Tatiana Kuzmic

«Serbia — Vronskii's Last Love»: Reading *Anna Karenina* in the Context of Empire

During May of 1877, as the last installment of *Anna Karenina* was to come out in *Russkii vestnik*, which had been publishing the novel intermittently since January 1875, Tolstoi quarreled with the journal's editor. Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov, well known for his conservative imperialist politics, refused to print the Epilogue because of its frank opposition to the Russian volunteer movement, which was helping Serbia and Montenegro in their fight for independence from Turkey. The Epilogue would have made a poor fit with the rest of that particular issue, since its table of contents reads almost like a history of Russia's wars with Turkey on behalf of other Orthodox Christians, with titles such as "Россия и Европа на Востоке пред Андрианопольским миром" (Russia and Europe in the East before the Treaty of Andrianople), "Восточная война" (the Crimean War), and the contemporaneous "Воспоминания добровольца" (Memories of a Volunteer).

In a paragraph at the bottom of the last page of the issue, Katkov acknowledges that a conclusion to *Anna Karenina* was to follow and summarizes it thus:

> В предыдущей книжке под романом *Анна Каренина* выставлено: "окончание следует". Но со смертию героини собственно роман кончился. По плану автора, следовал бы еще небольшой епилог, листа в два, из коего читатели могли бы узнать что Вронской, в смущении и горе после смерти Анны, отправляется добровольцем в Сербию и что все прочие живы и здоровы, а Левин

© Tatiana Kuzmic, 2013
© TSQ 43. Winter 2013 (http://www.utoronto.ca/tsq/)

остается в своей деревне и сердится на славянские комитеты и на добровольцев. Автор быть-может разовьет ети главы к особому изданию своего романа.[1]

In the last issue under the novel *Anna Karenina* it was posted: "conclusion to follow." But for all intents and purposes the novel ends with the death of the heroine. According to the author's plans, a small epilogue was to follow, a printer's sheet or two, from which the readers could find out that Vronskii, in confusion and grief after Anna's death, leaves for Serbia as a volunteer and that all others are alive and well, but Levin remains in his village and is angry at the Slavonic committees and the volunteers. The author may develop those chapters in a special edition of his novel.

Katkov's assessment that for all intents and purposes the novel ends with Anna's death has been confirmed by popular conceptions of the novel, including its film versions, which tend to privilege Anna over Levin. Yet the Epilogue's heavy-handed political message offers us a view, albeit a hind-sighted one, of the entire story as an allegory for Russia's imperial politics. By examining the novel in the context of the political upheaval of the mid-1870s, this article proposes a model for reading *Anna Karenina* as an articulation of national anxieties through the fate of the adulterous heroine. I do not intend to claim that Tolstoi purposefully conceived of Anna as an anthropomorphized Russia, nor is there any proof of that in his drafts or letters about the novel. I am proposing, however, a metaphorical reading that moves away from the more traditional reading of the novel of adultery as a response to the "Woman Question," while still retaining the category of gender for the purposes of discussing its role in national(ist) rhetoric. Relying on Tolstoi's own oft-quoted description of *Anna Karenina* as a series of links (*сцепления*),[2] my

[1] M. N. Katkov (ed.), Russkii vestnik: Zhurnal literaturnyi i politicheskii 129 (1877): 472. Translations from Russian, unless otherwise noted, are my own.

[2] Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (*PSS*), 90 vols. (Moscow, 1928-1958), 62:269. Future citations of Tolstoi's *PSS* will be given by volume and page number in the text.

reading of the novel explores the links between the progression and culmination of the Eastern Crisis during the serialization of the novel and the foregrounded story of a family in crisis.

The long tradition of gendering nations and other collectivities as female, evident in expressions ranging from "Mother Earth" to "Mother Russia," invites links to be drawn between the novel's heroine and its response to a national crisis. A nation, like a woman, is an entity for which men live and die — as do Karenin and Vronskii, respectively — and whose honor they pledge to defend. The Judeo-Christian tradition especially, with its personification of Israel as a woman (in some cases an adulterous woman) and the Church as the bride of Christ, provides a significant framework for reading *Anna Karenina* as a national allegory. The Pan-Slavic movement relied, as did many a national movement steeped in the same religious tradition, on a rhetoric of Russia's destiny to be the savior of the world, or at least of its Orthodox brothers in the East for the time being. More specifically, the Russian image of that savior had always been cast in the mold of the Virgin Mary, whose icons preceded armies into battle and were considered endowed with miraculous powers.[3] The presence of grammatical gender in the Russian language, which marks the nation and all of its attributes as feminine, only reinforces the link.

Tolstoi's oeuvre is especially rich in intersections of gender relations with issues of national identity, as a cursory glance at his three major novels reveals. His growing disregard for sexual relationships and for national allegiances takes place simultaneously as the increasingly promiscuous representation of his heroines accompanies his declining views of Russia. *War and Peace* idealizes both Russia — in contrast to France — and the woman — in the figure of Natasha Rostova. Russia's victory over France is

[3] The most often cited statement regarding the paramount role of the Virgin Mary in Russian culture is Nikolai Berdiaev's from *The Russian Idea*: "The fundamental category is motherhood. The Mother of God takes precedence of [sic] the Trinity and is almost identified with it. The people have felt the nearness of the interceding Mother of God more vividly than that of Christ." (Boston: Beacon Press, 1962, pp. 6-7).

cast in terms of *moral* superiority,[4] while Natasha is saved from eloping with Anatole Kuragin and goes on to become the perfect wife and mother in the Epilogue. Tolstoi's last major novel, *Resurrection*, casts a hardened prostitute in the leading female role and exposes the state as a perpetrator of crimes against women and other minorities. Moreover, *Resurrection* was much more closely engaged in battling state policies than merely decrying them in its pages; its vitriol against the Orthodox Church proved to be the last straw that led to Tolstoi's excommunication in 1901. The novel was written long after Tolstoi had already abandoned the genre and for the sole purpose of financing the emigration of Dukhobors, who were being persecuted by the state church. The freeing of a religious sect from a corrupt state by means of a story about a corrupt(ed) woman thus completes the downward trajectory that began with an ideal woman and a morally superior state. *Anna Karenina* occupies the middle ground between the two extremes as a novel that features an adulteress and criticizes Russia's military involvement on behalf of other Orthodox Slavs. The heroine and the state are swayed by romance and nationalism, respectively, the latter in itself being a kind of romance. The adulterous woman, who breaks the family boundaries by assuming a role outside its parameters, turns out to be a suitable metaphor for the adulterous nation, whose own parameters come under question regarding its relationship with and responsibility for other nations.

The plight of Orthodox Christians under Ottoman rule had been of concern to Russia since the Crimean War and the first Slavic Benevolent Committee — the object of much ridicule in *Anna Karenina* — was founded in Moscow in 1858.[5] However, it

[4] In the last paragraph of chapter 39, part 2, volume 3 of the novel, Tolstoi describes the end of the battle of Borodino as "победа нравственная" for Russia, a victory that "убеждает противника в нравственном превосходстве своего врага," and ends the chapter with "погибель Наполеоновской Франции, на которую в первый раз под Бородиным была наложена рука сильнейшего духом противника." Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (*PSS*), 90 vols. (Moscow, 1928-1958), 11:265.

[5] For historical information, I have relied on Barbara Jelavich's *Russia's Balkan Entanglements 1806-1914* (Cambridge University Press, 1991), Peter J. S.

was not until almost two decades later that the Eastern Crisis, re-opened again as a result of the Balkan uprisings, became the all-consuming public issue that the Epilogue describes. In early July of 1875 a scant summer harvest that threatened starvation, combined with the general consciousness of the increasingly obvious decline of the Ottoman empire, triggered the first of a wave of uprisings in Herzegovina. Bosnia and Bulgaria soon followed, while Serbia and Montenegro, confident of Russian support, declared war on Turkey in the summer of 1876.[6] The political crisis generated by the uprisings garnered the kind of public involvement that was compared to 1812,[7] with the added dimension of being fueled in an unprecedented manner by the press, which is also criticized in the Epilogue for drowning out all other voices ("Из-за них не слыхать ничего.") (*PSS* 19:390). Pan-Slavism, which was up until that time a philosophical idea debated by a handful of intellectuals, turned into a massive grass-roots movement that aided the Balkan states without any official government involvement or permission. As the Epilogue itself partially describes, church services incorporated prayers for the Balkan rebels and collected monetary donations while the volunteer movement of several thousand soldiers under the leadership of general Mikhail Grigor'evich Cherniaev, as well as groups of doctors and nurses, reinforced the Serbian troops.[8] Ivan

Duncan's *Russian Messianism: Third Rome, Revolution, Communism and After* (Routledge, 2000), and two books by Jelena Milojković-Djurić; *Panslavism and National Identity in Russia and in the Balkans 1830-1880: Images of the Self and Others* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1994) and *The Eastern Question and the Voices of Reason: Austria-Hungary, Russia, and the Balkan States 1875-1908* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2002).

[6] The famous travelogue writer of Yugoslavia, Rebecca West, recalls the following anecdote that encapsulates the political relationship: "It is said that a traveller said to a Montenegrin, 'How many of your people are there?' and he answered, 'With Russia, one hundred and eighty millions'" (*Black Lamb Grey Falcon*, p. 1009).

[7] Aleksander Nikolaevich Pypin in an article for *Vestnik Evropy*, cited by Milojković-Djurić in *The Eastern Question*, pp. 14 and 35.

[8] The third and final version of the Epilogue was published as a separate booklet in July 1877 before it appeared, together with the first seven sections, in book form in January 1878. If the published Epilogue seems harsh in its

Sergeevich Aksakov, who presided over the Slavic Committee during the Balkan uprisings and, consequently, the Committee's greatest political relevance (from 1875 to 1878) lamented in the late 1850s that "the Slavic question does not extend to the core of the people, it is alien to them."[9] The Balkan uprisings changed all that as they provided such Slavophiles as Aksakov, Katkov, Tiutchev, and Dostoevskii with a political platform and mass following. Tolstoi took his usual place of contrarian, accusing the press of sensationalism and the cause itself of providing yet another diversion for the idle wealthy classes. On April 24 of 1877, caving under the immense public pressure and reneging on his policy of *recueillement*, Aleksandr II officially declared war on Turkey. The plan for the contested Epilogue's publication less than a month later thus proved to be of particularly bad timing.

While Anna's life ends in the last chapter of part 7, her dead body haunts the Slavonic movement in the controversial Epilogue, where her grieving lover boards the train for Serbia. As a volunteer, described in chapter 5, Vronskii follows a whole host of unfortunate characters whose disappointing circumstances at home inspired them to join the war abroad. The first chapter of the Epilogue describes the academic failure of Levin's half-brother Sergei Ivanovich Koznyshev, whose six-year book project on government in Russia and Europe merited two negative book reviews and, aside from those, overall silence. "На его счастье" (fortunately for him) as the narrator puts it, the Slavonic question had just come into vogue and "Он посвятил всего себя на служение этому великому делу и забыл думать о своей книге." (He devoted himself completely to the service of that great work and forgot to think about his book.) (*PSS* 19:352, 353). He does not fail to notice, however, that

condemnation of the Volunteers, it is a toned down version from the first two, which open with the narrator's own critique of the Slavonic craze (instead of introducing it through Koznyshev's book troubles, as it is done in the final version) and name Cherniaev directly.

[9] Quoted from Stephen Lukashevich's *Ivan Aksakov 1823-1886: A Study in Russian Thought and Politics* (Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 120.

> ...при этом общем подъеме общества выскочили вперед и кричали громче других все неудавшиеся и обиженные: главнокомандующие без армий, министры без министерств, журналисты без журналов, начальники партий без партизанов. (*PSS* 19:352-3)
>
> ...in this general upsurge of society the ones who leaped to the forefront and shouted louder than the rest were all the failures and the aggrieved: commanders-in-chief without armies, ministers without ministries, journalists without journals, party chiefs without partisans.

Koznyshev himself fits the list as a scholar without book accolades and so might Vronskii as a lover without a mistress. In chapter 3 Koznyshev's companion Katavasov enters a second class carriage in order to meet the volunteers and encounters a boasting drunkard, a retired officer who had been juggling various professions his entire life, and a cadet who had failed his artillery examination. In chapter 4 Koznyshev runs into Vronskii's mother at the train station and finds out that Vronskii was persuaded to join the cause by his friend Yashvin, who had lost everything at cards. Regarding Vronskii, his mother proclaims: "Это Бог нам помог —эта Сербская война. Я старый человек, ничего в этом не понимаю, но ему Бог это послал." (This is God helping us — this Serbian war. I am an old person, I don't understand anything about it, but God has sent this to him.) (*PSS* 19:360). Her statement not only puts Vronskii in the same category with the other, utterly unheroic, down-and-out volunteers, but her theology makes an even harsher affront on the Slavophiles, who preferred to see Russia as God's help to Serbia instead of Serbia as a destination for Russians who could not make themselves useful at home.[10]

That is the lead-up to the description of Vronskii himself, in chapter 5, where the Pan-Slavic movement is most closely linked to adultery since Vronskii joins the volunteers as a direct response

[10] Tolstoi's portrayal of the volunteers is verified by other writings, such as Gleb Ivanovich Uspenskii's "Letters from Serbia," which describe the volunteers as motivated by the prospects of material gain that was unavailable to them in Russia and as largely ignorant of Pan-Slavic ideology. See Milojković-Djurić *Panslavism* pp. 105-111.

to losing his mistress. Within the broader tradition of gendering nations as female, the adulterous heroine of a novel that ends with a strong political critique invites the analogy even without discussing the fate of the grieving lover. But Vronskii's trip to Serbia — his last mistress, as cleverly noted in an essay by a recently deceased Serbian journalist[11] — allows for the analogy to be made from *within* the novel itself instead of merely relying on the much wider cultural context of gendered nations.

The space of the train station naturally reminds Vronskii of the site of Anna's suicide:

> При взгляде на тендер и на рельсы… ему вдруг вспомнилась *она*, то есть то, что оставалось еще от нее, когда он, как сумасшедший, вбежал в казарму железнодорожной станции: на столе казармы бесстыдно растянутое посреди чужих окровавленное тело, еще полное недавней жизни… (*PSS* 19:362)
>
> As he looked at the tender and the rails… he suddenly remembered *her*, that is, what was still left of her when, like a madman, he ran into the railway shed: on the table in the shed, shamelessly stretched out before strangers, lay the blood-stained body still filled with recent life…

Attention to grammar in the Russian original reveals Anna as the subject, as opposed to object — and an emphasized subject at that, with the italicized *она* — of Vronskii's memory; it might be more accurate in English to say that she appeared to him instead of "he suddenly remembered *her.*" Vronskii's subsequent failed attempt "вспомнить ее такою, какою она была тогда, когда он в первый раз встретил ее тоже на станции" (to remember her as she was when he met her for the first time, also at a station) (*PSS* 19:362) can be read as a failed attempt at reversing those roles and becoming the subject, as mirrored in the grammar reversal. Anna

[11] The title of Momo Kapor's essay is "Serbia — Vronskii's Last Love" and it belongs to his collection, *A Guide to the Serbian Mentality* (Belgrade: dereta, 2006). The essay takes the same naive approach to Russian and Serbian brotherhood that is so harshly criticized in the Epilogue to *Anna Karenina*.

remains the agent and haunts the Epilogue in her last, most grotesque, and to Vronskii most unsettling, incarnation.

Vronskii's futile attempt to recall the initial Anna also recalls the train's previous role in the novel as the conduit for vehicles of adultery. Prior to the Epilogue the train was associated almost exclusively with the adultery plot; in fact it frames the adultery plot as its inception and its end. Other train travel occurs, of course, but in no case is it described in the amount of detail that it takes up in the three scenes associated with the affair: the one that occasions Vronskii's and Anna's meeting as she arrives in Moscow in the same compartment with his mother, the one where Vronskii follows her back to Petersburg and openly confesses his intentions, and the one that leads Anna to suicide. Thus, the train's role in the Epilogue as the vehicle for transporting Vronskii and the volunteers to the Balkans links it to the adultery plot and lends Anna's affair the symbolic meaning of Russia's national adultery.

Vronskii's vision of Anna's blood-stained, dismembered ("what still was left of her") body stands in gruesome contrast to the saintly, virginal, self-sacrificing female image of Russia that underpins the rhetoric of the Slavophiles and is briefly referenced in the Epilogue as part of a speech delivered to the volunteers: "На великое дело благословляет вас матушка Москва." (For the great deed mother Moscow blesses you.) (*PSS* 19:354). Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov, whose Slavophile writings Levin recalls several chapters after Vronskii recalls Anna's corpse, greeted the Crimean War as an occasion for Russia to experience spiritual redemption through an act of self-sacrifice. His successor, I. S. Aksakov, saw the opportunity reappear twenty years later, as did Tolstoi's admirer and the other giant of Russian literature, F. M. Dostoevskii. Dostoevskii discussed the Slavonic Question at length in his self-published *Dnevnik pisatelia* (A Writer's Diary) and commented extensively on *Anna Karenina*. He supported Russia's involvement in the Balkans as part of its mission in "единении всего славянства, так сказать, под крылом России" (uniting all of Slavdom, so to speak, under Russia's wing) (*PSS* 23:47) and defined Russia's relationship to her fellow-Slavs as "покровительница их и даже, может быть, предводительница, но не влады-

чица; мать их, а не госпожа" (their protector and even, perhaps, leader, but not ruler; their mother, but not mistress) (*PSS* 23:49).[12] The use of feminine nouns — lost in the English translation — to figure Russia as an intercessor for the Slavic states recalls the role in Orthodoxy commonly assigned to the Mother of God and thus creates an image of the nation that is antipodal to Tolstoi's dismembered adulteress. Dostoevskii's general admiration for Tolstoi, his praise for the forgiveness scene between Anna, Karenin and Vronskii after Anna's nearly fatal birthing (*PSS* 25:51-53) and his assessment of Levin as a "чистый сердцем" (pure-hearted) type of Russian nobleman "которым принадлежит будущность России" (to whom the future of Russia belongs) (*PSS* 25:57) intensified his disappointment in the Epilogue and he devoted long entries to bemoaning Levin's isolation from the people, who overwhelmingly supported the volunteers.

The Epilogue to *Anna Karenina*, in addition to having Levin verbally protest the war, confronts the idealized image of Russia's motherly sacrifice with (Vronskii's memory of) Anna's mangled corpse. Even in such a state, her "закинутая назад уцелевшая голова" (thrown back intact head) with "полуоткрытым румяным ртом" (half-open red mouth) (*PSS* 19:362) suggests a sexual pose, while the reference to her body being "shamelessly stretched out before strangers" recalls the shame incurred by the affair. Most importantly, her dismembered body presents the literalization of the metaphor begun in the description of her first physical union with Vronskii. In arguably one of the weirdest love scenes of nineteenth-century literature, the consummation of the affair is also portrayed as dismemberment:

> Он же чувствовал то, что должен чувствовать убийца, когда видит тело, лишенное им жизни… Но, не смотря на весь ужас убийцы пред телом убитого, надо резать на куски, прятать это тело, надо пользоваться тем, что убийца приобрел убийством. И с озлоблением, как буд-

[12] Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (*PSS*), 30 vols. (Leningrad, 1972—1981), 23:47, 49. Future citations to Dostoevskii's *PSS* will be given by volume and page number in the text.

то со страстью, бросается убийца на это тело, и тащит, и режет его; так и он покрывал поцелуями ее лицо и плечи. (*PSS* 18:157-8)

He felt what a murderer must feel when he looks at the body he has deprived of life… But, despite all the murderer's horror before the murdered body, this body must be cut into pieces and hidden away, and he must make use of what he has gained by the murder. And with animosity, as if with passion, as the murderer throws himself upon that body, and drags, and cuts it; so he covered her face and shoulders with kisses.

If this famous passage likens adulterous sex to bodily dismemberment, if it foreshadows death as the consequence of marital infidelity, then the Epilogue's recalling of that first love scene by the grieving lover-turned-volunteer suggests a link between foreign involvement and national dismemberment. [13]

As Tony Tanner observes in *Adultery in the Novel*, the first literary recordings of marital infidelity portrayed the act as wreaking havoc upon entire civilizations (as in the case of Paris and Helen) or societies (as in the case of Lancelot and Guinevere). In the nineteenth century novel, read by Tanner in the context of bourgeois morality and order, destruction is focused on the nuclear family and most often on the adulteress herself. The untimely and unnatural death of the transgressing heroine is the typical ending for Anna Karenina, Emma Bovary, and the German Effi Briest, to name a few of the most familiar ones from the

[13] It is interesting, in light of Tolstoi's political disagreements with Katkov, and in combination with the reading of Anna's story as symbolic of the author's anxieties regarding the Eastern Crisis, that Katkov disliked this particular scene as well. Tolstoi's answer to his objections was the following: "В последней главе не могу ничего тронуть. *Яркий реализм*, как вы говорите, есть единственное орудие, так как ни пафос, ни рассуждения я не могу употреблять. И это одно из мест, на котором стоит весь роман. Если оно ложно, то всё ложно." (In the last chapter I cannot touch anything. *Vivid realism*, as you say, is the only tool, such as neither pathos nor reflections could be. And that is one of the places on which the whole novel stands. If it is false, then everything is false.) (*PSS* 62:139).

European canon.[14] Bodily dismemberment, however, is unique to Tolstoi's heroine. His idea for the manner of Anna's suicide, as is well known, came from the act committed by his neighbor's mistress about a year before he commenced the writing of the novel.[15] The incident does not account, however, for the precise manner in which Tolstoi chose to foreshadow Anna's death in describing the consummation of her affair with Vronskii. That particular scene recalls passages from the so-called porno-prophetic sections of the Hebrew Bible. The term "porno-prophetic" was coined by feminist biblical scholarship as a designation for the pornographic sections of prophetic literature. These sections include images of both male and female genitalia that would make even the famous "seer of the flesh" blush, their main point being a graphic rebuke of the people for worshiping other gods by comparing Israel to an adulterous woman and prophesying her destruction at the hands of her foreign lover(s). The harsh repudiation of female sexuality and, moreover, female pleasure that these passages contain makes it easy to see how they would provide ample fodder for feminist critique.[16] The nineteenth-century novel of adultery, of course, has been the recipient of similar critique and Tolstoi's work in particular has produced interpretations ranging from misogyny to radical feminism. His peculiar depiction of the consummation of Anna's affair turns out to have more in common with the ancient texts of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea than it does with Tolstoi's more immediate European

[14] Tanner's book (Baltimore, 1979) does not address *Anna Karenina* (or *Effi Briest*), but deals with earlier novels of adultery, namely Rousseau's *Julie, or the New Heloise*, Goethe's *Elective Affinities*, and Flaubert's *Madame Bovary*. With an emphasis on bourgeois standards, Tanner examines these works within the context of class issues, whereas my larger argument involves the claim that subsequent novels of adultery (such as — besides *Anna Karenina — Middlemarch* and *Effi Briest*) are more productively read as symptomatic of national anxieties.

[15] See Nikolai Nikolaevich Gusev, *Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva L'va Nikolaevicha Tolstogo* (Moscow, 1958-1960), 384. The woman's name was Anna Stepanovna Pirogova and, after toying with some other first names for his heroine, Tolstoi settled on Anna.

[16] The term "porno-prophetic" has been employed by the following scholars: Athalya Brenner, Cheryl Exum, and Fokkelien van Dijk-Hemmes.

predecessors who wrote about adultery, such as Goethe or Flaubert.[17] The link between porno-prophetics and Tolstoi's novel of adultery is only strengthened by the biblical epigraph that frames the novel and invokes vengeance, a key theme of porno-prophetic literature to which I will return. Since the writings of the Slavophiles relied on the same biblical Madonna/whore rhetoric — whore when criticizing Russia and Madonna when proclaiming her virtues — *Anna Karenina* as a whole can be read as if in dialogue with them, and not just its Epilogue, the only part of the novel that addresses Slavophile Balkan entanglements directly.[18]

The porno-prophetic motif of God's punishment of the adulterous woman/nation is perhaps best encapsulated in one particular verse from Isaiah: "Your nakedness shall be uncovered, and your shame shall be seen. I will take vengeance, and I will spare no-one."[19] Nakedness, shame, and vengeance at the hands of her own lover(s) is prophesied to both Babylon and Israel by Isaiah and to Jerusalem by Ezekiel. In chapters 16 and 23 of the latter, the adulteress is to be handed over to her lovers, who will strip her naked and hack her to pieces. This is precisely what happens to Anna, metaphorically, at the hands of Vronskii and it is

[17] For a discussion of similarities and possible influences between Flaubert's famous novel and Tolstoi's rendition of adultery twenty years later, see Priscilla Meyer's article "*Anna Karenina*: Tolstoy's Polemic with *Madame Bovary*" in *The Russian Review*, vol. 54, April 1995, 243-59.

[18] For another example of porno-prophetic rhetoric, consider the following segment of I. S. Aksakov's speech, delivered to the Moscow Slavonic Benevolent Committee during Russia's concessions (which severely diminished the gains made for the Balkan states) at the Congress of Berlin in June 1878:

"Ты ли это, Русь-победительница, сама добровольно разжаловавшая себя в побежденную? Ты ли на скамье подсудимых как преступница, каешься в святых поднятых тобою трудах, молишь простить тебе, твои победы?... Едва сдерживая веселый смех, с презрительной иронией, похваляя твою политическую мудрость, западные державы, с Германией впереди, нагло срывают с тебя победный венец, преподносят тебе взамен шутовскую с гремушками шапку, а ты послушно, чуть ли с выражением чувствительнейшей признательности, подклоняешь под нее свою многострадальную голову." (*Sochineniia* 1:299)

[19] Chapter 47, verse 3. Biblical quotations used in this article are taken from the *New Oxford Annotated Bible* (Oxford, 2001).

what happens to her in the many interpretations that have been spawned by the novel, including the popular association of the fate of Vronky's horse, Frou-Frou, with Anna's.[20] Nakedness, shame, and vengeance are also the images that inform the bizarre sex scene in Part II, Chapter 11 of the novel. Following the author's famous ellipsis and his almost clinical assessment in the opening line of the chapter that "это желание было удовлетворено" (that desire had been satisfied) (*PSS* 18:157), he depicts Anna lowering her "когда-то гордую веселую, теперь же постыдную голову" (once proud, happy, but now shame-stricken head) (*PSS* 18:157) and feeling oppressed by "стыд пред духовную наготою своей" (shame at her spiritual nakedness) (*PSS* 18:158). The passage is as replete with the word "shame" when describing Anna as it is with "murder" when describing Vronskii. Shame subsequently recurs in the Epilogue through Vronskii's memory of Anna's corpse "shamelessly stretched out before strangers" as he prepares to commit murders in the Balkans.[21]

It might be noteworthy to consider the change that took place in this scene between the drafts of the Epilogue and its final version. In an earlier draft, Levin was the one described as viewing Anna's corpse (*PSS* 20:562). Such a turn of events would have, no

[20] Critics from Boris Eikhenbaum to Vladimir E. Alexandrov have read the parallel between Anna and Frou-Frou as intended by the author, especially given the similarity of language employed to describe Vronskii's reaction to each "murder": "бледный, с дрожащею нижнею челостью" (pale, with shivering lower jaw) (*PSS* 18:157) with Anna and "бледный и с трясущеюся нижнею челостью" (pale and with trembling lower jaw) (*PSS* 18:210) with Frou-Frou.

[21] To describe Vronskii's final action in this way is not an exaggeration of the text, since Levin — the author's mouthpiece — expresses the same sentiment in the discussion of the Slavonic Question that takes place in the Epilogue. While Koznyshev and Katavasov attempt to engender sympathy in him for "православных *людях*, страдающих под игом 'нечестивых Агарян'" (Orthodox Christians suffering under the yoke of the 'infidel Hagarenes') (*PSS* 19:388), Levin protests the idea of "убивать Турок" (killing the Turks) (*PSS* 19:391). In his earlier masterpiece *War and Peace*, though ideologically more pro-Russian state, Tolstoi also describes war as murder (at the end of a long list of other crimes) in the opening of volume 3 (*PSS* 11:3), which is — significantly, I would argue — the midpoint, that is, the very center of the book.

doubt, strengthened those readings of the novel that privilege the author (through the autobiographical Levin) as the one wreaking the vengeance prophesied in the much-puzzled-over epigraph, all the more so since Tolstoi himself went to view the body of his neighbor's dead mistress. Additionally, another meeting of the two protagonists in the Epilogue, though post-humous for one of them, might have satisfied those critics who saw the novel as divided into the Anna-story and Levin-story. Vronskii's viewing of the corpse, on the other hand, reinforces the image of Anna as *his* victim and thus confirms the hints made about his role as murderer in the consummation of the affair in chapter 11 and in his accident while riding Frou-Frou at the races in chapter 25 of Part II. Such a confirmation of earlier metaphors in the Epilogue that criticizes Russia's foreign policy reinforces the parallels between an adulterous woman and an adulterous nation, as it points to Vronskii's role in being the agent of harm to both.

While attention to the porno-prophetic motifs employed in the depiction of Anna's affair strengthens the link between the adulterous heroine and Russia's war on behalf of Orthodox Slavdom, it also calls for yet another re-examination of the epigraph: "Мне отмщение, и Аз воздам" (Vengeance is mine, and I will repay) (*PSS* 18:3). As has been well documented, Tolstoi most likely got the idea for it from Book 4 (*Ethics*, chapter 62) of Arthur Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Representation*, where the Bible verse is quoted.[22] Since the author is, effectively, God of the world of his novel, the most straightforward interpretation has been the one already mentioned above in connection with the draft that has Levin viewing Anna's mangled body: that Tolstoi himself punishes Anna for her transgression. Yet Tolstoi is sympathetic to Anna and unsympathetic to the hypocritical society that surrounds her, which prompted Viktor Shklovskii to conclude that it was people, and not God, who pushed Anna

[22] Tolstoi was reading the complete works of the philosopher, and raving about him, at the end of the 1860s. See Boris Eikhenabaum's *Tolstoi in the Seventies* (Ann Arbor, 1982), 145 and Donna Orwin's *Tolstoi's Art and Thought* (Princeton, 1993), 150.

under the train.[23] Since the verse about vengeance occurs both in the Old Testament — as God's threat to Israel — and in the New — as an injunction against human action — interpretations of the epigraph, such as the two examples just listed, can be grouped according to which Testament they rely on. Schopenhauer certainly had the New Testament in mind, since he quotes the verse in support of his statement that "No person has the authority to set himself up as a moral judge"[24] and Tolstoi's rendering of the Old Church Slavonic comes from the verse in Romans.[25] Considering the verse in relation to the political message of the Epilogue, the New Testament context supports Levin's qualms about waging war on behalf of oppressed Orthodox Slavs. One of the drafts of the Epilogue even evokes the epigraph when it points out the irony in the idea that "в войне за христианство… надо отмстить Туркам" (in the war for Christendom… one must wreak vengeance on the Turks) (*PSS* 20:556).

The Old Testament is still significant, however, not only as the original source of the phrase, but because its particular context, the so-called "Song of Moses," follows the same pattern as the prophesies of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah (although without the gendered and pornographic elements): it starts by reviewing God's deliverance of Israel, then warns the nation of forgetting this deed and worshipping other gods, and finally, enumerates the ensuing punishment. It is a form evident in the writings of first generation Slavophiles, such as A. S. Khomiakov, who fought the Turks in Bulgaria in 1828, wrote a "Letter to the Serbs" — warning them against westernization — in 1860, and whom Levin recalls

[23] Viktor Shklovskii, *Lev Tolstoi* (Moscow, 1978), 436. For a more detailed review of the various interpretations of the epigraph, see Amy Mandelker's *Framing Anna Karenina: Tolstoi, the Woman Question, and the Victorian Novel* (Columbus, 1993), 44-47. Tolstoi's initial conception of Anna Karenina was to "сделать эту женщину только жалкой и не виноватой" (make that woman only pitiful and not guilty) (Gusev, 369). Levin, as the author's mouthpiece, confirms this when, upon meeting Anna finally in Part VII, he experiences her as "удивительная, милая и жалкая" (amazing, dear and pitiful) (*PSS* 19:279).

[24] Cited in Eikhenbaum, 145.

[25] See Alexandrov, *Limits to Interpretation: The Meanings of* Anna Karenina (Madison, 2004), p. 308 (footnote #3) and chapter 7 for more on the epigraph.

reading in the Epilogue.[26] Khomiakov's writings enjoyed a resurge in popularity during Russia's war with Turkey in the late 1870s. Tolstoi, who had met the Slavophile thinker frequently in the late 1850s, read his works again in the spring of 1877, that is, as he was completing *Anna Karenina.* God's vengeance in the "Song of Moses" takes the form of national dismemberment — through arrows and swords, pestilence and plague, and the scattering of the people of Israel — which is, incidentally, the fear that Levin (and Tolstoi through him) expresses for Russia when he lumps her war with Turkey together with other rebellions and conquests that presented a threat to the nation. He comments that "в восьмидесятимиллионном народе всегда найдутся не сотни, как теперь, а десятки тысяч людей, потерявших общественное положение, бесшабашных людей, которые всегда готовы — в шайку Пугачева, в Хиву, в Сербию…" (among eighty million people, there are always to be found, not hundreds like now, but tens of thousands of people who have lost their social position, reckless people, who are always ready — to join Pugachev's band, to go to Khiva, to Serbia…) (*PSS* 19:389). If, as Alexandrov claims, the epigraph, functioning as "metaphoric montage," is "clearly relevant to a novel named after an adulteress," then I would argue that it should also be considered in light of Tolstoi's political concerns, all the more so since those are the primary concerns of the verse's original meaning.[27]

Henry James' famous assessment of Tolstoi's novels as "large, loose, baggy monsters"[28] can be applied to the empire from which they emerge and whose loose ends are acknowledged at several points in the novel, not just by Levin in the Epilogue. If Vronskii dismembers Anna and over-extends the empire into war, then the

[26] For one of the better known examples, see the following two stanzas of his famous poem "Rossii," which he composed on the eve of the Crimean War:

В судах черна неправдой черной	О, недостойная избранья,
И игом рабства клеймена,	Ты избрана! Скорей омой
Безбожной лести, лжи тлетворной,	Себя водою покаянья,
И лени мертвой и позорной,	Да гром двойного наказанья
И всякой мерзости полна!	Не грянет над твоей главой!

[27] Alexandrov pp. 67 and 69.

[28] Henry James, The Tragic Muse, 2 vols. (London: MacMillan, 1921), xi.

cuckolded Karenin represents a vain attempt to keep both wife and nation in order. The disobedient wife and the loose parts of the baggy empire appear as a pair of troubles and spill into each other for this high-ranking public official. Chapter 14 of Part 3 is divided between Karenin's first decisive move regarding Anna's infidelity and his drafting of a plan for investigating the the drought in the Zaraysk province and the "плачевно[е] состояни[е]" (lamentable situation) (*PSS* 18:302) of the *Inorodtsy*. His political plans are couched between his glancing at Anna's portrait that hangs in his study, the action progressing from his writing her a letter to glancing at her portrait to drafting notes for the ministry to glancing at her portrait again. Although Tolstoi's plans for *Anna Karenina* did not involve portraying the unfaithful wife as an anthropomorphized Russia, the analogy suggests itself quite strongly in this particular chapter, where a husband's dealings with his marital problems are intertwined with his dealings with the problems of empire. Just as the image of Anna's mangled body haunts the volunteer movement in the Epilogue, so her portrait oversees Karenin's statesman duties regarding Russia's colonies. Karenin feels pleased with the letter he writes to Anna, but when he looks at her portrait, she seems to look back at him "насмешливо и нагло" (mockingly and insolently) (*PSS* 18:300), causing him to turn away with a shudder. By contrast, looking at her again after attending to state business he "презрительно улыбнулся" (smiled contemptuously) and when he lies down in bed afterwards "событие с женой, оно ему представилось уже совсем не в таком мрачном виде" (the incident with his wife, it no longer presented itself to him in the same gloomy light) (*PSS* 18:303). The wife and the state become interchangeable concepts as drafting solutions to one problem eases the pain of the other.

The Slavonic Question had not yet gathered mass interest in Russia when Tolstoi wrote the first sketches for "the novel concern[ing] an unfaithful wife and the whole drama resulting from this" on March 18, 1873,[29] nor when *Russkii vestnik* published

[29] The phrase is Sof'ia Andreevna Tolstaya's and is quoted here from Eikhenbaum, p. 94.

the first installments in its January-April 1875 issues. The Herzegovinian uprising that started the wave and got the attention of Europe took place that summer, while Tolstoi was on a long break from writing.[30] Yet the Slavonic Question was on the his radar, since already in the first part of the novel (Chapter 32, published as part of the second installment in February 1875) Countess Lidiia Ivanovna receives a letter from a "известный панславист" (famous Panslavist) and rushes off to a Slavonic Committee meeting (*PSS* 18:115). In part 5, chapter 23 (published in December, 1876), the Countess is not only portrayed as an enthusiastic Pan-Slavist in more detail, but her political infatuations blur with romantic ones:

> Графиня Лидия Ивановна давно уже перестала быть влюбленною в мужа, но никогда с тех пор не переставала быть влюбленною в кого-нибудь. Она бывала влюблена в нескольких вдруг, и в мужчин и в женщин; она бывала влюблена во всех почти людей, чем-нибудь особенно выдающихся. Она была влюблена во всех новых принцесс и принцев, вступавших в родство с Царскою фамилией, была влюблена в одного митрополита, одного викарного и одного священника. Была влюблена в одного журналиста, в трех славян, в Комисарова; в одного министра, одного доктора, одного английского миссионера и в Каренина. (*PSS* 19:82-3)
>
> Countess Lidiia Ivanovna had long ago ceased to be in love with her husband, but had never since ceased to be in love with somebody. She was in love with several [persons] at once, both men and women; she had been in love with almost every one who was particularly prominent. She was in love with all the new princesses and princes who became connected with the Tsar's family, she was in love with a metropolitan, a bishop, and a priest. She was in love with a journalist, three Slavs, Komisarov, a minister, a doctor, an English missionary, and Karenin.

[30] For a review of the original serial publication dates in *Russkii vestnik*, see William Mills Todd III's article "The Responsibilities of (Co-)Authorship: Notes on Revising the Serialized Version of *Anna Karenina*" in *Freedom and Responsibility in Russian Literature* (Evanston, 1995), 159-69. As the dates show, regular monthly publication was interrupted each summer and fall.

Lidiia's infatuations are never to be physically consummated, like Anna's, but are sublimated, as evidenced in the quoted passage, through her involvement in benevolent causes. She proves to be aware of this when, several sentences later, "она ясно видела, что не была бы влюблена в Комисарова, если б он не спас жизни Государя, не была бы влюблена в Ристич-Куджицкого, если бы не было Славянского вопроса" (she saw clearly that she would not have been in love with Komisarov if he hadn't saved the Tsar's life and that she would not have been in love with Ristich-Kudzhitsky if it wasn't for the Slavonic Question) (*PSS* 19:83). Despite these lofty reasons, the similarity between the description of Lidiia's infatuations and a description of a prostitute's conduct from Tolstoi's last great novel prove to have a lot in common. Chapter 2 of *Resurrection* describes Katyusha Maslova's

> …прелюбодеяния с молодыми, средними, полудетьми и разрушающимися стариками, холостыми, женатыми, купцами, приказчиками, армянами, евреями, тартарами, богатыми, бедными, здоровыми, больными, пьяными, трезвыми, грубыми, нежными, военными, штатскими, студентами, гимназистами — всех возможных сословий, возрастов и характеров. (*PSS* 32:11)
>
> …adulteries with the old, middle-aged, half-children and feeble old men, bachelors, married men, merchants, clerks, Armenians, Jews, Tartars, rich, poor, sick, healthy, drunk, sober, rough, gentle, military men, civilians, students, highschoolers — of all possible classes, ages, and characters.

In both cases a long list of various types of persons is presented and the main difference between the two women is that of class: Lidiia Ivanovna's title allows her contact with the highest echelons of society, with "everyone who was particularly prominent" — princes, doctors, and ministers — while Katyusha is obliged to entertain anybody who pays for her services. Further, while Katyusha's list, proportionate to her profession, connotes heavier degrees of national adulteration in that it incorporates the disenfranchised ethnic groups of the Russian empire, Lidiia's love-fantasies center around trendy current events, such as the Slavonic

Question. The latter is alluded to in the figures of the three Slavs on Lidiia's list (and perhaps also the journalist that precedes them, since the Slavonic Question occupied the headlines at the time) as well as Ristich-Kudzhitsky, based on Jovan Ristich, the well-known Serbian political activist involved in the independence movement. Karenin, Lidiia's latest infatuation, is the appropriate person to end the long list as a man who expects his ideas to "принести величайшую пользу государству" (be of greatest use to the State) (*PSS* 18:301) and whose doctor, invited by Lidiia to check up on him after Anna's betrayal, cares for his health "*для* России" (for the sake of Russia) (*PSS* 18:214).

Tolstoi's tainting of the Slavonic cause with connotations of romantic profligacy through the character of Lidiia Ivanovna becomes even more significant when considered in comparison to the earlier drafts and in light of a probable real life model for the Countess. Manuscript #46 (*PSS* 20:369 ff.) shows that Lidiia Ivanovna was originally intended to be Karenin's sister, Katerina Aleksandrovna, which allowed her to move in with him after Anna moved out, but prohibited the possibility of her infatuation. Her mock-worthy hyper-spirituality and love of Slavdom are present from the start, however, since she is described as one of the "дамы того высшаго Петербурскаго Православно-Хомяховского-добродетельно-придворно-Жуковско-Християнскаго направления" (ladies of that higher Petersburg-Orthodox-Khomikovian-virtouous-courtly-Zhukovskian-Christian trend) (*PSS* 20:370-71). The lengthy designation is a form of the shorter, yet equally ridiculous, "филантропическое, религиозно-патриотическое учреждение" (philanthropic religio-patriotic society) (*PSS* 18:115) to which Lidiia Ivanovna belongs in the published novel, and it is located in the same chapter (32 of part 1) where she rushes off to a Slavonic Committee meeting. Although the reference to the prominent Slavophile Khomiakov from the draft is removed from later versions describing Lidiia Ivanovna, his name appears in the final version of the Epilogue, as already mentioned above, in the form of yet another disappointment in Levin's quest for spiritual enlightenment.

Subsequent versions of the section describing Lidiia Ivanovna's relationship to Karenin give her the name she bears in the final version, do not designate her as family, and have her falling in love with him (in manuscript #88, for example, the naive Karenin thinks that she is the only one compassionate towards him because she is the only Christian among his friends, *PSS* 20:420), but it is only in the final version, written — according to Sof'ia Andreevna's diaries and Gusev's notes — in the week preceding November 20, 1876 that Tolstoi penned the section describing Lidiia's multiple infatuations.[31] The timing is significant because the section under question was in the first installment published in *Russkii vestnik* (in December, 1876) after Serbia and Montenegro declared war on Turkey the previous summer with expectation of Russian support. Even more significantly, immediately preceding the writing of that section, Tolstoi traveled to Moscow with the express purpose of finding out more about the war, as he informs both Fet and Strakhov in letters dated November 12 (*PSS* 62:288, 291). Tolstoi had been corresponding with Fet regarding the war for a year by this time, since November 1875, when Fet informed him that his brother had joined the fight in Herzegovina. In the letters of November 12, 1876 Tolstoi informs both Fet and Strakhov that "всё это волнует меня очень" (all this disturbs me a lot), but to Fet he also brings up, as an example of a Slavophile, "какая-нибудь Аксакова с своим мизерным тщеславием и фальшивым сочувствием к чему-то неопределенному" (some Aksakova with her meagre vanity and false sympathy toward something indefinite) (*PSS* 62:288). Anna Fedorovna Aksakova was married to Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov, the president of the Slavic Committee during the Eastern Crisis, and she was the daughter of the poet and outspoken Slavophile Fedor Ivanovich Tiutchev, which placed her in a visible position within the movement. A reference to her in a letter composed only days before completing chapter 23 of part 5 about Lidiia Ivanovna is a strong indicator that Aksakova might have been the inspiration for that particular character description.

[31] Gusev, 462.

The Eastern Crisis, thus, enters the book from the outside as well as the inside, the very process of writing it as well as its plot. The war creeps into the novel slowly, through characters such as Ivanovna, and as the crisis progresses, the references to it not only increase, but come to punctuate extremely significant family events, such as the birth of Levin's long expected first-born son. The last full section of the novel printed in *Russkii vestnik*, section 7, abounds with hints regarding developments in the Balkans. In chapter 3 Montenegro enters small talk when Katavasov asks his visitor Levin: "Ну что каковы черногорцы? По породе воины." (How about those Montenegrins? Warriors by nature) (*PSS* 19:254), while a "неумолкаемый разговор о Герцеговине" (never-ending discussion of Herzegovina) (*PSS* 19:261) takes place in the following chapter. Finally, Levin loses his composure in chapter 14, when the doctor who is to deliver Kitty, rather slow for the panicked Levin in getting his things together, casually remarks: "Однако Турок-то бьют решительно. Вы читали вчерашнюю телеграмму?" (However, the Turks are certainly being beaten. Have you read yesterday's telegram?) (*PSS* 19:289).

The Epilogue opens with the din of patriotic activities, which is then carried over from the train station into the shelter of Pokrovskoe[32] through Koznyshev and Katavosov, who visit Levin and unsuccessfully attempt to convert him and his father-in-law to Pan-Slav ideology. Shortly following their heated discussion, an intimate family moment occurs when Levin is called into the nursery, where Kitty demonstrates to him how their infant son, Mitia, "очевидно, несомненно уже узнавал всех своих" (obviously, undoubtedly already recognized all of his own [people]) (*PSS* 19:396). This private scene of family bliss and the discussion of the Eastern Crisis that takes place outside it both engage the topic of boundaries as they address the question of who one's own people are and how to recognize them. Mitia begins to recognize his own

[32] The name of Levin's estate itself illuminates the national positions allegorized in the family home. Pokrovskoe suggests shelter and protection, as Donna Orwin points out and contrasts it to the name of Vronskii's estate — Vozdvizhenskoe — which suggests movement. See *Tolstoi's Art and Thought, 1847-1880* (Princeton, 1993), 182.

parents at the end of the day during which his uncle had argued on behalf of the Southern Orthodox Slavs, while his grandfather proclaimed that he felt no love for his brother Slavs ("никакой к ним *л*юбви не чувствую") and was, together with Levin, interested only in Russia (*PSS* 19:388). An earlier draft of the Epilogue creates a direct link between the family moment in the nursery and the question of Slavonic brotherhood. In the published version, Mitia's recognition is followed by Levin's own realization that he loves his son (an emotion that, contrary to his own expectations, he did not experience immediately upon his son's birth). In a draft version Mitia's recognition prompts Levin to think about the Slavonic Question he had just discussed with his visitors, and constitutes the conclusion to the novel:

> "Сербы! говорят они. Нетолько Сербы, но в своем крошечном кругу жить не хорошо, а только не дурно. Это такое [счастье], на которое не могу надеяться один, а только с помощью Бога, Которого я начинаю знать," подумал он. Конец. (*PSS* 20:571-72)
>
> "Serbs! they say. Not only the Serbs, but to live in one's own tiny circle, if not well, then at least not badly. That is such [happiness], for which I cannot hope on my own, but only with the help of God, Whom I am beginning to know," he thought. The End.

In this somewhat incoherent conclusion to the novel Levin affirms the desire of all people ("not only the Serbs") to enjoy the moments of intimacy that he had just experienced and that can only be realized in a "tiny circle." This universalization of experience negates any kind of uniqueness in the case of Serbs and the isolationist politics expressed in the metaphor of the "tiny circle" prohibits any grand-scale action.

The question of who is *свой* and who *чужой* can be traced all the way back to the famous opening line, which sets up a definition of sameness and difference: [33] "Все счастл*и*вые семьи похо-

[33] I am indebted for this insight, as well as a previous one regarding Mitia Levin's recognition of "своих," to Cathy Popkin, whose paper, "Occupy and Cultivate: Foreign Policy and Domestic Affairs (or The Case of *Anna Karenina*)"

жи друг на друга, каждая несчастливая семья несчастлива по-своему." (All happy families resemble one another, each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way) (*PSS* 18:3). The assertion does not entirely bear out, as Alexandrov points out, since the unhappy families of the novel are, in fact, unhappy in the same way, their unhappiness being caused by the infidelity of one of their members.[34] A closer look at the composition of the families portrayed as the novel proceeds justifies reading the first half of the opening line not only as "this happy family resembles another happy family," but also as "members *within* a happy family resemble one another." Nowhere is that more obvious than in the relationship between Levin and Kitty, the model happy family that comprises the real ending of the novel. Levin and Kitty's union is seamless, as described in another oft-quoted passage, where he can't tell where she ends and he begins (*PSS* 19:50). It even borders on the incestuous, since the Shcherbatskiis are the only family Levin has ever known (*PSS* 18:24-25) and Kitty associates him with memories of her dead brother (*PSS* 18:51). Following the same logic, the members of an unhappy family are strangers to each other, as exhibited by the Oblonskiis, immediately following the opening line, when Dolly repeatedly uses the word "чужой" to describe her unfaithful husband (*PSS* 18:14,16). The same happens to the Karenins; after Anna confesses her affair, she and her husband become "совершенно чужды друг другу" (completely estranged from each other) (*PSS* 18:372).

The family metaphor and the story of the consequences of breaking family boundaries become especially appropriate for the novel that ends up questioning the status of Southern Orthodox Slavs as Russia's "братьев, единокровных и единоверцев" (brothers of the same blood and faith) (*PSS* 19:387). Levin certainly feels no familial connection with the Serbs and in a section that echoes the political message of the draft cited above, he does indeed define his circle of "своих" along tiny parameters:

---

was presented and discussed at the University of Illinois Russian Reading Circle (*Kruzhok*) in Urbana on November 10, 2005.

[34] Alexandrov, p. 71.

> …когда он старался сделать что-нибудь такое, что сделало бы добро для всех, для человечества, для России, для всей деревни, он замечал, что мысли об этом были приятны, но сама деятельность всегда бывала несладная… теперь же, когда он после женитьбы стал более и более ограничиваться жизнью для себя, он… видел, что оно спорится гораздо лучше… (*PSS* 19:372)
>
> …when he had tried to do something that would be good for everyone, for mankind, for Russia, for the whole village, he had noticed that thinking about it was pleasant, but the doing itself was always awkward… while now, after his marriage, when he began to limit himself more and more to living for himself, he… saw that it turned out much better...

Nestled inside the country, the seat of *народность*, Levin remains unimpressed with Khomiakov and exhibits indifference, as Dostoevskii bemoans, to the all-uniting Slavophilic cause that is to redeem Russia.

The Soviet critic Eduard Grigor'evich Babaev was the first to read the family as symbolic of nation in the opening line — although he did not have the Slavonic Question in mind — when he noted its similarity with the French saying "Happy nations have no history," which also appears at the end of *War and Peace*,[35] Tolstoi's more explicitly nation-oriented tome. The linking in such a way of the ending of a work in which, according to the oft-quoted diary entry of his wife, the author loved the "мысль *народную*" (national idea) with the beginning of his next big work, in which, according to the same quote, he loved the "мысль *семейную*" (family idea) indicates that the two ideas are not as distinct as the many uses of Tolstaya's report would have us believe.[36] After all, both novels contain an Epilogue that combines nursery scenes with heated political discussions (the Decembrists in the case of *War and Peace*). The French saying regarding happy nations did

[35] Babaev, E. G. *Lev Tolstoi i russkaia zhurnalistika ego epokhi.* (Moscow, 1978), 133.

[36] Gusev, 468. (Emphases in the quote made by the original author, Sof'ia Andreevna Tolstaia.)

make it into the first draft of *Anna Karenina*, its very first chapter no less, thus creating an even stronger link with the ending of *War and Peace*. Much like *War and Peace*, the first draft of *Anna Karenina* also opens with an evening party scene, where guests in search of topics for conversation settle upon malicious gossip, eventually leading to Anna's affair, because "счастливые народы не имеют истории" (*PSS* 20:16). By the end of the finished novel we find out that the recipe for happy nations, like the one for happy families, requires a tight circle of mutually resembling members. By contrast, Anna's "избыток чего-то" (surplus of something) (*PSS* 18:66), that quality that firsts attracts Vronskii to her, and Russia's surplus of feeling for the Southern Slavs, both lead to ruin.