Introduction

1. As reported by the curatorial staff at Yasnaya Polyana. Philip Rogers, personal communication, 1988.

2. Although Tolstoy rejected *Anna Karenina* along with his entire "preconversion" oeuvre, the fact remains that Tolstoy, the artist in pursuit of a new art, did write novels, and *Anna Karenina* was written at the critical juncture in the development of his aesthetic theory. His views on art and his pursuit of mythopoiesis are readily apparent in the novel, as many critics have noted, most recently Silbajoris.


4. Not solely the practice of male authors. George Eliot's Dorothea, for example, is elaborately carved, painted, and framed throughout *Middlemarch*.

5. Although this spelling is not consistent either with the Library of Congress transliteration system or with common usage, I utilize it here, first, to emphasize the connection between this surname and the first name of the author, pronounced Lyoff. Second, the spelling "Levin" suggests a Jewish background that is inappropriate.

6. In developing this terminology, I am deeply indebted to the work of Richard Gustafson and to his inspired notion of emblematic realism. Rimvydas Silbajoris's important work on Tolstoy's aesthetics and his art has also impressed me profoundly, although his book appeared after this manuscript was largely completed.

7. It could be argued that Tolstoy belongs to the tradition of Romantic Realism outlined by Donald Fanger. Because Tolstoy is not usually seen as sharing affinities with Gogol and Dostoevsky, Fanger's representative Romantic Realists, I find this notion more problematic than the solution I propose, of establishing a sui generis category for Tolstoy on the cusp of symbolism.
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4. Uspensky, 146.


8. See, for example, W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., and Monroe C. Beardsley, “The Intentional Fallacy.” In Lambropoulos and Miller, 103–115.


10. I refer the interested reader to Ruth Crego Benson’s study, where a complete overview of Tolstoy’s misogynist remarks is available.

11. Consider, for example, Andrea Dworkin’s reading of *The Kreutzer Sonata* where any feminist qualities of the text are negated by the fact that Tolstoy continued to have sexual relations with his wife.


13. The views I have sketched have their most thorough expression in Ruth Crego Benson’s study of women in Tolstoy. Typical of prevailing opinion is this statement, taken from the entry on “Women and Russian Literature,” in *Hand-

For Lev Tolstoi the woman question did not exist except, as in his opinion expressed in 1905 in an afterword to Chekhov’s “The Darling,” . . . [as] “a vulgar, fashionable movement confusing both men and women.” He considered a woman’s calling (and her superiority to man) to be her sublime capacity for love and sacrifice. . . . Tolstoy’s good women, as in War and Peace, are innocent as girls and become chaste wives and dedicated mothers, like Natasha and Princess Marie, or useful, selfless spinsters, like Sonya; adulteresses, like Hélène Bezukhov, wreak evil and perish by it—even the lovely heroine of Anna Karenina. Hence, there is no need to develop a woman’s mind, still less her imagination. A worldly, frivolous education makes even blameless girls into traps for masculine lust and leads to tragedies, such as in The Kreutzer Sonata, while carnal passion breeds crime, as in The Power of Darkness.


16. Four translated editions had appeared in Russia within two years of its publication in England in 1869. Strakhov’s review of Mill’s book provoked Tolstoy into writing a letter to Strakhov that expressed antipathy toward the women’s liberation movement and endorsed Strakhov’s opinion that prostitution was a valuable profession, necessary for the existence of the family. Although Tolstoy probably thought better of this position almost immediately since the letter remained unsent, these early outrageous statements have been cited ad nauseam to indict him as a misogynist. It should also be noted that part of Strakhov’s rejection of the woman question was motivated by his sense that it was a European import, not an issue native to Russian culture. Tolstoy undoubtedly concurred with this assessment.


19. Ibid., 75.

20. Ibid., 76.

21. Ibid., 77.


25. In fact, many feminist thinkers of the nineteenth century considered that Russian women were better off than their European counterparts.


27. Figures are cited in Stites, 57 and 60.


32. Tolstoy’s views on the woman question as expressed in What Then Must We Do? occasioned some journalistic discussion in 1886. Tolstoy was attacked by Skabichevsky and defended by Obolensky. Their polemic prompted Tolstoy to clarify his views in the essay “Men’s and Women’s Work,” which he published that same year in Obolensky’s journal.

33. For a discussion of the “new” sexual morality at the turn of the century as it related to Tolstoy’s views on the “sex question” and the “marriage question,” see Peter Ulf Möller, Postlude to The Kreutzer Sonata: Tolstoy and the Debate on Sexual Morality in Russian Literature in the 1890s. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.


35. Paigé’s Adam, Eve, and the Serpent demonstrates quite clearly that early Christianity was an antifamily force.

36. I use this term to refer to the current trend in French feminism represented by such thinkers as Cixous, Irigaray, and Kristeva, who suspect the masculinist formation of earlier feminist thought.

37. Leo Nikolaevich Tolstoy, Brak i polovaia liubov’ s predisloviem V. Chertkov. Rabochee knigoizdatel’stvo, 1919, p. 30.


40. Chodorow even denies women any special capacity for nurturance and thus minimizes biological differences between the sexes. Despite the fact that
with this view there is the attempt to disregard the extremely powerful experiences of pregnancy, childbirth, and breast-feeding, the view is widely adhered to.

41. Tolstoy, Brak, 51.
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14. This viewpoint was essential to the earliest formulations of Russian formalist poetics and to a program that became increasingly important as the formalist critics developed their theories. Formalist critical practice, therefore, does not quite deserve the reputation it has acquired in recent years for operating within a vacuum or for absence of contextualization.
15. This schematization overlooks a third critical path taken by Nancy Miller in *The Heroine’s Text*, in which she posits that the so-called dysphoric plot of fall, ruin, and death may actually be redemptive or represent the enactment of free will (e.g., *La Princesse de Clèves*, *La Dame aux Camélias*); by contrast, the euphoric plot of marriage and material prosperity signals the spiritual death of the heroine.


17. Iurii Lotman, *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Trans. Ronald Vroon. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Contributions, no. 7, 1977, p. 211. The shift from referring to Anna as “woman” to referring to her as “person” is indicative of the recasting of Anna’s tragedy from local to universal interest.


19. Evans, 84.


22. John Bayley even places Flaubert’s words in Tolstoy’s mouth: “In such a relation it does not matter how apparently dissimilar is the creator from his creation: it is not a kinship of externals and ideas but of a deeper psychological identification... like Flaubert with his heroine, Tolstoy—had he been given to such comments—could have said: “Madame Karenine, c’est moi.” *Tolstoy and the Novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966, p. 201.

23. “What [Tolstoy] loves in Anna is his own sexuality,” comments Armstrong in her most succinct summation of Tolstoy’s unconscious drives as embodied in the novel. See Armstrong, 94.


26. As Dworkin does, for example, in the first chapter of her book *Intercourse*. New York: Macmillan, 1987. Tolstoy himself argued in the afterword to *The Kreutzer Sonata* that chastity, like other ideals, is difficult to achieve and that what is important is continued effort.


31. Evans, 35.


35. Stewart, 274.

36. “From Homer on, there have been those who contend that fatherhood, unlike motherhood, is a learned role, not a natural one. If that’s true, it could explain why so many absent fathers feel awkward in their relationships with their children, and avoid them rather than learn to cope.” Nina J. Easton, “Life without Father,” Los Angeles Times Sunday Magazine, 19 June (Father’s Day) 1992, p. 18.

37. Evans, 40.

38. Gifford, 301.


40. Evans, 3–4.


43. Christian, 175.


45. The best, most recent discussion of this problem that I was able to read only after my manuscript was completed appears in Robert Louis Jackson, “On the Ambivalent Beginning of Anna Karenina.” In E. de Haard, T. Langerak, and W. G. Weststeijn, eds., The Semantic Analysis of Literary Texts. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1990, pp. 345–352. Jackson concludes that “for Tolstoy the ethical injunction—‘do not judge’—is also an esthetic injunction—one that must govern the authorial stance of the artist, that is, his relationship to his heroes. . . . Tolstoy does not judge Anna. He understands her” (p. 346).

47. Cited in Eikhenbaum, 145. Eikhenbaum shows quite convincingly that Tolstoy originally simply translated Schopenhauer’s “Mein ist die Rache” into an inaccurate Russian version, “Otnishchenie møe” (which persisted through several drafts of the early variants), and only later corrected his Russian text against the church Slavic.

48. It is more than likely that Tolstoy had read these novels by the time he was composing Anna Karenina. He mentions Ellen Wood in his correspondence with admiration and refers to her as “bol’shoe vliianie” in his list of literary influences. East Lynne offers many intertextual resonances with Anna Karenina. There are eight novels by Mrs. Henry Wood and eleven novels by Trollope in the library at Yasnya Polyana. The significance of Trollope for Tolstoy has been well documented. Tolstoy is known to have read the entire Palliser series as it appeared in print, and Phineas Redux was published just one year before Anna Karenina. (See chapter 3 for a more extensive discussion of the Victorian literary influences on Anna Karenina.)

49. For a comprehensive study of all the references to the biblical passage in the novel, see Rebecca S. Hogan, The Wisdom of Many, the Wit of One: The Narrative Function of the Proverb in Tolstoy’s “Anna Karenina” and Trollope’s “Orley Farm.” Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1985.


51. E. Depuy, Les Grands Maîtres de la littérature russe au dix-neuvième siècle (1885); cited in Knowles, 326.

52. D. H. Lawrence, from his introduction to Cavalleria Rusticana. In Gifford, 197.


58. D. H. Lawrence, from Study of Thomas Hardy. In Gifford, 150.


60. Jackson, “Chance and Design in Anna Karenina.” In Bloom, 34.

61. The terms heroine-ism and heroism were apparently introduced into the criticism by Diana Trilling in “The Liberated Heroine.” Partisan Review 45

62. Armstrong, 120.


66. These issues are elaborated in chapter 7.


68. Edwards, 9.

69. Evans, 83.


73. Much has been made of the fact that Anna apparently has little maternal love for her daughter, Ani. This, together with her rejection of future childbearing through contraception, is taken as a sign of her depravity and loss of maternal instinct. We ought to remember that Anna almost died in her last childbirth and therefore medical counsel probably advised her to avoid future pregnancies. Other critics have suggested that Anna felt an unconscious rivalry with a child of her own sex and could only be gratified by the adulation of a male child (see Armstrong). However, while there is no question that Anna does not love Ani as she loved Seryozha, this does not necessarily imply an absence of maternal feeling. Just as an infertile woman who desperately longs for children of her own may find the presence of other people's children intolerable, so Ani is a continual, painful reminder to Anna that she has lost Seryozha: “[She] went to the nursery. ‘Why, this is wrong—this isn’t he! Where are his blue eyes, his sweet shy smile?’ was her first thought when she saw her chubby, rosy-cheeked little girl with her black, curly hair.” From *Anna Karenina*. Trans. C. Garnett, ed. and introd. L. J. Kent and N. Berberova. New York: Random House, Modern Library, 1965, p. 794. Unless otherwise stated, this is the edition used for the subsequent quotations in the text.


76. Other feminist critics attack the “idealization of motherhood” in both its feminist and antifeminist forms as being an attempt to romanticize traditional female spheres of influence as idyllic realms of desexualized and powerless femininity. See, for example, Jessica Benjamin, The Bonds of Love: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the Problem of Domination. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.


79. Morson’s theory of prosaics and its applications to Tolstoy’s aesthetics and oeuvre will be discussed in chapter 3.

80. I stress the primacy of Victorian literary models for the creation of a Russian myth of childhood. As Andrew Wachtel recently demonstrated (The Battle for Childhood: Creation of a Russian Myth. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), Tolstoy’s own autobiographical novel, Childhood, served as the basis for the subsequent development of an idealized vision of family life in Russian literature. Wachtel minimizes the importance of European, and especially Victorian, literary models for the subsequent development of that myth in Russian literature since “almost every account of childhood published in Russia after 1852 turned to Tolstoy (and not to Rousseau, Dickens, Töpffer, or others) for inspiration” (44). However, Tolstoy’s own myth of childhood was clearly constructed or, as A. N. Wilson puts it, “Copperfielded” on the Western model (Tolstoy, pp. 88–95).


83. It is interesting to note that the cultural icon of the Lady with the Lamp echoes the mythological figure of Psyche mentioned in this chapter and discussed in greater detail in chapter 7. Elizabeth Helsinger, Robin Lauterbach Sheets, and William Veeder (The Woman Question: Society and Literature in Britain and America 1837–1883, vol. 3: Literary Issues. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983) point to three stereotypes of women in Victorian literature: the angel in the house, the fallen woman (demon), and the angel out of the house. The latter category would apply to Varenka, who, we may remember, is frequently referred to as an angel in the course of the novel.

Chapter 3

2. Lady Audley’s Secret is in the library at Yasnaya Polyana.
3. Diary entry, 31 October 1853, Tolstoy’s Diaries, 76.
10. The term is applied in the sense used by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979. They define palimpsestic texts as “works whose surface designs conceal or obscure deeper, less accessible (and less socially acceptable) levels of meaning,” p. 73.
14. Diary entry, 3 October 1865, Tolstoy’s Diaries, 185.
15. Diary entry, 31 October 1853, Tolstoy’s Diaries, 76.


19. The recent work of Richard Gustafson, Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986, and Gary Saul Morson, Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in “War and Peace.” Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987, has attenuated this view. Gustafson creates a new category of emblematic realism to describe the difference between Tolstoy’s work and European literary practices, while Morson reaffirms the view of Tolstoy as innovator that was first developed by the Russian formalists. Even within the native Russian realist tradition, which was established as a naturalist, even Gogolian school, Tolstoy necessarily occupies a sui generis position.


21. In so doing, he overlooked the great appeal this type of detail may have, for the reader from the margins of society, who may feel that she is thus initiated into a world otherwise closed to her. In his essay “Prosaics: An Approach to the Humanities” (The American Scholar 57 [Autumn 1988]:515–528), Gary Saul Morson indicates the pleasure we derive from gazing at the exotic paraphernalia of everyday life in photos of cabinets from earlier periods. However, the meaning of trivial items and a knowledge of their use are elusive for the uninitiated. This loss of meaning was Tolstoy’s concern.


réaliste.” However, it could be argued that this conflation relies on a historiciza-
tion of realism as the raison d’être for every new avant-garde. While this aspect of
realistic motivation is certainly a feature of artistic motivation, both Tomashevsky
and Shklovsky also create a definition of realistic motivation that should, perhaps,
be renamed “verisimilar motivation”: “We demand an elementary ‘illusion’ from
every work, i.e., no matter how conventional and artificial a work, its perception
must be accompanied by a sense of the reality of what is taking place.” (See Boris
Tomashevsky, Teoriia literatury. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo, 1928;
The latter motivation is conceived of as being in opposition to artistic motivation.
The conventions for realizing verisimilitude obviously vary generationally, ac-
cording to artistic movements. Thus, realistic motivation and artistic motivation
are two opposed aspects of textual dynamics, as Shklovsky asserts: “The forms of
art are explained by their conformity to the laws of art [and, nota bene, would be
understood to be artistically motivated] and not by ‘realistic’ motivation.” (See
Viktor Shklovsky, “Parodiinyi roman: ‘Tristram Shendi’ Sterna,” Texte der rus-
nich: W. Fink, 1969–1972, vol. 1, p. 298.) This statement represents Shklovsky’s
extremist view that most textual motivations are superficial devices concealing
the more vital motivation of the form of the artistic work itself. Or, as Tomas-
hevsky explains later in a more reasoned fashion, “Since the laws of composition
of the siuzhet [Story, A. M.] have nothing in common with verisimilitude, every
introduction of motifs is a compromise between this objective verisimilitude and
literary tradition. . . . between realistic illusion and the demands of artistic con-
struction” (Tomashevsky, 147, 150, translated by Nepomnyashchy).

27. The term was apparently coined by Shklovsky in “Parodiinyi roman”
and refined by Tomashevsky.


30. Tomashevsky, 149–150.


32. Such a view may be particularly attractive to the literary critic, espe-
cially in this poststructuralist moment since it liberates the critic from the urgent
need to weave every loose end into a complete, unified artistic design. It has the
additional advantage that any textual elements that contravene the critic’s reading
can be proclaimed random and insignificant, and any critical reading based on
such details can be indicted for overinvesting detail with meaning.

33. Morson, Hidden in Plain View, 173.

34. Ibid., 173–189.

35. Ibid., 94.

36. Indeed, the character of Protogenes could have served Tolstoy as a
model for Mikhailov since he is “extremely poor, and extremely devoted to his art


41. Of course, the terms realism and Romanticism were used interchangeably in the early years of criticism to refer to works we now identify as realist. See Donald Fanger, *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens, and Gogol*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.


44. The formalists themselves, especially Eikhenbaum, characterized Tolstoy in this way.

45. Gustafson, xiv.

46. I deliberately employ this term in two different senses: I conflate the Peircean semiotic definition with a theological, Augustinian view of semiosis as divine inscription.

47. Gustafson, 202.

48. Ibid., 212.


50. Gustafson, 204.


53. Ibid., 29. Tolstoy’s omission may be due to the fact that in his discussion of German aesthetics he relies on one secondary source, Schasler’s *Kritische Geschichte der ästhetik* (1872).


55. Kant, 392.

56. Ibid., 393–394.
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7. Ibid., 88.


16. Men’s portraits are treated differently in literature as the source of demonic alterity, as for example in *The Portrait of Dorian Gray*, the portrait in *The House of the Seven Gables*, or Gogol’s *The Portrait*.


18. See Bakhtin’s essay on the bildungsroman in *Speech Genres*. This account is somewhat oversimplified and would eliminate from consideration the narrative practices in iconic and medieval painting where characters appear simultaneously on different portions of the canvas.

20. In Nastasya Filipovna's case, the stabbing leaves only the tiniest mark and scarcely any blood is spilled. Myshkin suggests this is because the blade went directly into the heart, but the result also permits Dostoevsky to paint a final portrait of absolute immobility unperturbed by evidence of violence.


24. See Gates.


27. Higonnet, 81.

28. Florence Nightingale herself was anorectic and often close to death until she was able to liberate herself from her family and take up nursing. The citation is from volume 2 of her *Suggestions for Thought to Searchers after Religious Truth*. Cited in Gates, 36.

29. Higonnet, 77.


32. See Gates, chap. 7.


**Chapter 5**


2. For a standard summation of the topos, see Murray Krieger, “Ekphrasis and the Still Movement of Poetry, or Laokoon Revisited.” In Frederick McDow-


9. Both Anna and Lyovin are also authors, whose books remain unfinished.


11. The problem of the description of the personality and the failures of portraiture preoccupied Tolstoy in his earliest writings, as evidenced in a diary entry from 1851: “It seems to me that actually to *describe* a man is impossible . . . words give no understanding of a man but make a pretense of delineating him while more often than not only misleading [the reader]” (PSS 46:67). Tolstoy then proceeds to describe a man in a manner that is reminiscent of the salon game “portrait moral”: first he relates what he has heard of the man’s reputation from others, then he describes his appearance, and finally he describes the impression the actual man made upon him. Tolstoy employs the same procedure in relating Lyovin’s visit to Anna: first he hears Stiva’s account of her, then he views her portrait, and finally he is affected by her actual presence.


13. An example of a Tolstoy misquotation. M. A. Balakirev’s piece is known simply as *King Lear* (1860). *King Lear of the Steppes* is a novella by Turgenev (*Stepnoi Lir*). Tolstoy’s own title, *King Lear in the Steppe* (*Korol’ Lir v stepi*), differs from both.

14. Tolstoy was probably referring to the projected sculpture of Pushkin
submitted in competition for the centennial by M. M. Antokol’skii (1843–1902). A sketch of the planned sculpture was exhibited in 1875.

15. Lessing, 39.

16. Lessing casts the issue of invisibility in neoplatonic terms as the separation of upper and lower spheres: “with the loss of all distinction to the eye between the visible and the invisible beings, all the characteristic traits must likewise disappear, which serve to elevate the higher order of beings above the lower.” See Lessing, 77.

17. Lessing, 80–81.

18. For a more thorough discussion of these issues in relation to What Is Art?, see Bayley, chap. 6.


22. It is interesting to note that in Russian the word for education (obrazovanie), like the German word Bildung, is based on a root meaning “to shape, form, build.” However, in Russian the root obraz is also used to refer to icons. Thus, in popular etymology, to acquire learning implied “becoming like the images (icons),” that is, becoming like the saints. For Russians, therefore, the concept of education has a marked spiritual component as well as a visual realization.

23. In response to a letter criticizing Tolstoy for lack of structure in Anna Karenina, Tolstoy replied: “I pride myself on the architecture—the arches are so joined that it is impossible even to notice the keystone.” Letter to S. A. Rachinsky, 27 January 1878, PSS 62:377. Criticism on Anna Karenina has taken up the metaphor; the most successful work along these lines is that of Elisabeth Stenbock-Fermor, The Architecture of Anna Karenina: A History of Its Structure, Writing, and Message. Lisse, Belgium: Peter de Ridder Press, 1975. Stenbock-Fermor argues quite convincingly that the keystone scene is the Oblonskys’ dinner party, which contains the central, symposiac debate on the woman question. In “Tolstoy’s Portrait of Anna: Keystone in the Arch,” Criticism 18 (1976):1–14, Joan Grossman argues that Lyovin’s viewing of Anna’s portrait is the keystone scene.

24. Stenbock-Fermor notes a symmetrical, architectural structure in the novel, built around the opening and closing scenes at railroad stations and the symposiac debates on love. According to her diagram, the keystone scene is the Oblonskys’ dinner party at which Dolly pleads with Karenin to forgive Anna, Lyovin and Kitty become betrothed, and the company discuss the woman question.

25. After this manuscript was completed, Ronald LeBlanc’s article, “Levin Visits Anna: The Iconography of Harlotry,” appeared in Tolstoy Studies Journal 3
LeBlanc makes several of the same points I make here but draws a different conclusion, that "the visit to Anna's—metaphorized as a trip to a brothel—can be seen as the culmination of a process at work throughout the novel whereby the hero gradually loses his innocence and compromises his values as he becomes less a 'savage' and more a 'civilized' nobleman" (15). LeBlanc thus adheres to the critical view of Tolstoy as holding negative opinions on women and sexuality.

26. We are reminded of David Copperfield, who, on the occasion of his first debauchery, studies his face in the mirror and concludes that only his hair looks drunk. I am indebted to Elizabeth Beaujour for drawing my attention to another intertext for this passage, Dostoevsky's *Notes from the Underground*, where the Underground Man pauses prior to consummating his purchase at the brothel and glances in the mirror. It is in keeping with his perverse, reverse logic that the recognition of his drunken, disheveled state gives way to an overcompensating narcissism: "I caught sight of myself in a mirror. My agitated face seemed to me repulsive in the extreme: pale, vicious, mean, with tangled hair. 'All right, I'm glad of it,' I thought; 'I'm glad to seem repulsive to her; I like that.'"

Looking into a mirror suggests self-examination and the awakening of the conscience, as well as psychic dissociation or projection, the emergence of the uncanny twin, or double. Other characters in the novel also look into mirrors or refuse to do so, as is the case with Dolly when she visits Anna at Vronsky's estate. In a critical scene before her suicide, Anna looks into the mirror and does not recognize herself.

27. Freud's theories on the scopic drives, voyeurism, and exhibitionism, as developed in his 1915 essay "Instincts and Their Vicissitudes" (see Sigmund Freud, *Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, 24 vols. Revised and ed. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1953–1974) were later reworked by Jacques Lacan in his concepts of the "mirror phase" and the "Gaze." The Lacanian theory of the unconscious discourse of the "Gaze" is based on a system of shifts or alternations between voyeurism and exhibitionism. The voyeur refuses to be seen as an object and attempts to assume power through visual dominance while the exhibitionist refuses to be shown or to see and is similarly dogmatic in determining the rejection of the visual field. Lyovin's role as a voyeur and Anna's exhibitionism in the public arena and with Vronsky are echoed in Lyovin's "screwing up his eyes" while trying to see more clearly and Anna's habit of "screwing up her eyes" while refusing to see.

28. Feminist critics of the representation of women in art argue that "women cannot be represented as themselves, since we cannot know their identities. They are simply present as a consciousness of being perceived and represented as objects. Hence the duplicitous mystery of women in portraits whose gaze outward is really turned inward on themselves." Margaret R. Higonnet's in-

29. The Eugubine Tables were written in an undeciphered Northumbrian dialect and were discovered in 1444 in Eugubium, Italy. It is interesting to note that the treatise on the tables that Karenin is reading is in French. Like Vronsky's portrait in French style of Anna in Italian costume, Karenin’s portrait of Anna is coded in Italian and framed by the French language.


Chapter 6


2. One early reviewer of *War and Peace* considered Dolokhov and Anatole Kuragin to be the heroes of the novel. For a fascinating discussion of early critical responses to the formal peculiarities of *War and Peace*, see Gary Saul Morson, *Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in ‘War and Peace’*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1987. Morson comments: “Had Tolstoy continued the work through 1825 or 1856 as he once intended, what would have been the eventual status of Prince Andrei?” (59).


4. The preoccupation with and consciousness of “position” (*polozhenie*), a motif that Tolstoy borrowed from Trollope, afflicts the main characters of *Anna Karenina*. This problem is discussed by Michael Holquist in “The Supernatural as Social Force in *Anna Karenina*.” In Amy Mandelker and Roberta Reeder, eds. *The Supernatural in Russian and Baltic Literature: Essays in Honor of VictorTerras*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1988, pp. 176–190.


8. As many critics have noted, carriages and trains provide settings for insight, debate, and meditation throughout the novel. The inside of the carriage is a stage for confined action; the window offers a composed vision of “external reality.” Trains of thought are set in motion by locomotion, usually with a deleterious effect. Tolstoy’s personal antipathy to trains is well known and Anna’s semipsychotic states on the train anticipate those of Pozdnyshnov in *The Kreutzer Sonata*. On the image of the railroad in *Anna Karenina*, see M. S. Altman, “‘Zheleznaiia


14. On p. 78 of his study *Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin,* William Todd summarizes the literary situation in early nineteenth-century Russia by placing it on the grid of Jakobson's communication schema:

**Folklore, Popular Religion, Curiosities**

Anonymous Scribe    Tales, Songs, Novels    Viewer, Reader

Chapbook, Broadsheet

Mixed style (ecclesiastical, bureaucratic, language of commerce)


17. Arndt, 175.


21. The Platonic dialogue most often discussed in the criticism on *Anna*

22. In fact, it was a delegation of Russian nurses to the Crimean front that inspired Florence Nightingale to pursue her career in nursing. However, initially these was skepticism that Russia’s nurses would be able to withstand the horrors of the front, either physically or emotionally. It was even suggested that their actual role would be to act as prostitutes for the soldiers rather than as nurses.


27. That Vronsky, through conflation with the knife, becomes Anna’s phal- lus is literalized in the episode where, “lacking a knife,” Anna uses a photograph of Vronsky to remove her son’s photograph from its frame.


31. “What are these words? This candle, etc.? A beautiful allegory, and nothing more! A clever way of concealing our total ignorance and incomprehension of reality at such a moment. What candle? . . . Upon looking, even briefly, into this matter and removing the poetic veil of beautiful words, we find that it is impossible to imagine anything here at all.” Konstantin Leontiev, Analiz stil’ i vedenie: o romanakh Gr. L. N. Tolstogo: Kriticheskii etud (1890). Trans. in Henry
Chapter 7


4. Ibid., 178.


8. According to a variety of accounts, Tolstoy was inspired to begin Anna Karenina after reading a fragment of Pushkin’s prose that began, “The guests assembled at the dacha.” For a full discussion of the compositional history, see N. K. Gudzii, “Istoriiia pisaniia i pechataniia Anny Kareninoi. In PSS 29:577–643. In the Pushkin fragment, the guests discuss the adulterous behavior of a society lady and speculate on her future. The fragment concludes with the fallen woman abandoned by her lover and contemplating suicide. For an excellent study of Tol-


11. I am paraphrasing Gary Saul Morson’s succinct and elegant exposition of Bakhtin’s theory of absolute language from chapter 1, “Tolstoy’s Absolute Language” in *Hidden in Plain View*.


17. This statement is not intended as a generalization since Morson also illuminates the use of absolute language throughout Tolstoy’s oeuvre. Morson’s thesis is that the intrusion of absolute language into the narrative of *War and Peace* constitutes a violation of novelistic boundaries and an irruption of extranovelistic discourse into the novel.

18. In Tolstoy’s version of the fable, a dog carrying food sees her shadow with what appears to be a larger portion of meat. She drops her portion in order to steal from her own shadow and ends up with nothing. The obvious moral, that any crime against another is actually a crime perpetrated against oneself, is repeated in “Karma,” Tolstoy’s adaptation of the story.

19. Andersen’s story has had considerable influence on Russian literature. Together with the legend of Mozart’s “man in black” in Pushkin’s Little Tragedy, *Mozart and Salieri*, Andersen’s story apparently serves as a subtext for Chekhov’s “Black Monk” (*Chernyi monakh*). The black monk appears to the scholar Kovrin under circumstances that are similar to those under which Andersen’s scholar releases his shadow: a balcony, music, and the presence of a beautiful woman. The
lithograph illustration for the story used in one Russian translation shows a
scholar seated opposite a well-dressed but vulgar demonic figure in a frock
cloak—a visual representation that may have influenced Dostoevsky’s description
of Ivan Karamazov and his devil. The shadow, or man in black, appears on the
Russian stage in Blok’s Fairground Booth (Balaganchik) and in Olesha’s unfin-
ished play, The Man in Black. Shvartz adapted Andersen’s story into an indict-
ment of Stalinist society in his drama The Shadow (Ten’). A brief discussion of
this tradition in Russian literature and in Esenin’s long lyric poem, The Man in
Black, may be found in Amy Mandelker, “The Haunted Poet: Esenin’s Černuj
čelovek and Musset’s ‘La Nuit de décembre,’” in Amy Mandelker and Roberta
Reeder, eds., The Supernatural in Slavic and Baltic Literature. Columbus, Ohio:

20. For a discussion of the evolution of cultural perceptions of demonic
possession and psychic disintegration in the genius figure from antiquity to mod-
ern literature, see Ken Frieden, Genius and Monologue. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell

21. Chamisso also dramatized the legend in his Faust.


23. Die Frau ohne Schatten is apparently based on a Swedish legend in which
a young girl admiring her reflection in a pool is approached by a supernatural
figure who offers her eternal beauty in exchange for her shadow and her fecundity.

24. Could this French connection be the solution to the mystery of why the
peasant mutters in French?

25. The synecdochical use of a shadow to indicate abdication of moral re-
ponsibility appears in response to desire for a woman in both the case of Vronsky
and that of Andersen’s scholar. The appearance of a shadow self in another realist
novel also occurs in response to sexual temptation. In Eliot’s Adam Bede, which
Tolstoy claimed made the greatest impression on him during the years he wrote
Anna Karenina, the young squire Arthur Donnithorne rides to a forbidden rendez-
vous with Hetty Sorrel: “[his] shadow flitted rather faster among the sturdy
oaks of the chase than might have been expected from the shadow of a tired man
on a warm afternoon.” The physical similarities between the fallen heroines of
the two novels has been discussed by Gareth Jones, “George Eliot’s Adam Bede
and Tolstoy’s Conception of Anna Karenina,” Modern Language Review 61
(1966):473–481. Eliot’s influence on Tolstoy has been explored in articles by Ed-
wina J. Blyumberg, “Tolstoy and the English Novel: A Note on Middlemarch and
stoy’s Reading of George Eliot: Visions and Revisions.” Slavica and East European

29. Ibid., Book 2. p. 102.
32. Carl G. Jung, “Approaching the Unconscious.” In Carl G. Jung, ed., Man and His Symbols. New York: Dell, 1968, p. 22. Some psychoanalytic feminist critics, such as Judith Armstrong (The Unsaid Anna Karenina, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1988) interpret Anna as representing a fragment of Tolstoy’s own personality, specifically his anima, and regard Anna’s death as implying that Tolstoy was unable to resolve his own psychic conflicts.
33. Irina Paperno has convincingly argued that this dream is a polemical response to the “rational” polyandry proposed by Chernyshevsky in What Is to Be Done? See her Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1988, pp. 154–155. Tolstoy thus exposes the absurdity of a male-developed radical feminism for the women who were expected to adopt it, and he renders uncanny the true meaning of such a resolution.
34. It is interesting that Tolstoy himself used a similar excuse in a plea for forgiveness that he wrote in his wife’s diary: “Sonya, forgive me, I have only just realized that I am to blame. . . . There are days when one seems guided not by one’s will but by some irresistible external law. . . . somewhere inside me there is
a fine person, but at times he seems to be asleep. Love him, Sonya, and do not reproach him too much.” The Diaries of Sophia Tolstoy. Translated by Cathy Porter, O. A. Golinenko et al., eds. New York: Random House, 1985, p. 23.


40. For a discussion of Russian literature in these terms, see Ellen Chances, Conformity's Children: An Approach to the Superfluous Man in Russian Literature. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1978.

Chapter 8


4. Ibid., 53.

5. Ibid., 52.

6. See primarily Barbara Hardy, The Appropriate Form: An Essay on the Novel. London: Athlone, 1964. Most recently, Gary Saul Morson has argued for the recognition of textual details as unrealized prosaic potentials. (See the discussion in chapter 3.)


9. Ibid., 215.

10. Hardy, 126.


16. Even Old Testament law follows this precept: a woman is not dishonored by rape that occurs in the forest—only by rape occurring in the fields or in the city.


20. Ibid., 356.

**Conclusion**


3. The fact that he is able to do so is partly a result of the fact that Nekhludov’s character is meant to serve as a moral standard. Nonetheless, as an ideal, he suggests Tolstoy’s vision of equality between the sexes.