворения; тем ближе к противоположному крайнему, духовному пределу, тем меньше вызываются новые желания, тем полнее удовлетворение. Чем ближе к первому, тем разрушительнее для жизненной силы; чем ближе к второму, к духовному, тем спокойнее, радостнее и сильнее общее состояние.

...the nearer the form of intercourse approaches the extreme physical boundary, the more it kindles the desire, and the less satisfaction it receives; the nearer it approaches the opposite, spiritual boundary, the less new desires are excited and the greater the satisfaction. The nearer it comes to the first, the more destructive it is to life energy; the nearer it approaches the second, the spiritual, the more serene, the more enjoyable and forceful is the general condition. (*PSS XXVII*, 288)

We can feel Tolstoy's personal enmity toward the physical emerging in these lines, countered by his abiding faith in the power and vitality of ascetic, spiritualized relations. Tolstoy sees in Parkhurst's arguments a legitimation of such relations, as abstinence becomes a quite natural and clearly beneficial pattern of behavior: "...он не только не признает невозможности воздержания, но считает его естественным и необходимым условием разумной половой гигиены как в браке, так и вне его." ("...he not only does not recognize any impossibility in self-restraint, but considers it a natural and indispensable condition of a reasonable system of sexual hygiene in married life and outside of it.") (*PSS XXVII*, 288)

Parkhurst himself, however, does indeed recognize limits to self-restraint, and in fact stresses throughout the text the need to maintain a balance of physical satisfaction. Conspicuously absent from Tolstoy's *Diana* is the sensuality which Parkhurst advocates for marital relations, notwithstanding their ultimately chaste nature. In fact, the Dianic principle which gives the pamphlet its name refers precisely to the practice of sublimation of desire through controlled sexual contact:

In order to secure proper and durable relations between the sexes, it is essential to live in harmony with the law of Alfism.

Abstinence except for procreation

But if that principle is adopted alone, no means being taken to provide for the due exercise of the sexual faculties, it will be likely either to be abandoned or to lead to a life of asceticism. In order to make Alfism practicable for ordinary men and women, another law must be observed:

--Sexual satisfaction from sexual contact

understanding by the term contact, not merely actual physical nude, external contact, but using the term in its more general sense, to include sexual companionship, or even correspondence, bringing the minds into mental contact. The observance of this law will lead to complete and enduring satisfaction in abstinence. (*Diana*, 7)

Parkhurst in fact takes pride in offering his reader this satisfaction, having set forth a program through which chastity does not require deprivation, but instead suggests fulfillment. The tract's title and its epigraph, "*The twain shall be one flesh*" both stress the corporeal, while the author does not renounce the flesh, but admits its powerful beauty:

When the twain become one flesh, they should no longer cherish reserve from each other. People do not know what they lose by seeing the nude only in paintings and in statuary. A picture of a fall of snow, of a tree waving in the wind, or of a foaming cataract may be beautiful; but how much more beautiful is nature herself, where the falling snow, the waving branches, the dashing waters, are in actual motion, making a picture which no art can portray. And so much more beautiful is the nude in action than the lifeless forms of the painter or sculptor. (42)

In light of this value placed on reality over representation, physical contact becomes a necessary part of the rational hygiene of marriage.

When men and their wives can learn to be together, seeing each other, and embracing each other without the intervention of clothing, and to enjoy such caresses disassociated from passionate feelings, there will be little danger that there will ever be such sexual excess between them as to endanger the perpetuity of their mutual attraction." (43)

Such interaction produces a "galvanic satisfaction," whereby the sexual urge is met with a passion-dulling, yet pleasurable response, restoring "the sexual equilibrium in the normal way," and avoiding "amorous excess."²⁷

As Parkhurst describes it, "the principles laid down here consist of a duty and a

²⁷ Parkhurst is somewhat unclear in describing the limits to this contact. While taking issue with Noyes' practice of male continence (because it "stimulates into activity the generative function of the sexual batteries; and this not only causes a wasteful use of sperm, but diverts the sexual batteries from their affectional function, diminishing amative attraction"), he nevertheless offers an ambiguous conclusion: "Experience in each individual case can alone determine what form of external sexual contact will afford the highest satisfaction..." (18)

privilege; the duty of abstinence except for procreation, and the privilege of sexual satisfaction from sexual contact." (45) Attempts to fulfill the Alphy duty without resort to this privilege, however, are ill-fated--Parkhurst maintains that the ascetic impulse, when not balanced with the proper portion of satisfaction, is a danger to the health and longevity of a marriage and its individual partners. Sexual interaction, in all its various guises, is "an important element of our natural sensibility," and in fact fulfills and improves men and women. (22) When properly controlled, the sexual impulse provides a "helthful action," and the "sexual batteries" (testicles and ovaries) generate a vital power "which makes the perfect man, more noble than the eunuch." (22, 9) As Parkhurst was to say later in "Why I Wrote *Diana*," theories which relied only on repression met "with constant failures from the neglect to cultivate and to satisfy the physical sex nature." ("Why", 8) The idea of sexual continence "had been taught as a moral principle only, to be obeyed as a sacrifice; whereas, *Diana* teaches it also as a physical principle, the violation of which is a sacrifice." (7) The Dianic principle, in other words, was based in a pragmatic reconciliation with the physical laws with which ascetics had struggled for so long, and was believed by Parkhurst, in fact, to represent a means of optimizing physical satisfaction.

At first glance it would seem that this regimen of rational control of physical desire might indeed have prevented Pozdnyshev's fall. He had, after all, pointed to unbridled sensuality as the source of the enmity between himself and his wife: "Влюбленность истощилась удовлетворением чувственности, и остались мы друг против друга в нашем действительном отношении друг к другу, то есть два совершенно чуждые друг другу эгоиста, желающие получить себе как можно больше удовольствия один через другого." ("Love was exhausted by sensual satisfactions, and we were left facing each other in our true relation, that is as two egotists, completely alien to one another, desiring to achieve as much pleasure as we could from one another.") (PSS XXVII, 32) Parkhurst would maintain that this animosity could have been avoided through controlled, "galvanizing" sexual contact and spiritual intimacy. Tolstoy, however, took a more pessimistic view. While in *Diana* it is assumed that couples "can learn to be together, seeing each other, and embracing each other without the intervention of clothing, and to enjoy such caresses *disassociated from passionate feelings*," Tolstoy maintains no such Noyesian trust of the body. The "Postlude to the Kreutzer Sonata" offers no safe haven--even before sexual maturity--for excursions into sensuality, the dangers of which emerge in the everyday practices of bourgeois society:

Наряды, чтения, зрелища, музыка, танцы, сладкая пища, вся обстановка жизни, от картинок на коробках до романов и повестей и поэм, еще более разжигает чувственность, и вследствие этого самые ужасные половые пороки и болезни делаются обычными условиями выращивания детей обоего пола и часто остаются и в зрелом возрасте.

(Costumes, reading, entertainments, music, dances, sweets, the whole setting of life, from pictures on boxes to novels, stories and poems, inflames sensuality even more, as a result of which the most horrible sexual vices and diseases become the normal conditions for the maturation of children of both sexes, and often endure into maturity as well.) (PSS XXVII, 82)

This list of anathemas, extending far beyond the bedroom door, provides a striking contrast to the frolicking encouraged by Parkhurst. The mind is never to relax in its struggle to overcome the desires of the body, and the program of corrective labor which is to keep it properly occupied offers no place for Dianic diversions. Romantic love and all its "poetry" only distracts men and women from the true duties incumbent upon them in their most productive years, during which they should be occupied with their true life's work (labors to improve humanity). Non-propagative sexual relations and the mechanisms allowing such relations are rejected because they free people "от забот и трудов о детях, служащих искуплением плотской любви." ("from cares and labors over children, which serve as the expiation of carnal love.") (XXVII, 81)

Parkhurst's justification for sexual contact is based in assumptions which Tolstoy did not accept; that, though in need of reform, marriage is a worthy and redeemable institution, and that sexual behavior should be codified in accordance with observable and unimpeachable physical laws. For Tolstoy, the only inviolable laws are spiritual, and are derived from the teachings of Christ. The moral imperative of chastity was presented in Matthew 19:12, when Christ answered a question about marriage by referring to "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven," adding, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." Tolstoy was very literal in interpreting this passage, and was uncompromising in arguing for its fulfillment, even if this were to mean the end of generations of humankind. As he had argued in the "The Kreutzer Sonata" and its "Postlude," the birth of new generations was merely a "safety valve," a cycle of second chances in which the ultimate goal was always the victory over the body and its sensual temptations.²⁸ Thus marriage was viewed only as the "next best" alternative to a life of chastity and uncompromised spirituality. The veracity of this stark ideal is proved by its very incommensurability with human nature and the physical world: "Идеал только тогда идеал, когда осуществление его возможно только в идее, в мысли, когда он представляется достижимым только в бесконечности и когда поэтому возможность приближения к нему --бесконечна." ("An ideal is only an ideal, then, when its realization is possible only as an idea, in thought--when it seems achievable only in eternity and when, for this reason, the possibility of approaching it is eternal.") (PSS XXVII, 84) Reconciliation with the body was therefore antithetical to Tolstoy's approach to the dilemma represented in sexuality; admitting the power of the body, he was nonetheless unwilling to assign it authority over the spirit.

Thus the basic premises of Tolstoy's chastity program are radically different from Parkhurst's, emerging from an acceptance of human imperfectability that contravenes Parkhurst's rationalist reformism. Tolstoy's impulse toward chastity is ascetic in that it

²⁸ Pozdnyshv argues: Из срастей самая сильная, и злая, и упорная -- половая, плотская любовь, и потому если уничтожатся страсти и последняя, самая сильная из них, плотская любовь, то пророчество исполнится, люди соединятся воедино, цель человечества будет достигнута, и ему незачем будет жить. ("Sexual, carnal love is the strongest, and most wicked and stubborn of the passions, and for this reason if the passions are done away with, down to the last and strongest one, carnal love, then the prophecy will be fulfilled; people will unite as one, the aim of humanity will have been achieved, and there will be no reason to live.") (PSS XXVII, 29)

rejects the body and the sensual gratification it calls for; like that of the Desert Fathers, it is intrinsically connected to a Christian vision of Utopia, wherein humanity will overcome its corporeal limitations and live in a perfect community of spirits. Parkhurst's view, also utopian in its own way, seeks to refine the body through a rational balancing of its needs and limitations.²⁹ The Dianic program is not unlike a phonography of the body, stripping its excesses and imbuing it with a satisfying functionality. It is a utilitarian and indeed a "Platonic" utopianism, as Tolstoy suggests, in that it harkens back to the *Republic* in its view of sexual virtue as the harmonization of individual needs with those of society. Parkhurst believes as well in the perfecting quality of idealized sexual relations, which are both physically and morally exalting. His reveries on the rarified intimacies he proposes provide a sharp contrast to the opinions of Pozdnyshev, who asserts: "предполагается в теории, что любовь есть нечто идеальное, возвышенное, а на практике любовь ведь есть нечто мерзкое, свиное..." ("It is suggested in theory that love is something ideal and exalted, but in practice it is really something foul and swinish.") (PSS XXVII, 34) Sensual satisfaction, much like the aesthetic enjoyments renounced in *What is Art?*, is displaced by the moral imperatives of Christianity.

It is no surprise, then, that the snowdrifts and prancing nude forms of the Dianic landscape are omitted in Tolstoy's article, which instead privileges the "Alphic" asceticism Parkhurst had sought to mitigate.³⁰ Tolstoy worked diligently on his exposition of the text, working through at least five drafts of the text within a period of several days immediately following his receipt of the pamphlet.³¹ In spite of these labors, however,

²⁹ Parkhurst even allowed that "an occasional violation of [chastity] in practice wud be of littl more consequence than the violation of the fzyiological principls, that food should be taken at regular hours, and sleep during the hours of the niht." (41)

³⁰ Comparison of the passage quoted above (about nude forms, etc.) with the following passage from the "Kreutzer Sonata": Возьмите всю поэзию, всю живопись, скульптуру, начиная с любовных стихов и голых Венер и фрин, вы видите, что женщина есть оружие наслаждения. ("Take all of poetry, painting, and sculpture, beginning with love poems and the nude Venuses and Phrynes, and you'll see that woman is an instrument of pleasure.") (PSS XXVII, 37) This austerity is also reflected in Tolstoy's language in describing Diana, which avoids the discursive excesses of the original. Parkhurst tends to illustrate his arguments with far-flung analogies, creating the sort of bells and whistles which often euphemistically describe the sexual act itself: the sexual attraction in its different forms behaves like a magnetic, galvanic, or electric force, with accompanying explosions and repulsions; the male sexual drive is compared to the lactation of cows, which require milking only when regularly milked.

³¹ The editors of the *Sobranie sochinenii* include in their annotations to the text some comments on a draft which they consider to be subsequent to the manuscript from which the text was printed in *Nedelia*. Two changes are noteworthy. The first is the deletion of two sentences:

Брак поэтому, по мнению автора, составляющий естественное и желательное условие для всех людей, достигших зрелого возраста, не есть необходимо физическое соединение, но может быть и духовным. Смотря по условиям и темпераменту, а главное по тому, что соединяющиеся считают должным, хорошим и желательным, для одних брак будет более приближаться к духовному общению, для других -- к

Tolstoy began to worry that he had not sufficiently obscured the sensuality of *Diana*, and, writing to Nikolai Strakhov two weeks later, he confessed:

Изложение брошюры «Дианы», после того, как я послал вам, мне разонравилось. Я много выпустил и смягчил, а то там есть нехорошее -- удовлетворение чувственности в разных видах; и я боюсь, что она может подать повод к соблазну, особенно место о малороссийском обычае женихання. Да и лучше не печатать ее вовсе.

(I took a disliking to the account of the pamphlet *Diana* after I sent it to you. I left out and softened a lot, but there's still something bad--satisfaction of sensuality in various forms--and I'm afraid that it might lead to temptation, especially the part about Ukrainian engagement customs. Yes, it would be better not to print it at all.) (PSS LXV, 177)

To his dismay, however, "*Ob otnoshenii mezhdru polami*" appeared as written in the last October issue of *Nedelia*, just two weeks after Tolstoy had received the pamphlet from Eliza Burnz.

Tolstoy's initial enthusiasm for Eliza Burnz's "Private Letter" was to undergo a similar reversal, though for different reasons. The "Letter" discredits the belief that the male body required elimination of excess sperm, arguing instead that such a notion derives

физическому; но чем больше общение будет приближаться к духовному, тем полнее будет удовлетворение.

(For this reason marriage, in the author's opinion, comprising the natural and desirable condition for everyone who has reached maturity, is not necessarily a physical union, but may also be a spiritual one. Depending on the conditions and the temperament, but primarily on that which the partners consider proper, good and desirable, for some marriage will approach the spiritual union, while for others, the physical; but the closer it comes to the spiritual union, the more complete will be the satisfaction.)

This cut may merely be stylistic, in that the passage is somewhat redundant in relation to the rest of the article; it is, on the other hand, possible that Tolstoy was uncomfortable with the freedom of choice the passage offers married couples, and likewise with the suggestion that marriage is a "desirable condition."

The second change alters the penultimate paragraph of the article, reworking the completion of this phrase: "...приведение разума в согласие с изложенными здесь принципами и постепенное образование привычек, согласных с ними...." ("...the gradual leading of the reason into agreement with the principals here outlined, and the gradual education of the habits in accordance with them..."). In the printed version it continues "...избавит людей от многих страданий и даст им удовлетворение их половых стремлений." (... will preserve people from much suffering and give them satisfaction of their sexual desires."), while in the later draft it reads "...все более и более будет избавлять человечество от тех бедствии, которым оно подвергает себя науршением закона, которому подлежит человек в отношении полового стремления." (...will more and more preserve humanity from those calamities to which it subjects itself by the violation of the law under which a person is bound in relation to sexual desire.") Again Tolstoy has removed "sexual satisfaction" from the picture.

from "sexual immorality" and is "destroying the vitality and happiness of our race." (Burnz, 52)³² Basing her argument entirely on "comparitiv fyziology," Burnz uses rhetorical devices similar to Parkhurst's, unhesitatingly indulging in the method of analogy. Correcting those who would mistakenly class the "Spermatic Secretion" with those bodily fluids which require expulsion, such as bile, pancreatic juice, or saliva ("some men will spit a pint a day..."), Burnz suggests that the secretion of semen is rather akin to that of "lachrymal fluid" or, in other words, tears, which "ar ever redy, waiting to spring forth when there is adequate cauz, but they do not acumulate and distress the man becauz they are not shed daily, weekly, or monthly." (54, 52) A number of factors further legitimize the analogy:

Neither flow of tears or semen is esential to life or helth. Both ar greatly under the control of the imagination, the emotions, and the wil; and the flow of either is liable to be arested in a moment of sudden mental action. Also, when a man sheds tears, there is a subsequent depression arizing from nervous exhaustion consequent upon the violent emotions which caused the tears, and a similar effect follows sexual emission. (53)

Making for an even happier analogy, the stigma attached to crying among men can now be extended to undesirable sexual activity, as Burnz points out that "it is unmanly for them to shed tears frequently or on trivial ocazions, and that moreover uncalld for emission is a destructiv waste of life material." (53)

Tolstoy was no doubt especially appreciative of these insights, echoing as they did the argument of Pozdnyshev in the *The Kreutzer Sonata*: Мужчине необходимо [удовлетворять свою похоть] ... Опять милые жрецы науки уверили всех... Внушите человек, что ему необходима водка, табак, опиум, и все это будет нербходимо." (For men it is necessary [to satisfy their lust]... Again the dear wizards of science assure everyone... Convince a person that he needs vodka, tobacco, or opium, and all that will be necessary.") (PSS XXVII, 35) Moreover, Burnz had not only focused her arguments on male sexuality, but had fashioned them so as to imply that true masculinity lay in the proper control of the passions. In suggesting that submission to the sexual impulse could in some sense be "unmanly," she challenged the traditional privileging of sexual virility as a sign of manhood, and affirmed instead a more Stoic masculinity. Thus her text resonates with Pozdnyshev's (and Tolstoy's) lamentations over youth misspent in the pursuit of carnal pleasures, and with the argument in the "Postlude" that avoidance of such sensual self-indulgence would preserve the strength and productivity of a proper manhood. To this end Tolstoy suggests at the end of his article on *Diana* that the "Private Letter" should be disseminated "между взрослыми мужчинами, губящими так напрасно свои лучшие силы и свое благо, и, главное, между

³² The "Letter" appears at the end of *Diana* as an appendix of the sort which was common to the genre, the record of another voice lending further authority to the central text. In the same manner, Tolstoy's extract/review was later to be appended to the end of *Diana*, with an introductory comment from Parkhurst. We can consider Tolstoy's utilization of these texts to support his arguments in "The Kreutzer Sonata" as yet another deployment of this device.

бедными, гибнущими только от незнания, мальчиками в семьях, училищах, гимназиях и в особенности корпусах и закрытых заведениях..." (among grown men, so uselessly wasting their best strengths and their well-being, and, most importantly, among the poor boys perishing only out of ignorance in families, schools, gymnasia and especially in the army and boarding schools...). (PSS XXVII, 289)

The text was not destined to enjoy such wide distribution, however, as Tolstoy's enthusiasm was again checked by reservations. While the first drafts of "*Ob otnoshenii...*" indicate that Tolstoy originally intended to include his translation of the "Private Letter" at the end of his account of *Diana*, he wrote Strakhov that the letter was probably too candid for the readers of *Nedelia*. Seeking a forum with a more limited audience, Tolstoy turned to E.A. Pokrovsky, editor of *Vestnik vospitaniia*, whose brochure "*Ob ukhode za malymi det'mi*" Tolstoy had helped edit and prepare for publication. Unfortunately, this attempt to direct the work to a more "suitable" audience placed it under greater critical scrutiny than it could withstand, as Pokrovsky answered that he could not vouch for the veracity of the letter's content and thus declined to publish it. This concern evidently impressed Tolstoy, for when the text was finally published--by *Posrednik*, four years later, in the collection *Tainyi porok: Trezvyie mysli o polovykh otnosheniakh*--he wrote on the envelope containing the manuscript, "Верно ли физиологически?" ("Is it accurate physiologically?") There is little record of the events surrounding the publication of the "Private Letter" at this later date, so we do not know how, or even if, this question was decided by Tolstoy. A continued uncertainty is perhaps reflected in the fact that neither his translation nor his praise for the letter in "*Ob otnoshenii mezhdu polami*," which was quoted to preface the text, are attributed to Tolstoy by the editors.³³

POSTLUDE

Tolstoy's reversal in his reading of *Diana* is perhaps best illustrated in one final episode in our story, occurring some twenty years after Eliza Burnz first sent the pamphlet to Yasnaya Polyana. In February, 1910, Vladimir Chertkov had learned of "another" pamphlet, written, as he believed, by Eliza Burnz, which was being passed from hand to hand in manuscript copy in England. Chertkov was concerned about this pamphlet, as it was "also" called "Diana," and was being confused with the previous "Diana," of which Tolstoy had spoken approvingly in his article «О половых отношениях»:

Вы когда-то написали статью о половом вопросе, в которой цитировали целиком прекрасную статью Елизы Борнз Е. Burnz, американской писательницы. Оказывается, как мне говорил навестивший вас не так давно друг мой Даниель, что эта же самая Е.

³³ In translating the "Private Letter", Tolstoy was assisted by A.M. Bogomolets, a doctor who was visiting Yasnaya Polyana at the time. Their translation is by and large faithful to the original text; there is one notable deletion, Burnz's "Also, when a man sheds tears there is a subsequent depression arising from nervous exhaustion, consequent upon the violent emotions which caused the tears, and a similar effect follows sexual emission."

Burns написала, кроме того, брошюру о супружеских отношениях, с которой мы с вами ни как не можем согласиться, под названием: "Diana." А в Англии многие, в том числе был и Даниель, думают, что вы с этим согласны т.к. в той давнейшей вашей статье хвалили и цитировали другую хорошую статью Е. Burns, также связанную со словом Diana.

You at one time wrote an article on the sexual question, in which you cited, in entirety, a wonderful article by Eliza Burnz, an American writer. It seems, as I was told by my friend Daniel, who visited you recently, that this same Eliza Burnz wrote another article on marital relations, with which we can by no means be in agreement, under the title "Diana." And in England, many people, including Daniel, think that you are in agreement with this, inasmuch as in that old article you praised and cited the other, good article by E. Burnz, also connected to the word Diana.³⁴

Though he reports that he is sending a copy of the text to Tolstoy, Chertkov suggests that since its language is somewhat obscure, he might do well to describe the author's ideas. In his synopsis of the pamphlet, which is of course none other than the original text by Parkhurst, Chertkov focuses on that "pagan" sensuality of *Diana* which Tolstoy had referred to, and then obscured, in his earlier resume. Accurately summarizing Parkhurst's views, Chertkov emphasizes their sensual aspect, describing a program of flirting, frolicking, and even, albeit incomplete, sexual intercourse, with which he is certain Tolstoy can by no means be in agreement. Though he asked Tolstoy to read the material himself and to be forthcoming with his opinion, Chertkov was so certain of Tolstoy's disapproval that he could not resist some rather predisposing comments: "Если не можете или считаете не стоит на это отвечать подробно, то напишите мне по этому поводу хоть несколько слов, чтобы воспользовавшись ими, я мог опровергнуть ваше сочувствие такому безобразию." ("If you can't, or consider it unnecessary to, answer in detail, then write me at least a few words on the matter, so that, using them, I might refute your sympathy with such disgracefulness.")

Tolstoy's answer indeed confirmed Chertkov's opinion on the matter:

О последнем вопросе, о Диане, к[отор]ую я пробежал, отвечаю, что мои взгляды о полов[ых] отнош[ениях] много раз были высказаны и что они, как не могут сходиться с взглядами этой Г[оспо]жи, так я считаю полное целомудрие высшим совершенством, к к[оторо]му должен стремиться человек, самым же низшим и безнравственным отношением к половому стремлению --признание этого стремления источником допустимых наслаждений.

On the last question, about Diana, which I looked over, I will answer that my views on sexual relations have been expressed many times, and that they are not in agreement with the views of this woman, inasmuch as I consider complete chastity, toward which a person should strive, as the greatest perfection, and the recognition of that striving as a source of acceptable pleasures as the most base and immoral relation to the sexual desire. (PSS LXXXIX, 172)

³⁴ The full text of this letter may be found in the appendix below.

The irony of this final episode, though perhaps lost to its chief protagonist, was not, however, unforeseen by him. In confirming Chertkov's supposition in his responding letter, Tolstoy unwittingly justified the apprehension he had experienced in his first encounter with the text some twenty years earlier. Parkhurst's attempt to make abstinence practicable through controlled sexual contact was ultimately too compromising for Tolstoy, whose own writings on sexuality reveal a complete disdain for sensuality in all its forms. Writing to ask Chertkov his opinion about *Diana* in 1890, Tolstoy had indicated the selectivity of his approval of the text-- "...написал изложение ее. Перевести ее всю было бы хуже" ("I wrote an extract of it. To translate the whole thing would have been worse"), and in this incomplete recreation of the text he had done much to rewrite it according to his own beliefs. (*PSS LXXXVII*, 49)

APPENDIX

I. Eliza Burnz's Letters to Tolstoy³⁵

1. OCTOBER 7, 1890:

New York, Oct 7, 1890

Count L.N. Tolstoi,

Honord Sir;

We hav the pleasure of transmiting you, by mail, a copy of a small book, entitled, "Diana, a psycho-fyziological essay on sexual relations, for married men and women," which we hope wil reach you in safety.

Since the circulation, in America, of your work, "The Kreutzer Sonata," very many persons hav said, "Diana carries out, and explains, and makes practicabl, Count Tolstoi's theories. So we take the liberty of sending you a copy, that you may judge for yourself. Praying for the fulfilment of your heart's dearest wish,

We ar, dear sir

Truly yours

Burnz & Co.

P.S. We shall be glad if you honor us with a notice that the work reaches you safely.

2. FEBRUARY 12, 1893:

New York, Feb 12th 1893

Count Lev N. Tolstoi

Honored Sir;

About two years ago, I sent you a copy of "Diana" which you thought so well of as to write a review of it in a Russian paper.

I now take the liberty of sending you two copies of my recently publisht Step by Step Primer in Pronouncing Print. This will enabl foreigners to get the correct pronunciation of English words in spite of our barbarous orthograpy. Soon, I hope to hav portions of the Scriptures--first the Sermon on the Mount--set in this Pronouncing Print; then other popular English works. A young Russian Mr. Wm. Robert Ebell, who has been in America 12 years, proposes to get my permission to publish this Primer with the introduction and explanations, and parts of the body of the book in Russian, for the benefit of Russians who ar in America, or Russia.

The two copies of the Primer ar sent by mail. I enclose in this specimen of Pronouncing Print.

Respectfully your humbl co-worker for humanity's good.

Eliza B. Burnz

³⁵ FMT, Tc 208 85/1, Tc 208 85/2

II. Caroline Winslow's Letters to Tolstoy³⁶

1. OCTOBER 23, 1890:

Dr. Caroline B. Winslow
1 Grant Place

Washington, D.C. Oct 23, 1890

Count Tolstoi
Dear Sir

Pardon this intrusion on your valuable time--But I must not omit [?] expressions of gratitude to the author of "Kreutzer Sonata." It delights me to hear the truth from a man's standpoint. So few men of our nation have any conscience on the subject of sexual holiness. And that solid falsehood, the "Physical Necessity" is so deeply engraved on the hearts of most men, and the few that have convictions on this subject are not often outspoken. Makes your book a sure treat.

I have taken the liberty to mail to your address a copy of the last years publication of The Alpha a paper edited by me for Thirteen years, in which I have contended for the right of the unborn child to a proper endowment of health, peace, and beauty, and for the recognition of the law of continence except for procreation in Marriage.

I have likewise sent you a package of pamphlets and leaflets published by the "Moral Education Society" --If you will do me the honor to look over these publications you will not be surprised that I am moved to address you, and they will introduce me, better than my note can.

Will you not write another book, and show forth the remedy, the antidote for that misery and the jealousies and hatred that separates so many married couples, and the disappointment, and heartaches, in the failure of their children, who become a sorrow and shame to their parents, instead of a pride and joy. Kreutzer Sonata does not cheer the heart of the reader with the hope and promise of a wiser and better fruition, when the "Laws of Sexual Life" are better understood and obeyed. There must be some way out of this domestic and public misery. Do you realize that at this day you probably [sic] house the largest audience of any living writer--Your opportunity of doing good by another book is boundless.

If this is offensive to you, forgive, and believe me truly your grateful friend.

Caroline B. Winslow

[In the margin:] I have neglected to say I am a friend of Dr. Alice Stockham of 40 years standing.

2. JULY 26, 1891:

Grant Place
Washington
July 26, 1891

Count Tolstoi
Dr friend

A mutual bond must exist between those whose aims & objects in life run in parallel lines--
It makes us friends.

I am just now for the first time reading your Anna Karenina. It gives me the first glimpse

³⁶ GMT, Tc 246 67/1, Tc 246 67/2

of Russian society life--not very different from the wicked waste of time and ability in all civilized society--everywhere men and women are serving the devil rather than God in the pursuit of pleasure instead of striving for higher and more enduring happiness which follows good uses of time and means.

Last February I received a note from your daughter asking me to name to you any new books or articles that tended to forward & propagate our reformatory views--Have you read "The Strike of a Sex" by Goerge N. Miller--"Is this Your Son, My Lord?" by Helen H. Gardner--[fr "Nova"] "The Dolls House" by Ibsen. If not I would like to send you copies of a cheap edition.

I would likewise call your attention to "True Manhood" by Elizabeth R. Shepherd & "For Girls" by the same lady.

They are special physiologies, taking up the subject where school physiologies leave off and carefully teaching young people their duties in Sexual Matters--duties to themselves and others. "Manhood" price \$2.00 For Girls \$1.00

Your daughter promised a remittance for the literature I sent to your order--This remittance was to come in a few days. I will mention it has not yet been received. If it was sent I fear it was lost.

I have many more of our publications if you can use more.

I shall be happy to hear from you again & believe me most sincerely your grateful friend.

Caroline B. Winslow

III. Moses Harman's Letter to Tolstoy³⁷

fr. American Journal of Eugenics

Los Angeles
Dec. 30, 1908

We have been sending you our magazine as a complimentary for several monthes and not hearing anything from you, we are in doubt as to whether it reaches you. We write you this line to ask whether you get our magazine, and if so, whether you would care to have it continued as a complimentary to your address.

Kindly drop us a line on an International postal card, and oblige,

Yours very sincerely & fraternally,

Moses Harman

IV. Vladimir Chertkov's Letter to Tolstoy of February 16, 1910³⁸

Милый друг Л.Н., ваше чувство, что мы духовно так близки, что вам трудно мне писать, я вполне понимаю и сам иногда испытываю нечто в том же роде к вам. Оно меня не только трогает, но служит, еще здесь на земле, наглядным проявлением того, насколько теснее связывает духовное единение, чем какая бы то не была другая связь--личной

³⁷ Б.А.Н.

³⁸ Б.А.Н.

любви, дружбы, --в области пространства и времени. Но вместе с тем, в том положении, в каком я нахожусь вынужденной разлуки с вами без малейшего представления о том, когда мы опять свидимся и с полной возможностью, что не свидимся никогда, мне не может не нехватать письменного общения с вами. И с этой стороны мне было бы очень грустно, если бы вы перестали мне от времени до времени писать те хорошие откровенные письма, которые всегда составляли одну из самых больших радостей моей жизни. Но за невозможностью этого, пишите мне хоть несколько строк, не откладывая, тотчас по получении каждого моего письма --Жду вашего ответа на мое последнее письмо с телеграммой, посланной вдогонку о моем письме в газеты по поводу сфальсифицированной вашей статьи под заглавием «Последний этап.» Я хочу лучше написать это письмо в газеты, но жду, во-первых вашего разрешения опубликовать его, и, во-вторых, быть может, ваших поправок. --Мы все здесь опечалены болезнью Алекс. Львовны. Телеграфировал сегодня узнать, как ей? Я так рад, что вы пользуетесь Булгаковым, и что он, по видимому, действительно вам помогает. А уж он то как рад! --Вы вероятно уже увидели в февр. Выпуск "Жизни для всех" мою статью "Две цензуры Льва Толстого." Как странно вышло, что стединение, помещенное там всех мест, выпущенных "Русск. ведомостями" из вашей статьи "О науке" составляют как мне уже заметили некоторые читатели, само по себе, очень последовательное и сильное изложение. Мое душевное состояние вялое. Я несколько дней проболел сильной простудой. Теперь почти поправился. Недоволен собой. Все не могу овладеть своей низшей, плотской природой. Завидую в этом отношении вашему возрасту. --Кстати, по поводу полового вопроса: Вы когда-то написали статью о половом вопросе, в которой цитировали целиком прекрасную статью Елизы Борнз Е. Burns, американской писательницы. Оказывается, как мне говорил навестивший вас не так давно друг мой даниель, что эта же самая Е. Burns написала, кроме того, брошюру о супружеских отношениях, с которой мы с вами не как не можем согласиться, под названием: "Diana". А в Фнглии многие, в том числе был и Даниель, думают, что вы с этим согласны т.к. в той давнейшей вашей статье хвалили и цитировали другую хорошую статью Е. Burns, также связанную со словом Diana. Т.к. недоразумление это очень нежелательное, то я попросил Даниель выслать мне эту с нашей точки зрения предосудительную брошюру Е. Burns, которая в Фнглии циркулируется в рукописном виде, будучий недозволена к печати. Посылаю вам ее заказной бандеролью, и очень жотелось, чтобы вы в письме ко мне сообщили ваше мнение о ней, высказываясь так, как высказались бы человеку, не знающему еще, как к этому отнестись, т.е. забывая, что я вперед с вами согласен. Т.к. статья это вероятно намеренно, в избежание цензурности формы, написана довольно вычурным языком, то вы можете многое пожалуй и не понять. А аотому только главное своими словами, соответственно местам отмечанным мною на полях карандашом. (Вообще, если вам некогда читать всей статьи, то вы можете ограничиться местами, отмечанными мною в полях каарандашом: в них все главное сказано.)

Правильные супружские отношения требуют полного воздержания от сношуние кроме как для деторождения. Это называется "Alphism." Но т.к. это трудно исполнить и может вести к аскетизму, то для обыкнове нных людей рекомендуется другой прием. А именно взаимное соприкосновение без полового акта, по крайней мере без довершения полового акта. Это называется "Dianism." Соприкосновение это понимается в самом разнообразном смысле, начинчя с душевного, словесного, общения, даже путем переписки, затем рукопожатия, поцелуи, хождение голыми друг перед другом, спанье в одной кровати, взаимные ласки в кровати, даже совокупление, но без окончательного акта.

Основание для этого такое: называя общим термином "amatory" вообще половые влечения, автор различает между "amative" и "amorous" desires. "Amative" feelings это взаимное влечение между мужчиной и женщиной, вытекающее из любовного, нежного отношения друг к другу. "Amorous" desires, это те, которые ведут к деторождению. Для того, чтобы быть в силах избегать "amorous" отношений, (ведущих к деторождению), обыкновенным людям советуется вступать и поддерживать между собой "amative" отношения, т.е. видаться, влюбляться и т.д., а супругам--соприкосаться в одной кровати голыми телами. Это будто бы дает удовлетворение и помогает воздерживаться от полного совокупления.

В этом сущность учения, изложенного в брошюре "Diana," с которым многие в Англии предполагают, что вы согласны, вследствие совпадения термина "Diana," который вы привели в одном вашем сочувственном отзыве и перевод статьи о половом воздержании того же автора E. Burns.

Если не можете или считаете что не стоит на это отвечать подробно, то напишите мне по этому поводу хоть несколько слов, чтобы воспользовавшись ими, я мог опровергнуть ваше сочувствие такому безобразию.

Вот пока все. Ожидаю вашего ответа относительно моего письма в газеты о «поселеней стадий».

WORKS CITED

- Burnz, Eliza. "A Private Letter to Parents, Fyzicians, and Men- Principals of Schools." In *Diana*. 4th ed. New York: Burnz Publishing House, 1890.
- Ellis, James (James Towner). *Free Love and its Votaries*. New York: 1870.
- Guarneri, Carl J. *The Utopian Alternative: Fourierism in Nineteenth Century America*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Maude, Alymer. *The Life of Tolstoy*. London, 1908-1910.
- Nichols, Thomas. *Forty Years of American Life*. London: J. Maxwell, 1864.
- Noyes, John Humphrey. *Male Continence*. Oneida, 1872.
- Parkhurst, Henry Martyn. *Diana: A psycho-fyziological essay for married men and women*. 4th edition. New York: Burnz & Co., 1890.
- , "Why I Wrote Diana." In *Diana: A psycho-fyziological essay for married men and women*. 6th ed. New York: Burnz & Co., 1896.
- Sears, Hal D. *The Sex Radicals: Free Love in High Victorian America*. Lawrence, Ka.: Regents Press of Kansas, 1977.
- Stern, Madeleine B. *The Pantarch. A biography of Stephen Pearl Andrews*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968.
- Stockham, Alice. *Tokology: A book for every woman*. Chicago, 1883.
- , *Karezza*. Chicago: Alice B. Stockham & Co., 1896.
- Stoechr, Taylor. *Free Love in America: A Documentary History*. New York: AMS Press, 1979.
- Tolstoy, Ilia. *Moi vospominaniia*. Moscow: 1914.
- Tolstoy, L.N. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Moscow: 1928-1958.
- Wunderlich, Roger. *Low Living and High Thinking at Modern Times, New York*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1992.

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE SEXES

LEO TOLSTOY¹

The numerous letters I have received from a number of different sources about The Kreutzer Sonata and its "Afterword" have shown that not only I but a large number of thinking people are conscious of the necessity for a change of view in the relations between the sexes. Their voices are unheard and unnoticed only because they are drowned out by the roar of the crowd of those people who, yielding to their passions, defend with obstinacy and zeal, the habitual order of things. Among the letters I have received was the following of the 7th of October 1890 with the enclosure of the pamphlet entitled "Diana," which is mentioned in it. Here is this letter:

7 Oct. 1890

"We have had the pleasure of transmitting to you by mail a copy of a small book entitled 'Diana, a Psycho Fysiological Essay on Sexual Relations for Married Men and Women,' which we hope will reach you safely.

"Since the circulation, in America, of your work the 'Kreutzer Sonata,' many, so many, persons hav said 'Diana carries out, explains and makes practicabl Count Tolstoi's theories.'" We therefore take the liberty of sending you a copy, that you may judge for yourself.

"Praying for the fulfilment of your hart's dearest wish, we are, dear sir, Sincerely yours,
Burnz & Co."²

Earlier I received a letter and pamphlet from France from Angèle Françoise. Madame Angèle informed me in this letter about the existence of two societies having the goal of the encouragement of purity in sexual life: one in England and the other in France, the *Société d'amour pur*. In the article Madame Angèle had expressed thoughts similar to those in the article "Diana", only less clearly and definitely and with a shade of mysticism.

The thoughts expressed in the brochure "Diana", although also having fundamentally not a Christian but rather pagan, Platonic world view, are so new and interesting, and so obviously show the foolishness of the established dissipation in the life of bachelors and married men in our society, that I wanted to share these thoughts with readers.

¹Translated and annotated by Robert Edwards. A translation of «Об отножениями между полами», *Полное собрание сочинений Л. Н. Толстого*, 27: 286-290. Originally published in *Неделя* 43: 1368-1370, 7 October 1890. Nathan Haskell Dole translated this material as What "Diana" Teaches." (sic) using the "simplified spelling" system advocated by Burnz. Dole's translation along with Henry Martyn Parkhurst's *Why I Wrote "Diana"* were published as inserts to Parkhurst's third edition of *Diana: A Psycho-Fyziological Essay on Sexual Relations for Married Men and Women* (New York: Burnz and Co.). Earlier editions were published in 1882, 1885, and 1890.

²Dole omits a closing line from Burnz' letter translated by Tolstoy into Russian: «М ы будем рады, если вы почтите нас извещением о получении брошюры». ("We would be glad if you would honor us with notification of your reception of the pamphlet.")

The basic idea of the pamphlet set in the words of the epigraph "And the Twain Shall be One Flesh": is the following:

The difference between men and women exists not only in the physiological regard but also in other, moral properties, in the male in so-called masculinity, in the female in femininity. The attraction between the sexes is based not only on a striving towards physical union, but also towards a mutual attraction, the opposing properties which each sex exerts on each other: femininity on the male and masculinity on the female. One sex attempts to fulfill itself through the other, and the attraction between the sexes produces an identical striving towards spiritual, as well as physical union.

A yearning for physical and spiritual union are two manifestations of one and the same source of attraction, which are found in such dependence upon each other that satisfaction of one kind of yearning always weakens the other. However much the yearning toward spiritual relation is satisfied, that much weakened or entirely destroyed is the yearning toward the physical; and conversely, the satisfaction of physical yearning weakens or destroys the spiritual. And this is why the attraction between the sexes is not only a physical yearning which produces children, but is an attraction of the different sexes to one another, capable of taking the form of the most spiritual union of thought only, or the most animal union, producing children, and of all the most varying stages between one and the other. The question about on which of these stages the coming together of the different sexes will settle, is determined by what sort of relation those uniting themselves reckon to be good, proper, and therefore desirable at a given time, or perpetually-- (The striking custom of courting in Little Russia in which for arranged marriages the young men spend the night with their fiancées for years without violating their virginity serves as remarkable illustration of how a stage in the relations between the sexes can be subjugated to a conception of what is considered to be good, proper and desirable).

A given stage will provide full satisfaction for different persons who are uniting, which those persons consider to be good, proper and desirable, and also depends on their personal view. But independently from this, *per se*, objectively, for everybody one stage of relation should give more satisfaction than any another. What sort of relation will give most satisfaction, *per se*, for everyone, independently from the personal view of those who are being united together: that which approaches the spiritual or that which approaches the physical? The answer to this question is clear and unmistakable, although it runs counter to all accustomed thought in our society, and consists in the fact that the closer the form of the relation is to the extreme physical boundary the more desire is enkindled, and the less satisfaction is received; the closer to the opposite extreme, the spiritual boundary, the less new desires are evoked, the fuller the satisfaction. The closer to the former, the more destructive for the life force; the closer to the latter, to the spiritual, then the calmer, the happier and the more powerful the general condition.

The author considers the union of man and woman "in one flesh" in the form of an indissoluble monogamous marriage necessary for the condition of the higher development of man. Marriage, therefore, in the opinion of the author, constitutes a natural and desirable condition for all persons having attained maturity, and is not necessarily a physical union, but may be a spiritual one as well. Considering conditions

and temperament, but chiefly on the basis of that which those being united consider to be proper, good, and desirable, for some marriage will become a more spiritual relation, for others, a more physical one. But the more the relation approaches a spiritual stage the more fully satisfying it will be.

Since the author recognizes that those same sexual aspirations could lead to a spiritual union-- the capacity to love, and to the physical-- reproduction, the bearing of children, and that one activity passes to another in dependence on consciousness, naturally, he not only does not recognize the impossibility of abstinence, but considers it to be the natural and necessary condition of a rational sexual hygiene, both within marriage and outside it.

The whole article is furnished with a rich assortment of examples and illustrations about the topic under discussion, with physiological data about the processes of sexual relations, their influences on the organism and possibility of the consciously directing them by one or another path-- by the capacity to love or fruitfulness (resulting in the bearing of children). In confirmation of his thought the author cites Herbert Spencer's words: "If any law," says Spencer, "works to the advantage of the human race, then human nature infallibly submits to it, since obedience to it becomes a pleasure to a man." And thus we ought not, says the author, place too much emphasis on the established customs and conditions which now surround us, but rather should look at what human beings should and might become in a forthcoming bright future.

The essence of all the author states is expounded in this way. The basic theory of "Diana" is that the relations between the sexes has two functions: one of reproduction and the other fostering a capacity to love; and that sexual force, if not used only with the conscious desire to have children, should always be directed toward the path of fostering love. The manifestation which this power assumes depends upon reason and habit, in consequence of which the gradual administration of reason in harmony with the principles laid forth here, and the gradual education of habits will deliver people from many of their passions and give them satisfaction in their sexual aspirations.

At the end of the book is included Eliza Burnz' remarkable "Letter to Parents and Teachers."³ This letter, despite the fact that it treat subjects which are considered to be indecent (naming, as it is impossible to do this otherwise, things by their names), may have such a beneficial influence on an unfortunate youth, suffering from excesses and erroneous behavior, that the dissemination of this letter among grown men wasting their best forces and their own good, and most especially, among unfortunate boys perishing only from ignorance in families, gymnasiums, and in especially in military schools and closed institutions, would be a genuine good deed.

³The letter follows this article.

A PRIVATE LETTER
TO PARENTS, FYZICIANS, AND PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS

ELIZA BURNZ⁴

I take the liberty of ofering for your consideration sum views on the Spermatic Secretion, which, so far as I know, hav not been hitherto entertained, either by fyzicians or the public generally.

It is customary for fyzilogists and writers on the sexual organs and functions to asume that the spermatic secretion is analogous to the bile, pancreatic juice, saliva and uther secretions which are esential to human life, and which, when once formd, must be uzed and expeld from the system. The logical deduction from this theory is, that to ensure the perfect helth of every man and boy who has attained the age of fourteen or thereabout, he must expel this secretion at regular or irregular periods, either by inter-communication with one of the uther sex or by masturbation, unless the secretion passes away by the bladder or by involuntary action during sleep. A further deduction is, that there exists a natural necessity for unrestricted intercommunication between the sexes, or since, since society wil not sanction that, the establishment of houzes of prostitution. Now the moral nature and finer sensibilities of both men and wimen protest against such a concluzion, and therefore the truth of the theory which gives rize to it, is to be douted. For myself, I consider that to this theory, so generally beleaved, is due a large part of that sexual imorality which turns the heaven of the afections into a hel of the passions, and is destroying at once the vitality and happiness of our race.

"As a man thinketh so is he." This is classic truth. If a boy obtains the impression, from books or from companions older than himself, that at the age of fourteen or fifteen the spermatic secretion is necesarily formd and acumulated, and that, too, without his knowledge, volition, or power of prevention; and that in order to keep his helth he must in sum way periodically throw off that secretion, his actions wil imediately begin to corespond with his beleef.

⁴Annotated by Robert Edwards. Written by Eliza B. Burnz and anonymously appended to Henry Martyn Parkhurst's book, *Diana: A Psycho-Fyziological Essay on Sexual Relations for Married Men and Women*, third edition, revised and enlarged, (New York: Burnz & Company, 1885, pp. 51-55. "The Private Letter," like *Diana*, was written in the modified spelling system advocated and promoted by Burnz. Tolstoy refers to Burnz' letter in his «Об отношениях между полами».

In the 1895 edition, there also is a translation by Nathan Haskell Dole of "What 'Diana' Teaches" by Count Tolstoi, (from *Неделя «Об отношениях между полами»*, *Неделя* 43: 1368-1370, 28 October 1890.

Also enclosed with *Diana* is Parkhurst's 10 page pamphlet "Why I Wrote 'Diana'" in which he explains why "Diana" was originally published anonymously and why he later ventured to make his authorship publicly known.

Roundtable Discussion

Donna Tussing Orwin, *Tolstoy's Art and Thought 1847-1880*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Caryl Emerson, Princeton University:

Orwin's wonderfully dense, difficult book accomplishes a small miracle in Tolstoy studies: it returns a writer who strove all to be pellucidly, tediously, unsubtly and thus irrefutably *clear*, back to the messy daily drawing board, before any polemical synthesis has been achieved. "My aim," she writes, "is to present Tolstoy's work as he may have understood it himself." This is no small task, for Orwin as author and for us as readers. The nineteenth century was a time of literacy in philosophy and abstract systems that beggars our own; completely at home herself on that terrain, Orwin starts right in with metaphysical idealism as if it were Everyman's routine diet. Remarkably, she succeeds in bringing it all very much down to earth--thus bearing out her epigram from Tolstoy's 1856 Diary, about the beneficial effects of sensuousness on even the most arid idealism: "If you hold firmly to the earth, it stretches out the soul."

The book is organized chronologically, recalling Eikhenbaum's great Tolstoy Project: The Fifties, The Sixties, The Seventies. But whereas that magisterial post-Formalist scholar stuffed his chronology with a thick description of *things* -- pedagogical textbooks, gardening, horses -- Orwin sticks pretty faithfully to ideas, which require more skillful crafting if they are to take on the necessary weight and forward movement. Of the many intriguing paradoxes she explores, for me the most productive is her attempt to rethink the "divided Tolstoy" hypothesis (hedgehog/fox, seer of the flesh/ seer of the soul, etc.) via the prism first provided by that troublesome gadfly and astute literary critic, Nikolai Chernyshevsky: Tolstoy's master of the "dialectic of the soul." For in these famous binary oppositions by Isaiah Berlin and Merezhkovsky there is much insight but probably too little motion; their model, like all structuralisms, tends toward stasis, and this does Tolstoy's life a disservice.

Orwin demonstrates how Tolstoy's constant search for "an antidote to the destructiveness of analysis" led him through various idealisms, of which the most durable was the "metaphysical," predicated on the assumption that there *was* a whole, and that this whole was within. To study metaphysics is to study oneself. Thus could an extreme individualism coexist with pretensions to universal significance on grounds other than simple monologism (Bakhtin's trivial route) or simple egoism (the untutored reader's reaction to Tolstoy in an irritated, preached-at moment). And thus also could the dialectic be loosened and personalized. Despite the grinding distastefulness of Tolstoy as moralist and the sense we often have from him that to be ethically correct was to be just like

Tolstoy, this in fact is not quite right: as Tolstoy saw it, synthesis was not a question of ascent toward platonic essences, even less a question of brute matter in eternal conflict; synthesis was that new idea or thing which came about within us *in the presence of an ideal*. As with Tolstoy's "infection theory of art," the communication of like emotions is a rigid requirement, yes, but every organism is infected in its own way.

Two big ideas organize Orwin's book. The first is Tolstoyan psychology, endlessly surprising and resistant of paraphrase, and second is the nature/civilization distinction, weighted differently in each decade. Memory and analysis are her crucial strategies, for they serve to create an organic and evolving whole around one's own unrepeatable, sensuous self. (Tolstoy's intimacy with a group of "philosophically-oriented hedonists" in the 1850s, which goaded him toward a specifically *theoretical* justification of sensuality, was crucial in the formation of worldviews that were soon to triumph in the novels.) But the rub comes precisely in this tension between analysis and synthesis. A Cartesian at heart and a merciless splitter of things, Tolstoy discovered the striving self through the process of analysis; unlike Rousseau and Hobbes, however, he insisted upon synthesis to provide life with its moral meaning, to him indispensable. Orwin's subsequent readings of Tolstoy's literary production all come out of this analysis/synthesis bottleneck, whose often intolerable pressure Tolstoy siphoned off and put to work in ingenious ways.

The tension most often surfaces, according to Orwin, as a conflict between civilization and nature. In this struggle, however, nature in the prelapsarian Rousseauian sense by no means always has the upper hand -- since Tolstoy came to believe that morality becomes concrete and authoritative only in human history. The culmination of this conflict comes in Chapter Five, on *War and Peace*. Orwin argues that Tolstoy's primary impulse in this huge work is to unite man and nature, and, as part of that project, to make human history a part of natural process. This thesis is of immense consequence. Mimicking classical epic, Tolstoy can redeem selfishness and "living for oneself" as both "reasonable" and natural (as a bonus, Orwin's thesis also works to redeem the maddeningly indulged, often ridiculous but indestructable and ultimately victorious Pierre Bezukhov, whom Orwin makes whole with a phrase: "the most perfectly Goethean side of *War and Peace*"). In a nicely complementary move, Tolstoy can make Nature herself into a moral force: and one happy result of this development is that he can "accept was a natural without providing a humanly comprehensible justification for it." Such capacious flexibility would be cast off, of course, in the later and more didactic decades of Tolstoy's life.

Chapters Six and Seven, on Schopenhauer and *Anna Karenina*, document Tolstoy's shift from a celebration of life to moral instruction extracted out of it. Again, Orwin finds a perfect focus in "the nature of nature." Gone in the 1870s are the Rousseauist assumptions about the natural goodness of man; at issue now are moral freedom and its corollary, personal responsibility. Peasants are virtuous only through tradition, not by nature (nature brings happiness, but not necessarily faith or goodness); children, too, require moral instruction and proper chastisement. Leisure no longer has the magical idyllic quality that it had in *War and Peace*; time is tied down to childbearing or in thrall

to restless and passionate will. The universe has become mysterious, its chance events less accessible.

Apply these Schopenhauerian precepts to *Anna Karenina*, and that novel becomes less a question of Tolstoy "falling in love with his heroine" and more a matter of moral choices not taken, of Anna possessing an "excess of vitality" that becomes sinister because not constrained by inner or outer law. Where *War and Peace* could be an epic, *Anna Karenina* can only be tragic drama. And under this generic rubric, which recalls George Steiner's classic juxtaposition now played out within a single novelist, Orwin has very interesting things to say about the *resistance* of some of the novel's major heroes -- all significantly Tolstoy surrogates -- precisely to drama: a genre too erotic, uncertain, and altogether too directed toward the body as a three-dimensional good in its own right, rather than toward the more translucent spirit.

Orwin is especially helpful in realigning Tolstoy with European thinkers precious to him and yet too often blurred for us. The permanence of Rousseau in Tolstoy's heirarchy of values is again demonstrated and made freshly complex. A productive contrast is drawn between the wholeness characteristic of Hegelian thinking (with its faith in the integrity of historical time -- closed, rounded, abstract, predetermined and therefore to Tolstoy distressing) and the wholeness of nature as Goethe understood it (just as integrated, perhaps, but more spatial, tolerant of nonsynthesized contradiction, intuitive, marked by the freedom to spread out and choose -- and thus to Tolstoy more congenial). Inevitably at times the reader of Orwin's book will wander over this wide territory with too rudimentary maps. Vaguely abstract subtitles like "A Maturing Philosophy of Nature," "Nature, Reason, and the Feelings," "Reason, Morality and Nature in the Human Soul," "Nature after Schopenhauer," offer only the most general directions. The several chapters on specific works (*The Cossacks*, *War and Peace*, and *Anna Karenina*) are packed with local literary insights, but they function -- they are designed to function -- largely as illustrations of achieved plateaus in a philosophical struggle.

What the book does *not* do, and I believe this to be a mark of its special excellence, is what most studies by literary scholars inevitably do: take Tolstoy's literary masterpieces as starting points and then work selectively backwards, to opportunistic, easily assimilated slices of philosophy. Literature is not the starting point but the illustrative *end* point for Orwin, and we are invited to witness the confused, often contradictory development of Tolstoy's restless "bol'shoi um" (his "Big brain," in Orwin's rendering) as a literary imagination gestates within it. Throughout, there is almost none of that easily-achieved "anecdotal relief," which Tolstoy would have eschewed and which is so tempting to harvest out of Tolstoy's overdocumented life.

Andrew Wachtel, Northwestern University:

Donna Orwin concludes her thought-provoking book, *Tolstoy's Art and Thought, 1847-1880*, with the observation that Tolstoy's notebooks during the period he produced

his greatest literary work are sparse compared to those that date from the decades that follow. She explains this by saying: "Before 1880 he had done his thinking through his art, while afterward his art in his own mind, or at least in his public pronouncements, became but an instrument of his thought." (218) That this observation is true seems fairly clear, but precisely the fact that it is true makes what Orwin has done in her book problematic.

The great strength of this study is that Orwin, following to some extent in the footsteps of Eikhenbaum, has tried to flesh out the philosophical underpinnings of Tolstoy's early period. She parts company from Eikhenbaum, however, in focusing on the central philosophical ideas with which Tolstoy wrestled rather than providing a catalogue of all the social, philosophical, literary, and scientific trends that were "in the air" and that might have influenced Tolstoy. Even more important, she avoids the mistake of too many intellectual historians--she does not first provide her own brilliant interpretation of Rousseau or Goethe or Schopenhauer and then assume Tolstoy held it. Instead, she tries conscientiously to discern just which aspects of that thought became relevant for his understanding of the world.

Her achievement seems particularly impressive to me in her discussion of Tolstoy's debt to Rousseau. This is, after all, an old chestnut, and one is shocked to realize that even with the existence of whole books on the subject, one's appreciation for exactly which aspects of Rousseau Tolstoy assimilated and how he did so have remained unclear. Orwin lays out the connections elegantly and convincingly: thus, for example, her detailed treatment of the "Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar" and its effects on Tolstoy's view of nature and morality seems to me right on the mark. One could say the same of her treatment of the concepts "Vernunft" and "Verstand" in Goethe. This latter observation even pays direct dividends in understanding *War and Peace*, for it allows Orwin to decode something that had always been a mystery to me: why Natasha describes Pierre as "blue and red and square."

Nevertheless, there are drawbacks to Orwin's method, and the relative paucity of moments like the one just described--when a philosophical concept properly understood makes sense out of a novelistic moment that had previously been incomprehensible--is perhaps the major one. What I wish to say is that although the book is supposed to be about Tolstoy's art and thought, for my taste there is too much thought and not enough art here. More provocatively, I would say that the reader of Orwin's book comes away from it with the feeling that Tolstoy was basically a philosopher who wrote novels, rather than a novelist for whom philosophical and moral problems were interesting only insofar as they served his novelistic purposes. Or to put it another way, one might say that Orwin often trusts Tolstoy's own thought too much to analyze the novels that Tolstoy actually produced.

Toward the beginning of her study, Orwin makes the seemingly modest claim that she will try "to present Tolstoy's work as he may have understood it himself." (5) In the context of contemporary literary criticism this goal is, perhaps, somewhat old fashioned, but it is nevertheless a worthy one. The problem is that it is not entirely clear what it means to appreciate an author's work as he may have understood it himself. For Orwin,

understanding of the work comes from a full explication of the philosophical conceptions that underpin it. But despite all her quotations from Tolstoy's letters and diaries, it is clear that Tolstoy never understood his work the way Orwin does: he would never have been able nor would he have wanted to lay out the philosophical implications of his fiction as they are laid out here. Indeed, Tolstoy insisted a number of times (most notably in his article "A Few Words about the Book *War and Peace*" and in his letter of April 23, 1876 to Strakhov about *Anna Karenina*) that his own novels could not be analyzed in terms of separate components but rather that they could only be appreciated as wholes, in the full interaction of form and content. Thus, in excerpting out the philosophical content (and seeing it as a coherent whole) we risk viewing works of fiction as primarily vehicles for the explication of philosophical ideas--and we thereby risk turning the novels into something for less complicated than they actually are.

This criticism is not meant to imply that Orwin's readings of individual works are mechanical or dry. Indeed, one might say that her judicious readings of *The Cossacks*, *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina* get right to each novel's essence, at least to its philosophical essence. What they miss, however, is all of what is nonessential (philosophically speaking) to each novel. We fail to recognize in them those aspects of Tolstoy's writing (from his stylistic quirkiness to his unexpected plot contructions, from his overabundant "prosaics" to his intricate rhythmical repetitions, let alone the latent potentials in his novels that he could not and did not understand in any way) that have made him a novelist whom people want to read and reread. In short, a feeling for purely novelistic pleasure is absent from Orwin's readings, with the unfortunate result that the reader of her book might be forgiven for thinking that reading Tolstoy is more like reading Strakhov than Turgenev.

Still, this book makes essential reading for anyone who would attempt to understand Tolstoy's relationship to European thought in his pre-crisis period. In explicating these subtle and complicated relationships, Orwin has done a great service. And while I have criticized her book for not capturing everything that is important for an understanding of Tolstoy's novels, I am fully aware that no book could possibly do so. After all, as Tolstoy put it, "If I wanted to say in words all that I had in mind to express by my novel, I should have to write the same novel which I wrote all over again." Since we cannot simply rewrite and reproduce Tolstoy's novels, we are inevitably reduced to engaging only a fraction of his abundant universe. The fraction that Orwin has chosen is not my favorite one, but it is unquestionably worthy of the serious consideration it receives here.

Gary R. Jahn, University of Minnesota:

Donna Tussing Orwin's *Tolstoy's Art and Thought: 1847-1880* is a monument to its author's well-known thoroughness, breadth, and precision. Its eight chapters present a fully contextualized account of the development of Tolstoy's thought in the 1850's,

1860's, and 1870's, and of the literary and non-literary expression of that thought over that period.

This is a book about the evolution of Tolstoy's world view; his literary legacy of the period (*The Cossacks*, *War and Peace*, and *Anna Karenina*) is heavily involved in Orwin's account, and is considered mainly as a vehicle for the expression of Tolstoy's world view. Tolstoy is presented here as a thinker who valued his art above all as a means for the effective communication of his beliefs.

Dr. Orwin's approach both derives from and corroborates the notion that Tolstoy's salient characteristic as artist and thinker, and as a man, was his dividedness. His quest was consequently always for wholeness and integration. She sees Tolstoy's primary concern as the attempt to reconcile self and other, body and spirit, appetite and morality, nature and culture. She locates her work firmly in the context of other recent books on Tolstoy, notably those of Professors Morson and Gustafson. She is sometimes in agreement with these, sometimes not, but she sees them as concerned with the same sort of questions which have motivated her own research. Like them, she tends to take Tolstoy at his word: literary art is a form of communication in which the successful transference of the author's view of reality to the reader is of primary importance. As she herself explains it, she intends to "clarify the original meaning" of great texts by Tolstoy.

The "great art" of Part One of her book ("The 1850's") appears to be the story "Lucerne," but that, I think, is mainly because her sense of precision prevents her from ascribing *The Cossacks* (actually published only in 1863) to this period. She notes, however, that *The Cossacks* was in significant part written in the 1850's, and, as Orwin says, the novel "makes the case for a natural morality as far as Tolstoy had developed it in the fifties" (85). The apotheosis of the sixties is, of course, *War and Peace* and, of the seventies, *Anna Karenina*. In what follows, I would like to reflect on Dr. Orwin's analysis of these works and on the approach which she has adopted toward their study.

A great strength of this book is the wealth of contextualizing detail that Orwin provides in her first three chapters. She suggests that Tolstoy was, if not the intellectual product of his age, at least a product of the creative tension, both attraction and repulsion, between his own ideas and those of his mentors from the past and of his contemporaries. Orwin begins by describing the general climate of the times; she offers a clear portrait of the intellectual rift between the "right Belinskians" (Botkin, especially) and the left (especially Chernyshevskii). She uses this portrait as the backdrop to her exploration of Tolstoy's own intellectual genesis. I think that she has rightly identified the tension between the desire for an ideal and the feeling for the real as the driving force behind Tolstoy's intellectual development, and she relates this aspect of Tolstoy's thinking very successfully to the general preoccupation with the integration of the ideal with the real which characterized the 1840's and 1850's.

Concerning Tolstoy's predecessors, I was particularly impressed by Orwin's discussion of the relationship between Tolstoy and Rousseau, especially the crucial role apparently played in the development of Tolstoy's attitude to Rousseau by the Savoyard Vicar's *Profession of Faith*. Whether this work was a direct or an equivocating statement of Rousseau's beliefs, Orwin's main point is clear: Tolstoy regarded the Savoyard Vicar

as Rousseau, and it was *this* Rousseau whom Tolstoy followed in attempting to find a basis for morality in Rousseau's conception of human personality and human motives.

Just as important as the attempt to render the particular relationship between Tolstoy and Rousseau more precisely than heretofore is the considerable attention which Orwin devotes to the relationship between Tolstoy and other thinkers. Much attention has been given, not only by Orwin, to the connection between Tolstoy and Schopenhauer. By his own admission Tolstoy's interest in Schopenhauer was intense, but short-lived. the connection is undoubtedly crucial to a full appreciation of *War and Peace*, as both Harry Walsh and Sigrid McLaughlin have shown. Still, I found more helpful the discussion of Tolstoy's interest in the ideas of Kant and Goethe. Finally, there is a whole subset of information here pertaining to the relationship between Tolstoy and N.N. Strakhov. Orwin has set the standard for further examination and description of the significance of Strakhov for Tolstoy. Her portrait of Strakhov as a friendly and modest facilitator of Tolstoy's ideas rings completely true.

And yet there is, it seems to me, a down side to the wealth of valuable contextualization in the first three chapters of the book and passim in the remainder. The approach taken by Orwin may convey the impression that the development of Tolstoy's ideas was more linear and orderly than it may, in fact, have been. Such a thorough establishment of the relevant intellectual context carries with it considerable inertial force. The impression may be conveyed that Tolstoy is best understood as a sort of more literary copy of his friend Strakhov, that is, as a person interested in ideas and the discussion of ideas as such. It is salutary to remember that Tolstoy was wont to wax ironically at the expense of professional thinkers (one thinks of the famous trio of Wurst, Knaust, and Pripasov, mentioned in Book I of *Anna Karenina*), and that he evidently saw his own task as being, even if kindred, a much different one. To be fair, Orwin herself points this out, and more than once. Even so, while going through this material, I found myself occasionally reminded of the intense effort Prince Andrei expended in order to maintain the integrity of that "strange airy structure . . . of slender needles or splinters" that he sensed to be hovering in the air just above his death-bed. Tolstoy was always glad, I believe, to find a familiar thought in the writings or opinions of those who formed the intellectual context amidst which he lived, but one should be wary of imagining that his own development can be seen or explained as more or less completely consistent with or produced by that context. Such a view makes Tolstoy seem both more tame and more original than he was. It leads to the conclusion that, because some mentor or contemporary solved a particular philosophical problem in a particular way, Tolstoy may be seen as having solved it in the same or a similar way.

In her discussion of *The Cossacks*, for example, Orwin wants to assert that Tolstoy has here solved the problem of nature and morality in the same way as his right-Belinskian friends of the fifties. This is the problem of deriving a basis for moral action from the presumed self-centeredness of humankind in the Rousseauian "natural" state: whence comes the nobility of the noble savage? In dealing with this question Orwin uses her knowledge of Rousseau as Savoyard Vicar and of Goethe's "reason behind everything that lives" and of Turgenev's "Hamlet and Don Quixote" ("*Gamlet i Don Kikhot*") to good

effect. She shows that love of others emerges, in these works, in a natural sort of way from love of self, but only with the facilitation of one or another "civilizing" influence to precipitate it.

However, that it *can* be shown that this was a solution of the time and that Tolstoy was aware of this solution is not a demonstration that it is so in *The Cossacks*. (See Anthony Anemone's article in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal* for a problematicization of this resolution of the Rousseauian subtext in *The Cossacks*.) Orwin's assertion that a synthesis of morality and nature is achieved by Tolstoy in that novel depends upon the portrait which she draws of Olenin in the stag's lair, the deep awareness of himself which he experiences there, and the conclusions which he draws about how he ought to live on the basis of this experience. Orwin notes that most critics view Olenin's decision to pursue a policy of self-abnegation in the aftermath of his experience in the stag's lair as "one-sided" and "intellectual." Despite this, she seems to assert that Olenin has, in the heart of nature and with the mediation of his memories of childhood, discovered a synthesis of nature and morality, a balance between the love of self (which is, to Tolstoy, THE self-evident human motive) and the love of others (which seemed to Tolstoy to be the essence of morality).

It seems to me, however, that this picture of Olenin as inwardly harmonious, as possessing a "secret" which he has remembered in the stag's lair, simply does not accord with the facts of the narrative. It seems to me that the text authorizes rather the conclusion that the moral significance which Olenin's reason superimposes on his powerful experience only serves to obscure it, so to say, decorating it with ornaments which are not in the same style. His gift of a horse to Lukashka is evidently an attempt to recreate the feeling of "oneness" or "wholeness" which the stag's lair had offered him, and it is after all a *reasonable* attempt. But neither for Olenin nor for anyone else does his generosity succeed in recreating the much desired feeling of oneness. In fact, it only produces suspicion and disappointment. Something similar may be said of Olenin's intense feelings for Marianka, and his simultaneous hopes of educating her, i.e., changing her from the person who has inspired him with love so that she would more closely resemble those admittedly undesirable women whom he has left behind in Moscow. Because she has concluded that Tolstoy has solved the problem of nature and morality as described above, Orwin makes the point that Olenin leaves the Cossack village at the end of the novel because the *cossacks* are unable to accept *him*. It seems to me, however, that the problem resides in *Olenin himself*. His sense of being unable to belong is part of *his* personal baggage, as in Moscow at the beginning of the novel, so also again at the end.

In her discussion of *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*, Orwin's attention remains primarily focussed on questions of morality and on Tolstoy's attempt to discover a basis for morality in the world which he describes. She offers a very well reasoned theory in this connection which culminates in the assertion that "man would be moral not because he was natural, but because he was rational and free"(162). Her idea is that Tolstoy's thought carries him steadily away from "nature" and toward "culture," because nature, without the mediation of culture, is incapable of supplying any kind of moral context to human life (thus the shortcomings of the Cossacks, referred to above). Unquestionably,

Tolstoy was always deeply interested in questions of morality and right conduct, and Orwin's approach is certainly a proper one. She understands Tolstoy's moral progress in the context of his developing acquaintance with the writings of other thinkers, in the sixties and seventies particularly with the philosophies of Schopenhauer and Kant.

While this is a helpful and productive manner of approaching Tolstoy (I certainly benefitted a great deal from reflecting on these texts from Orwin's point of view), I would suggest that she assigns to questions of morality a *larger* significance, *earlier* in Tolstoy's career than they may have had in fact. We are dealing here, of course, with what is really a matter of scholarly emphasis; I would only like to say that Orwin's consistent attention to morality, and the impression that this creates of a Tolstoy primarily, almost exclusively, concerned with ethical questions (as opposed to other sorts of intellectual concerns) or with thought (as opposed to art) is not fully consonant with the features of the texts she discusses.

The quotation which I mentioned just now contains all the operative concepts ("natural," "free," "rational," "moral") required for a sound approach to the thought of Tolstoy as expressed in his literary work. Orwin's concern is primarily with the moral dimension, and the other concepts are introduced as contributory to the development of Tolstoy's moral position. In my opinion, the central importance which Orwin assigns to moral questions can be much more successfully urged at a later stage in Tolstoy's career than the period which is the subject of her study. For example, as I suggested earlier, I would tend to regard *The Cossacks* as concerned only in a minor way with questions of morality. Olenin's attempt to draw moral conclusions from his experience, to make it serve as a guide for right conduct, results only in the experience itself being obscured. Tolstoy affirmed that reason had a dampening effect on the power and freshness of immediate experience, and this is certainly borne out by the aftermath of Olenin's moment of epiphany in the stag's lair.

The primary thrust of *The Cossacks* (again, in the context of an explication of Tolstoy's thought) is not moral, but ontological: the nature of the human being and the disjunction between the individual and the group context of which s/he is a part. Olenin is actuated by the desire to find an environment of which he can feel himself to be a part. He leaves the city at the beginning of the novel because of his sense of isolation and alienation there. In the stag's lair he experiences a profound sense of the interconnectedness of things, but his attempt to reason from this experience leads only to a diminution of its strength. In the terms developed later in *War and Peace*, the "consciousness" of the experience resists his attempts to grasp it by "reason."

In *The Cossacks* the polarity of consciousness and reason is reflected in the tension between the Cossacks as a group and Olenin as an individual; the disappointing (for Olenin) conclusion of the novel seems to be that the individual, as an individual, cannot join or blend into the group; it is interesting that this fate is shared also by Uncle Eroshka, who lives by himself, apart from the other Cossacks. In *War and Peace* Tolstoy pursues this theme from the point of view of the individual's freedom to assert him/herself with respect to the group, where "group" is assigned the dimensions of the historical mass. The central question in *War and Peace* is not whether Napoleon is good or evil, but

whether or not he, as an individual, has the ability imputed to him of determining or controlling the action of the mass. Tolstoy seems to arrive at the conclusion that it is nonsense to think that an individual can control the actions of the mass, but quite sensible to think that one's own immediate actions are free and subject to one's own control. In *Anna Karenina* Tolstoy pursues the latter part of this idea: to what extent, in fact, can one indulge the freedom of one's immediate actions. Once again, the question of morality is ambiguous--Anna is (at least in her own mind) both guilty and not guilty--the main concern is to establish the extent to which an individual, like Anna or Levin, can assert her/himself, even within the context of the immediate surroundings of family and personal life. The answer, as reflected in Levin's retreat into his soul's "holy of holies" and Anna's self-destruction seems to be, not very far.

I agree with Orwin that the motive which drives Tolstoy to be dissatisfied with his thought at every stage of its development is that it does not yet succeed in addressing his moral concerns in a fully adequate manner; that is, there is a moral uneasiness in Tolstoy which causes him to think again and yet again about the conclusions which he reaches at the various stages of his career. And yet I would also like to remember that his reflections seem no to have been oriented directly to the solving of moral questions. Later in life Tolstoy, following Kant, declared that "religion" was no more than an individual person's answers to the three primary human questions: Who am I?, What else is there besides me?, and What is the proper relation between me and everything else that is? My only complaint about Orwin's book is that in foregrounding so completely the last of these questions she has obscured what seems to me to be the fact that in the works before 1880 Tolstoy was much more directly concerned with the first two questions.

Orwin's book rightly establishes the quest for happiness as a central concern of Tolstoy. She portrays this happiness as moral satisfaction of contentment. I would agree that the Tolstoy before 1880 understood happiness to have moral implications or a moral context, but I think the works of that earlier period are much more concerned with the *possibility* or the *location* of happiness than with its moral overtones.

The basis of happiness is the ability to be able to address one's competing desires for selfness and separateness on one hand and belonging and blending on the other. Very soon the question devolves onto a question about the possibility of freedom--where and how can the individual remain free while at the same time retaining membership in the group. In *Anna Karenina* the sphere of freedom is shown to be located only within the individual, this completing a steadily narrowing identification of the place and manner in which freedom is possible. *The Cossacks* shows us the difficulty of the relationship of the individual with the group. *War and Peace* illustrates that if the group is considered in its mass or historical dimensions, then the individual, as individual, disappears within it; but if we consider the group to be the immediate social and personal context of the individual, then it appears that the individual's intentions and choices are under his/her control and that there is a certain latitude for the free manifestation of action. *Anna Karenina* looks more closely at this latter conclusion, and it is discovered that neither Anna nor Levin are free to live their personal/family lives as they would. As in *War and Peace*, the question is not so much whether Anna's actions are right or wrong as whether she has the ability,

the freedom, to indulge her desires. To take the morality of Anna's behavior as the central concern of the novel is to agree with M.S. Gromeka's conception of the novel as illustrative of the idea that immorality will be certainly and inevitably punished. We shouldn't forget, of course, that Tolstoy declared that Gromeka was quite right in this understanding of the novel; on the other hand, it is difficult to see how this can be the main point of a novel in which so much of the same sort of "immorality" of which Anna is guilty goes quite unpunished.

In Levin's case the only real freedom appears in the end to be located within his own inner world. The individual at this point becomes a model of the world; the outer person belongs to the surrounding mass or totality of experience, the inner person is incorporated within this mass but capable of retaining at least the freedom to regard what is passing in the outer person with independent eyes. Even here Tolstoy has reached the point only of appropriately *locating* the moral feelings; Levin declares that he has found the power to invest his life with "goodness," but as yet he is unable consistently to *be* good.

This conception of an inner and outer person is arrived at by Tolstoy only after long years of reflection, the chronicle of which is kept in the books which Orwin has considered. For many readers, of course, Tolstoy's reasoning towards the beginnings of a code of morality from the experience of Levin was not more successful than Olenin's from his experience in the stag's lair. In any case, the history surrounding it is one in which the morality comes at the end; the desire for morality is present throughout this history--it may even be true that the desire motivates this history. But the history itself is a history of Tolstoy's concern primarily with questions of self and other, individual and group, reason and consciousness, freedom and necessity; it has a moral dimension and a moral import, but it is not, in itself, a search for morality.

Still, none of this is intended to detract from the quality and the competence of Donna Orwin's fine book. She has produced an original, coherent, and supremely well-informed account of Tolstoy's intellectual development up to the late 1870's. Her book will long be read and appreciated.

Donna Orwin Replies:

I would like to begin by thanking Caryl Emerson, Gary R. Jahn and Andrew Wachtel for their comments. I would also like to thank Amy Mandelker and the *Tolstoy Studies Journal* for giving me this opportunity to engage in a dialogue with my fellow *tolstovedy*.

Caryl Emerson has put me in the position, embarrassing for a critic, of having very little to say about her reflections. Where she summarized my arguments, she is right; where she ponders their consequences, I learn from her. It is a writer's greatest (and rarest) pleasure to have been understood so well.

Andrew Wachtel is disturbed by my philosophical approach to Tolstoy's art. Both

Wachtel and Gary Jahn fear that I make Tolstoy seem less like himself and more like Strakhov, in Jahn's words, "more tame and more original" (as a thinker) than he was. I agree that this is a danger of my book, because of my emphasis on philosophy and literary history rather than on the psychology of the writer or on issues of genre or style. Another related problem with my approach noted by Wachtel is that by untangling the various philosophical strands in Tolstoy's thought, I might make his thought seem more "linear" than it is. I take Wachtel to mean by this that Tolstoy's books cannot be reduced to a series of philosophic statements about them. I agree, and, as my readers have noted, I have tried as much as possible to show the role philosophy plays in Tolstoy's art by presenting it as culminating in the art rather than the other way around. Jahn observes that the first three chapters of my book contain more literary history and philosophy than the later ones. I wanted to build up a context within which I could accomplish my main task of textual interpretation.

Despite my emphasis on thought, I do not see Tolstoy as primarily an original thinker. I would place him rather among those poets who both push thoughts to their extremes and bring them to life. If one wanted to study Tolstoy strictly as a poet, one could concentrate on how he rendered his thoughts and feelings, or on what we might call his rhetoric, the way he convinced his readers that he was telling the truth. But this is not to say that poets always rank below philosophers by merely giving form to their thoughts. In the nineteenth century poets like Tolstoy consciously corrected philosophers who took a narrowly rationalistic view of life. Too often this stance has been understood as simply anti-philosophic. Tolstoy himself, for instance, opposed "linear" thought, because he believed that each thought or series of thoughts existed in simultaneous relation to others in what he characterized spatially as a circle or ball. Art was better suited to express the true nature of things than logic, which expressed things sequentially. True philosophy was therefore the product of a literary imagination which saw things in their interconnectedness, and, at least in the period I cover in my book, Tolstoy believed that the greatest poets -- Goethe, for instance -- practised philosophy.

Like Wachtel, I think that stylistic and historical approaches to Tolstoy's work are valid and indeed essential; and I also think it is valid to search out the elements of Tolstoy's fiction that are particularly attractive to the modern sensibility. That includes Wachtel's "latent potentials in his [Tolstoy's] novels that he could not and did not understand in any way" -- so long as they can be grounded in the text. It is not fair, however, for Wachtel simply to oppose these potentials to "philosophic content" and assimilate them to "purely novelistic pleasure." The fact is that they themselves, when drawn out of the text, are ideas as much in need of elaboration and justification as those of the nineteenth century. They only seem more natural because they are the ideas by which we live. Like other contemporary critics who are interested in philosophy -- Richard Gustafson and Gary Saul Morson are important recent American examples -- I have studied what was of importance to me and my time. In my case, I was attracted to Tolstoy's non-reductionist defense of the individual; I wanted to understand the philosophical explanation for the anti-rationalism that makes Tolstoy's fiction so attractive to us; and I was curious about the Tolstoyan argument especially in *War and Peace* for

what we cannot justify today, namely the coincidence of morality and personal happiness. Of course my love of the text came first. In this respect I think that it is I, and not Tolstoy, who resembles Strakhov, and intellectual who served as an interpreter to the public of the writing he loved.

It is true that Tolstoy resisted analysis of his work, even when he agreed with it. As Wachtel points out, however, all analysis is by its very nature one-sided. In Tolstoyan terms, it artificially separates a part from the whole. I believe that I have proved that Tolstoy himself cared about ideas and believed that his works had philosophic significance. The fact that criticism today tends to focus on other aspects of his writing only makes it more important that Tolstoy's thought be emphasized in relation to his art. I should say also that it is important to distinguish between my goals and Tolstoy's. Tolstoy wanted his books to seem perfectly true, simply natural. I wanted to expose the effort of thought that was required to achieve that effect.

Jahn believes that I have presented Tolstoy before 1880 as more concerned with morality than he in fact was. I would suggest that Jahn and I are closer here than he realizes. In an excellent formulation, he writes that "there is a moral uneasiness in Tolstoy which causes him to think again and yet again about the conclusions which he reaches at the various stages of his career." My point about the pre-crisis Tolstoy is that his main preoccupation is the achievement of happiness, but that he holds that human beings must believe that they are good in order to enjoy happiness. This is very different from saying, as Tolstoy usually did later, that to be good is to be happy. What kept the pre-crisis Tolstoy from being this moralistic was his determination to make morality fit the facts of human nature rather than the other way around.

Jahn is right to concentrate on *The Cossacks* as Tolstoy's least moralizing book. I do not think, however, that Olenin feels "alienated" or "isolated" in Moscow. He does go to the Caucasus to "find an environment of which he can feel himself a part," but that is because he is so free. Full of youthful energy, he wants to spend it on something. He himself has been loved but has never really reciprocated. Amongst the cossacks he falls in love (with Marianka) and he finds the same self-love (in Eroshka and especially in Lukashka) that he feels. He could have joined the cossacks if he had proven himself by participating fully in the raiding party, but he does not. In an excellent example of morality getting in the way of happiness, Olenin cannot bring himself to kill the way Lukashka does, and so he cannot replace Lukashka in Marianka's affections.

Jahn describes very well Olenin's overly self-conscious courtship of Marianka and his attempt at self-sacrifice in his gift of a horse to Lukashka. It is true that Olenin does not get things right here; but I still see the presence of self-sacrifice and even of reason in the stag's lair itself. That is where Tolstoy took issue with those "right-Belinskian" friends of his, who loved *The Cossacks* but considered Olenin a pill. The problem posed and not solved in the novel is that of reconciling Olenin's equally natural self-love with his love of others.

Jahn's observations about *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina* are also very stimulating and for the most part I agree with him. I cannot agree, however, that Tolstoy's earlier concerns were more ontological than moral. I see him rather as fitting

into the Russian tradition of carrying ontology only as far as ethics required. As proof of this, all the examples discussed by Jahn in fact concern Kant's third, ethical question on the proper relation between the individual and others.

Reviews

Gareth Williams, *The Influence of Tolstoy on Readers of His Works* (Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellon Press, 1990).

Writing about what he felt to be Tolstoy's chief quality, Boris Pasternak described the "passion of creative contemplation," in the light of which Tolstoy saw everything "in its pristine freshness, in a new way, as though for the first time" (*I Remember: Sketch for an Autobiography*). Pasternak was seized, as so many have been, by the awesome and elusive power of Tolstoy. Gareth Williams, too, as he explains in the preface to his study *The Influence of Tolstoy on Readers of His Works*, has experienced this compelling power.

In a study which covers Tolstoy's major works from the autobiographical trilogy and its drafts through *Anna Karenina*, Williams grounds his discussion in the literary and social issues and debates that concerned Tolstoy and his contemporaries. He relies heavily on biographical and historical material to give coherence to his chronologically structured discussion. This contextualizing information is presented clearly and interestingly, and will be especially useful to those of his readers who have not read a biography of Tolstoy and/or are not familiar with nineteenth-century Russian literary culture.

Another useful aspect of Williams' book, especially for people new to the study of Tolstoy, is that in the course of his discussion he frequently refers to the work--the insights and views-- of Tolstoy scholars from the nineteenth century to the present day: from Chernyshevsky to Shklovsky to E.N. Kupreyanova to G.S. Morson.

The scope, then, of Williams' study is far greater than he allows when he says he is mainly concerned with the means Tolstoy employs to influence his readers. Thus this book is much more, but therefore, in a sense, much less as well, than its author claims.

Williams' original contribution comes in the terms and metaphors he uses to describe several of the methods he identifies. For example, "investigation through invention" is the name Williams gives to characters' internal monologues in which he perceives a "constant branching out away from the original object of inquiry." This process, which follows "a definite pattern," leads, according to Williams, to the contemplation of absolute values. Williams never makes clear why he uses the phrase "investigation through invention" to describe this process. Nor can I agree that these "patterns of thought...are experienced by everyone." I do, however, agree with his assertion that with these passages Tolstoy "ensures that the reader sympathizes with his characters and cooperates fully in the reading experience." And Williams rightly remarks upon Tolstoy's use of repetition and rhythm in such passages to affect readers' emotions and encourage them to think about moral questions.

Williams uses passages from *Childhood* and *Boyhood* to demonstrate his concept of investigation through invention. By the time he mentions the term again, in one of two

chapters dealing with *War and Peace*, I had forgotten what the term meant, so little does it evoke in and of itself. This time Williams discusses the internal monologue of Nikolai Rostov as he faces Dolokhov across a hand of cards. Williams himself seems to question the usefulness of his term when he states at this point: "'Investigation through invention,' like all other devices, is not used for long in an unalloyed form; other means of presentation are combined with it, it is interrupted and varied." Thus he suggests that the Rostov monologue is different from other similar monologues, but proceeds to discuss it as an example of "investigation through invention" without specifying what makes it unique.

Williams ably observes that one of the main effects of the passage is to reduce the distance between the reader and Rostov. One reason for the reduction of distance is that, according to Williams, the reader recognizes "the very distinct pattern" of the questions Rostov asks himself. I simply do not discern the pattern--a movement outward from the particular to the general-- that Williams claims distinguishes these passages. I agree with Williams' assertion that Tolstoy relies on internal monologues to draw his reader into the experience of the characters, but I fail to see the usefulness of the term "investigation through invention" or of insisting on a pattern, which if it exists at all, is so general it could describe virtually any internal monologue.

Williams, however, suggests that the "pattern" of questions in "investigation through invention" is reminiscent of the structure of Laurence Sterne's "white bear passage" in *Tristram Shandy*, which in turn is based on the systems of rhetorical invention developed by classical rhetoricians. This discussion is interesting, if unconvincing. Williams turns to the field of music to describe another of Tolstoy's methods. According to Williams, those of Tolstoy's early stories in which the psychological life of the hero is foregrounded can be seen as "songs" in which a single melodic line dominates. Stories in which Tolstoy brings two different responses to the world into view are "antiphonal." In *The Cossacks*, we are told, "Tolstoy moves from an antiphonic to a symphonic presentation of reality." All we are told, however, about what a symphonic presentation might look like is that in *The Cossacks* "as in a symphony, everything coheres and adds to the significance of the whole."

These terms do not appear again in any of Williams' other chapters, a fact which brings me to an annoying aspect of this book. Williams' study lacks an effective organization. Just as it is difficult to identify an overall thesis to the book as a whole, it is near impossible to identify a central thesis or organizing principle for the separate chapters as well. And with one or two exceptions Williams provides no transitions between chapters. Thus although each chapter might include several insightful observations, there is no organizing principle to give these ideas coherence. The vagueness of the concluding lines of Chapter 3 is typical: "The catastrophes and peripetia mentioned by Annenkov are not random accidents, they are part of a moral pilgrimage. This is one of the sources of the strength which his contemporaries found in Tolstoy."

What puzzled me first about this sometimes useful and informative study is its title: *The Influence of Tolstoy on Readers of His Works*. Before beginning to read the book I took this title to mean that in his book Williams would be concerned with how Tolstoy has

influenced his readers and I assumed he meant to investigate what has been the influence of Tolstoy's ideas and convictions on his readers as expressed or embodied in his works. Generally, I would argue, when one talks about a person's influence, one has in mind the power exerted by that person over another by means of ideas and actions. But in the first paragraph of his Preface, Williams states that there has never been a detailed study in English of "the methods which Tolstoy employs to influence his reader and the relationship which he establishes with his reader." Williams also asserts that "I am concerned principally with the way in which...he influences his reader through the images he has created and helps him to join the world of the characters." And in the same paragraph he states "I am principally concerned with the way in which [Tolstoy] attempts to influence the reader through words." These three statements taken together do not constitute a coherent thesis. But having read the Preface through to the end I think that the author's purpose is to study the methods Tolstoy uses to direct the reader's experience.

I proceeded to read the body of Williams' book and I experienced both delight and displeasure as I perceived an impressive compendium of information, insights, and interpretations of a substantial number of Tolstoy's works all written in the period before 1880. Then when I read in the Afterword Williams' own view of his work, I was baffled. In the first line he states: "This study is an attempt to ascertain the *means* [my italics] by which Tolstoy exerts an influence on the reader." He goes on to summarize his accomplishment more fully and explains:

I have shown that Tolstoy believed that literature was communication with a reader and that from his earliest steps in literature he struggled to gain a clear picture in his mind of who his reader was and how he could best communicate with him. Indeed, has there ever been an author who has not imagined to himself the effect his work would have on his reader? *I have merely attempted to follow the author and study some of the effects of his work* [my italics].

There is a considerable difference between means and effects. And although these statements are not contradictory, neither do they provide a coherent statement of purpose or intent.

What Williams really offers, along with a great deal of contextualizing background concerning Tolstoy's literary career and critical reception and interpretations of aspects of some of Tolstoy's works, is an exploration of some of the methods Tolstoy uses to communicate and structure his vision and some discussion of the effects of these methods. Williams' focus is not on the experience of the reader; his focus, on the whole, is on Tolstoy--on his literary intentions and methods.

It must be said that in the two chapters Williams devotes to discussion of *War and Peace*, he is indeed concerned with the experience of the reader. His main point is that Tolstoy makes great demands on his reader. In the first of the two chapters, Williams discusses at length the opening scene of *War and Peace*. His discussion may well be interesting as well as useful to someone reading Tolstoy's book for the first time or for a non-specialist. Then in the second chapter he writes more broadly about the process of character development and Tolstoy's presentation of his historical philosophy. Here, Williams makes a number of insightful comments about the innumerable links among

characters, scenes, and themes that permeate *War and Peace*. He remarks, for example, that even links not easily detected by readers help them to follow, organize, make sense of what they are reading. Although I do not agree with Williams that Tolstoy creates "a system of links, I think his assessment of their central function is quite right: "These links tend, on the whole, to produce an impression of harmony through the perspective which they afford of individual destinies and of the whole range of human behavior of all kinds of love, hatred, cowardice, courage, avarice, jealousy, vanity and pride."

The final two chapters of Williams' study are devoted to *Anna Karenina*. As is the case throughout the book, Williams' style is meandering and digressive. To begin his discussion Williams goes on at excessive length about the importance of the concept of heat in Russia and Europe generally in the nineteenth-century. He points out that Levin resumes his reading of John Tyndall's book on heat when he returns to the country after Kitty's rejection, and proceeds to argue that consciousness, the will and heat are linked not only in the scenes depicting Levin's return home, but in the whole of *Anna Karenina*. Williams, however, never indicates what he thinks is the significance of the image or motif of heat in the novel. Instead, he explains: "It is evident that there is some sort of connection between Levin's ideas of family life, which are closely connected with his will to improve himself, and heat. This connection is not explained in any formula, it becomes evident from the juxtaposition of elements of the material. It is up to the reader to form his own conclusions." Similarly, a few pages later he asserts "Thus Tolstoy made the connection between energy in the physical world and energy in the spiritual world. This connection is not explained in the novel, but it is demonstrated." Thus I am never quite sure exactly what point Williams is trying to make.

In the second chapter devoted to *Anna Karenina* Williams discusses the link between consciousness and will in the novel. He refers several times to the "dialectical process" by which characters try to come to terms with their experience. Just as I object to Williams' use of "system" to describe the myriad links that permeate *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*, so do I object to his use of "dialectical process" to describe characters' experience. Tolstoy, I would argue, is nearer to the Aristotelian conception of evolution through quantitative variations than to the Heraclitean insistence on the underlying connection between opposites that pervades Hegel's dialectics. And just as "system" and "dialectical process" would not be words Tolstoy would identify himself with, his character the painter Mikhaylov in *Anna Karenina* would not use the word "technique" to discuss his activity as an artist. And yet Williams writes: "When Vronsky and Anna meet the artist Mikhaylov he is creating a picture which shows Pontius Pilate judging Jesus. The scene poses tremendous moral problems, but the aspect of his technique which Mikhaylov himself emphasizes does not have a moral dimension. He seeks to 'remove the coverings' which cloak what he is portraying in order to reveal, not the truth, not beauty, not goodness or vice, but 'energetic force.'" But removing the coverings is not a matter of technique for Mikhaylov: what one needs to be an artist is an eye, a keenly sensitive and discerning awareness. This awareness is precisely that "passion of creative contemplation" Pasternak wrote of.

Despite my own disagreements with aspects of Williams' description and

interpretation of Tolstoy's works, this study will serve as a useful and provocative introduction to Tolstoy. I do not know what kind of editorial intervention the book received, but I believe its positive aspects could have been strengthened had it received more.

As I read the closing lines of Williams' Afterword I am baffled anew: "It may be that his book is the record of the effects produced by Tolstoy's work only on one reader, that is, the author of this study. It would be surprising, however, if this were the case, since the author has no reason to suppose that his reactions to the works of Tolstoy are markedly different from those of most men." Would the author have reason to suppose that his reactions might be markedly different from those of most *women*? Why would a person choose to use "men" in the sense of "men and women" when it clearly would have been just as easy to say "most people"?

Like Pasternak and like Williams, I, too, have been impressed by the ineluctable power of Tolstoy to enchant me with his vision. At the very least, Williams' study reminded me of how difficult it is to describe Tolstoy's achievement.

Natasha Sankovitch, Ohio Wesleyan University

***Memoirs of Peasant Tolstoyans in Soviet Russia.* Translated, edited, and with an introduction by William Edgerton. Bloomington, Ill.: Indiana University Press, 1993.**

The memoirs included in this volume document the lives of those who attempted to live out Tolstoy's moral ideas during the first two decades of Soviet power. These memoirs describe pre-revolutionary village ways, the battles of World War I, the famine of 1921-22, the relative prosperity of the NEP period, and the brutal years of collectivization and Terror from a unique perspective. Boris Mazurin, an organizer of the Tolstoyan Life and Labor Commune and one of the few Tolstoyans still alive at the time of this collection's publication, describes the ideals that animated the movement and conveys the spirit that sustained it:

Often in frank discussions we would hear such statements as this from Communists--highly placed figures, ordinary members, and investigators, as well as simple working people: "It's all well and good, what you Tolstoyans say. That will all come about--a stateless society without violence and without frontiers, sober and industrious, and without private property. But this is not the right time for it--right now it is even harmful." But we did not understand that. The "Kingdom of God" that lived within us kept nudging us toward carrying out our ideals immediately, without delay. Putting off the fulfillment of our ideals until some indefinite time in the future seemed to us amazingly similar to the teachings of the church people, who urged us to be patient and endure our poverty and deprivation so that we would acquire the blessings we longed for in some future life beyond the grave." (97)

Because they resisted military service, and because they refused to profess the Communist creed and teach it to their children, the Tolstoyans quickly became targets for harassment. Forced collectivization almost destroyed the movement in 1929, but its leaders--backed by the influential Vladimir Chertkov--petitioned the authorities for the resettlement of the Tolstoyan Life and Labor Commune from the Moscow region to Western Siberia. Permission was granted, and in 1931 the Commune began new life in the Altai region, on the river Tom. All but one of the memoirists who speak to us in this book lived and worked on that commune, which attracted hundreds of farmers from all over Russia.

The fate of the Tolstoyans in the Soviet Union has received scant attention both there and abroad. The historian Mark Popovskii remembers his surprise when towards the end of the 1970's he learned that his writing on ethics and science had attracted the attention of the Tolstoyans: "Where could Tolstoyans be coming from, in the sixth decade of Soviet rule?," he wondered. He soon began corresponding with them and the result was the first history of the subject, his *Russkie muzhiki rasskazyvajut: Posledovateli L.N. Tolstogo v Sovetskom Sojuze 1918-1977* (London: Overseas Publications Interchange Ltd., 1983). Popovskii discovered that after the February Revolution, the Tolstoyans, far from losing momentum, gained followers and set about establishing a number of agricultural communes. These collectives went on to flourish thanks to the hard work and ingenuity of their members, many of them peasants or used to working the land. The communes were held together by the relative harmoniousness of their members' shared beliefs and practices (no one consumed meat, smoked, drank, or used vulgar language), although differences arose concerning childrearing practices and questions of economic management.

The surviving Tolstoyans had an acute sense of history; they preserved letters, papers, documents, and photographs and recorded their recollections for posterity. However, it was not until the advent of *glasnost'* that their story began receiving some attention in the Soviet press. *Vospominanija krest'jan-tolstovtsev, 1910-1930-e gody*, compiled by the historian Arsenii Roginskii, appeared in 1989. It is from this compilation that William Edgerton has drawn his selection, accompanying his excellent translation with an informative, readable introduction, useful annotations, and evocative photographs. Edgerton's edition provides the necessary context for the English-speaking reader. His abridgment of the Russian original does not diminish the material's impact; the volume may even gain in concision. And Edgerton's recalculation of the traditional Russian weights and measures into pounds, feet, yards, acres, etc. adds to the text's immediacy.

The volume will prove an excellent source for students of Soviet history and culture. In making available the memoirs of peasant-intellectuals, it supplements the more widely-known memoir literature written by intellectuals. In addition to "many grim pages about the harassment, persecution, arrests, torture, and years of confinement in labor

camps suffered by the Tolstoyans," as Edgerton notes in his introduction, the memoirs contain a wealth of other details:

descriptions of...the traditional matchmaking and wedding of one of the authors; scenes of the beautiful Siberian landscape in which the Tolstoyans relocated their Life and Labor Commune; a fascinating account of the initiative and ingenuity they showed in developing a new type of farming in the region.... (xviii-xix)

Some of the peasant Tolstoyans record the transforming effect of Tolstoy's writing on their lives. In the sinister days of 1936, Yakov Dragunovsky--the only one of the authors in this volume to perish in the camps--bravely submitted a statement protesting the mass arrests that had taken place at the commune. Dragunovsky continued to speak freely about his beliefs and, until his execution in 1938, to urge the authorities to heed reason and conscience. His papers and his story bear moving witness to the moral power of Tolstoy's ideas. His and the other memoirs in this volume can enrich our appreciation of the historical and cultural influence of Tolstoy's art and thought.

Gina Kovarsky, Columbia University

Bibliographical Abstracts

HAROLD K. SCHEFSKI, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

De Roeck, Galina L. "Tolstoj's Krejcerova Sonata: Music as Its Theme and Structure" *Russian Language Journal* XLI, Nos. 153-55 (1992): 111-118.

The author proposes that a musical and literary structure are merged in Tolstoy's "Kreutzer Sonata," and classifies the work as "a brilliant literary sonata." Thus, each section of the story assumes both a literary and musical form (e.g. "The first two chapters constitute the first movement or exposition" or "The second movement consists of sixteen sections or constitutes the development of the theme of matrimony," etc.). The sonata format which is embedded in the work can be extracted only upon subsequent readings and shows that Tolstoy carried the music metaphor to a subliminal level as well.

Drozd, Andrew M. "The Structure of Tolstoj's Xadzi-Murat" *Russian Language Journal* XLVI, Nos. 153-155 (1992): 119-124.

The author argues for the artistic merit of "Xadzi Murat", placing it on the highest level of Tolstoy's work after his "conversion." Structural components, such as frame, shifts in narrative perspective, multiple settings, and other devices reduce the force of Tolstoy's normally didactic approach and create a pleasing aesthetic effect. In this story Tolstoy has reasserted his penchant for symmetry, contrast, juxtaposition, that characterized his earlier artistic work before he gave way to a formulaic sermonlike approach in the later moralistic stories.

Gray, Norah J. "Count Bezukhov's 'Quivering Sphere'" *Irish Slavonic Studies* 12(1991): 57-68.

This work analyzes the meaning of "the quivering sphere" which Pierre Bezukhov sees in his dream by the campfire at Shamshevo in *War and Peace*. This image is dependent on three motifs: 1)the representation of Karataev as a drop which can be linked with other water images throughout the work, 2)the repetition of the verb разлиться which is juxtaposed with its opposite слиться as the rhythm of life is seen in terms of diverging and converging flow, and 3)repetition of the term узел жизни (the knot of life) where the word узел denotes node as well as knot and shows nature's tendency to move between liquid and solid forms. In short, symbolism is the major thrust of this dream just as it was with the dreams depicted in *Anna Karenina*.

Style Guide and Information for Authors

Editorial Policy: The *Tolstoy Studies Journal* is a refereed journal and welcomes contributions on any topic relevant to Tolstoy scholarship. In addition to articles, the journal publishes review articles, roundtable discussions, news and events, notices of work in progress, special reports, and book reviews. Book reviews will normally be invited, but unsolicited reviews may be considered. See the inside front cover for addresses for submissions.

Submissions: Two copies of the manuscript should be sent to the Editor. Receipt of manuscripts will be acknowledged, and the author will be informed as soon as possible whether or not the manuscript has been accepted. The usual deadline for submission is June 1. Special issues may have special deadlines which will be announced in advance.

Style: The manuscript should be prepared in accordance with MLA Style, that is, references should be made in the body of the text to works that are listed in a WORKS CITED section at the end of the paper. Footnotes should contain commentary rather than bibliographical material.

Transliteration: Russian and other Slavic languages should be transliterated according to the Library of Congress system of transliteration. Russian surnames which have commonly been transliterated differently in English, e.g., Tolstoy, Tchaikovsky, should be given in their standardized form.

Quotations: Quotations may be given in cyrillic. English translations should also be supplied. Direct quotations longer than four manuscript lines should be set off from the body of the text by indenting five spaces from the left margin and omitting quotation marks.

Computer generated copy: To facilitate type-setting, the journal encourages the submission of computer disks in any format. When submitting the disk, please indicate the type of word-processing program used, the operating system and the title of the file.

Announcements

Bristol Press has now issued two new Tolstoy works in its series of annotated Russian language readers. This series was originated by Bradda Books and acquired by Bristol Classic Texts in 1990. Each paperback edition includes an introduction, bibliography, stressed text, linguistic notes and vocabulary.

Tolstoy: *Childhood*

The Death of Ivan Ilyich

Sebastopol in May/December

Titles may be ordered from:

Duckworth
The Old Piano Factory
48 Hoxton Square
London N1 6PB

or

Focus
P.O. Box 369
Newburyport, MA 01950
Tel (508)462-7288
Fax (508)462-9035