

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL



Volume V

1992

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

Special Issue: Tolstoy and the West

**Volume V
1992**

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

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

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

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

Editorial Assistant: Jill Roese (Columbia University)

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

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

OFFICERS OF THE TOLSTOY SOCIETY (1992-1993):

President: Gary Saul Morson (Northwestern University)

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

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

Manuscripts: Please consult the "Style Guide and Information for Authors" at the back of this issue. Send submissions to the Editor, *Tolstoy Studies Journal*, Graduate Program in Comparative Literature, Graduate Center-City University of New York, 33 West 42 Street, New York, NY, 10036-8099. Send bibliographical entries to Professor Harold K. Schefski, Department of German, Russian and Classics, California State University Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA, 90840.

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

Cover Design: George Ouwendijk

Cover Graphics: Elaine Robin

Copyright 1992

ISSN 1044-1573

Tolstoy Studies Journal

Volume V, 1992

SPECIAL ISSUE: TOLSTOY AND THE WEST

Contents

FROM THE EDITOR: Amy Mandelker	i
CRITICISM: Thomas Barran Rousseau's Political Vision and Tolstoy's <i>What Is Art?</i>	1
Robert Edwards Tolstoy and John Dewey: Pragmatism and Prosaics	15
Galya Diment Tolstoy and Bloomsbury.	39
Philip Rogers Tolstoy's <i>Hamlet</i>	55
Suzanne Osborne When a House Is Not a Home: The Alien Residences of <i>Effi Briest</i> and <i>Anna Karenina</i>	67
REVIEW ARTICLE: Anna Tavis Leo Tolstoy and James Joyce: Post-Communist Negotiations	79
REPORT FROM THE FIELD: Robert Whittaker Americans Write to Tolstoy: A Report on the Tolstoy-USA Project	87
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABSTRACTS: Harold K. Schefsky	89
ANNOUNCEMENTS.	92
STYLE GUIDE AND INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS.	93

From the Editor

It has been said that "Every writer has an address," that is, a place where they can be reached and apprehended, even if they are exiled or at large. The address is the location where an arrest may take place, where the writer may be found *chez lui*, sniffing rotten apples or reposing behind cork-lined walls; the address is the locus where words begin to form and to be spoken or written. It is a peculiarity of Tolstoy's that he has simultaneously one of the most notorious and frequently addressed addresses in literary history -- Yasnaya Polyana -- yet his voice resonates with the authority of the super-addresser whose address may not be specified.

Tolstoy as correspondent with the world opened a dialogue that both demanded and defied response, and though his words emanated from Yasnaya Polyana, his image overpowered his voice, so that it was easy to deify him, as Chertkov, Gorky and even Tolstoy's descendents did in their hagiographic memoirs. In his later years, Tolstoy himself seemed to believe he had adopted a position so reactionary that it would preclude all dialogue and fail to communicate at all, as he wrote of himself, "He denies science and art, he wants to return people to savagery; why even listen to him or talk to him?" Yet, he did not stop talking, but created the image of a prophet speaking into a whirlwind of silence.

In considering the response to Tolstoy in the West, one is struck by how much this mythology shapes the reception of Tolstoy's literary work. Galya Diment's study of Tolstoy's influence on the British writers of Bloomsbury demonstrates how much his presence there was constructed from his philosophical and aesthetic theories, as much as from his actual *oeuvre*. In another assessment of Tolstoy's influence, Robert Edwards examines the numerous parallels between Tolstoy's philosophy and art and the thought of the American philosopher, John Dewey. In her comparative critical study of *Anna Karenina* and *Effi Briest*, Suzanne Osborne suggests the possibility of Tolstoy's influence on Fontane and extends her documentation of parallel thematics in the two novels to a broader consideration of the nineteenth-century adulteress heroine.

Among Tolstoy's most infamous addresses to Western and Russian bourgeois society are his pronouncements on art in *What is Art?* and his essay on *King Lear*. Anticipating the Russian Futurists and Stanford University in jettisoning the "greats" from the "steamship of modernity" and the canon of great art, Tolstoy penned irascible critiques of Shakespeare, Beethoven, etc. that have been dismissed as eccentric or neurotic. Philip Rogers weaves a coherent critique of *Hamlet* from Tolstoy's marginal notes and attaches it to the essay on *King Lear* to suggest consistent and coherent reasons underlying Tolstoy's denigration of Shakespeare. Thomas Barran re-reads *What is Art?* as an implicitly utopian document, styled on Rousseau's *Social Contract*, and explores other aspects of Rousseau's influence on Tolstoy by comparing *What Then Must We Do?* with Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality*.

This is the first of two special issues of the *Tolstoy Studies Journal*. The next special issue will appear as Volume VI, 1993, and will be on the topic of "Tolstoy and Sexuality." Articles, translations, notes, reviews, and review articles relating to any aspect of this topic should be submitted by the deadline of August 1, 1993. Contributors are encouraged to consult the "Style Guide and Information for Authors" at the back of this issue.

Amy Mandelker
New York City
March 11, 1993

ROUSSEAU'S POLITICAL VISION AND TOLSTOY'S *WHAT IS ART?*

THOMAS BARRAN, BROOKLYN COLLEGE CUNY

From its appearance in 1898, Tolstoy's *What Is Art?* has had a troubled reception. Because the work criticizes much of post-Renaissance European art, including Tolstoy's own prose fiction, readers have usually separated it from the body of Tolstoy's works. Even many of Tolstoy's admirers simply dismiss the work as a product of Tolstoy's psychological peculiarities, or attribute it to the eccentricities of old age. Scholars have wrestled with the question of how one should read this essay, much of which seems exaggerated, intentionally provocative, absurd, paradoxical. Rymvydas Silbajoris in his recent study of Tolstoy's aesthetics, quite properly insists on the unity of Tolstoy's entire *oeuvre* with the major strivings of his life: "It may be true, after all, that the framework of aesthetics, or of the theory of art, is not appropriate for measuring the worth of Tolstoy's ideas and the manner in which they were expressed" (248).¹

Silbajoris reasons quite correctly that *What is Art?* does not yield its meaning to a narrowly aesthetic reading; in fact, reading this book as a statement only of aesthetic theory virtually guarantees its misunderstanding. For all the space Tolstoy devotes to poetry, music and the plastic arts, *What Is Art?* remains a profoundly political document. The reluctance to concentrate on the social and political demands of the treatise has caused most of the problems with the public reception of this work. Tolstoy's artistic definitions and values can apply only to a society that has undergone a complete social and political transformation; obviously, people such as we, shaped according to the corrupt standards of an unjust social order, cannot be expected to comprehend the values of a transformed world. In order to understand *What is Art?*, we must read it as a political work containing both a critique of present civilization and a utopian outline of an ideal society.²

¹In *Tolstoy's Aesthetics and His Art*, Silbajoris writes, "The working hypothesis of the present study is that . . . Tolstoy's art and his esthetics are very intimately related; that, contradictions notwithstanding, his entire life, entire opus, are distinguished by a singular kind of internal unity and consistency, and that the nature of this internal unity of mind and heart, once understood, will lead to a much fuller appreciation of his genius." (9)

²I must qualify my use of "utopia" to describe Rousseau's and Tolstoy's projects without some qualification. I do not speak of utopias as *necessarily* fantastic and unattainable social projects. Rousseau and Tolstoy would probably have insisted that their idealized social orders are possible, whatever *we* might think of their prospects. George Kateb has distinguished and defined five varieties of utopian writing. I find his divisions quite applicable to this discussion. Both *Social Contract* and *What Is Art?* belong to Kateb's fourth category:

Fourth are those works, sometimes called philosophical anthropologies, in which the writer

Tolstoy's political vision encompasses more than mere institutional reform; he remained convinced that a change in the institutions of government alone would be futile without a complete transformation of the moral character of each citizen. Here his affinities with Jean-Jacques Rousseau are stronger perhaps than in any other area of his thought, for Rousseau's politics, more than those of any political thinker of his time, call for the complete psychological and moral regeneration of the individual and the citizen as a prerequisite of the renewal of political institutions.

I want to concentrate in this article on the evolution of certain social and political ideas that gain their final expression in *What is Art?*. I shall first discuss Tolstoy's pedagogical essays of the early 1860s, then such works as *What Then Must We Do?* (1883), before I proceed to the final consideration of *What is Art?*. I feel that Tolstoy derived these political ideas from Rousseau with very few modifications, since Rousseau elaborated politics in a larger sense, as a discipline that included virtually all human activity and provided an answer to Tolstoy's persistent question, "How must we live?" In the works I shall discuss, Tolstoy proceeds from critical to utopian discourse, as Rousseau did when he articulated his critique of civilization in his *Discourses* and then followed with the utopian project of *On the Social Contract*.

In the works leading up to *What is Art?*, Tolstoy articulates a thoroughgoing critique of European civilization that draws on the language and argumentation of Rousseau's *First Discourse* (1750) and *Discourse on Inequality* (1755). In *What is Art?*, he continues the Rousseauan critique, but contrasts the deficiencies of his present day with the outlines of a utopian vision in which art resumes the natural function it would have in a moral, egalitarian community bound by an almost mystical principle of unity.

Many scholars have already examined Tolstoy's relationship to Rousseau in general terms.³ Tolstoy himself acknowledged a debt several times in his writings. One of his statements bears quoting here because it has a direct relationship to the Rousseauan inspiration of *What is Art?*. In a conversation he had in 1901 with Professor Paul Boyer of Paris, Tolstoy said:

Rousseau was treated unjustly, the greatness of his thought was unappreciated, and he was slandered in every which-way. I read all of Rousseau, all twenty volumes including his

attempts a definition of what is peculiar to man, of what is genuinely human rather than merely conventional, or of man's potentialities. These discourses are not always consciously utopian; they may be directed to individual reformation or to preparation for the afterlife. Furthermore, the discussion may be carried on without the reference to concrete social practices and institutions. That is, they aim to assess the various kinds of human activity, the various pleasures open to men, or the various styles of life made possible by civilization or science. (213-14)

³For general treatments of Tolstoy's relationship with Rousseau see Milan I. Markovich, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et Tolstoi*. Paris: 1928. See also I. Benrubi, "Tolstoi, continuateur de Rousseau," *Annales de la société Jean-Jacques Rousseau*, III (1907), 83-118.

Dictionary of Music. I more than delighted in him--I worshiped him. At the age of 15, I wore a medallion with his portrait around my neck in place of my natal cross. Many of his pages are so close to me, that it seems that I wrote them myself.⁴

Tolstoy's remarkable statement touches not only on Rousseau's writings, but his biographical image as well: that of the misunderstood visionary. Tolstoy himself rhetorically adopts this image for himself in *What, Then, Must We Do?* and *What is Art?*⁵ Even Tolstoy's replacement of his natal pectoral crucifix with a portrait of Rousseau metaphorically expresses the exchange of one persecuted prophet for another.

When he says that some of Rousseau's writings affect him so powerfully that the boundaries between writer and reader seem to dissolve, Tolstoy places Rousseau directly within the context of the aesthetic theories he was developing in *What Is Art?*, which he wrote in 1898--three years before his conversation with Professor Boyer. In Section 15 of his treatise, Tolstoy describes the relationship that binds artist and audience when the work of art is genuine. The effect of true art, its capacity for "contagiousness" (*zarazitel'nost'*), consists of a sharing of affect rather than a one-way transmission of stimuli or information:

The main characteristic of this feeling lies in the fact that the perceiver merges (*slivaetsia*) with the artist to such an extent that it seems to him that the object he perceives was created not by someone else, but by himself, and that all that is expressed by this object is that which he himself had for a long time wished to express. (*PSS*, 30, 149).

Tolstoy's statement about Rousseau expresses the highest compliment he can pay to an artist; his work can so "infect" the reader that the boundaries between them will dissolve, awakening in the reader the feeling that his own thoughts are being expressed. Art, moreover, cannot infect unless the artist possesses sincerity. This word expresses a key feature of Tolstoy's psychology of creativity: the artist must not only have experienced the feelings he renders, he must transform them into art in response to a deep internal need, and for no other motivation than the satisfaction of that need. Thus for Tolstoy Rousseau not only represents the misunderstood prophet of the transformed world, but also embodies

⁴My source for this passage is the Moscow 1955 collection of Tolstoy's writings on literature, edited by F. A. Ivanova, p. 702. Silbajoris (33) locates its source in a 1928 lecture by Academician M. N. Rozanov entitled "Rousseau and Tolstoy."

⁵Aylmer Maude reinforces this view of Tolstoy as the prophetic visionary of a future order. In a preface to his translation of *What Is Art?*, he writes: "No doubt most of those to whom [art] is an end in itself, who live by it, or make it their chief occupation, will read this book (or leave it unread) and go on in their former way, much as Pharoah, of old, hardened his heart, and did not sympathise with what Moses had to say on the labor question." *The Complete Works of Lyof N. Tolstoi* Vol. 4 (New York: Crowell, 1899) p. 340.

the very type of the artist who would live under the new order.⁶

As Silbajoris has pointed out most recently Tolstoy's observations of his peasant students' innate creativity in 1862 led him to a major reassessment of the importance of art in its relation to other important aspects of human life (41-67). At this early date, Tolstoy began formulating a critique that centered on art, but also encompassed the economic and social inequities of contemporary European society that distorted art and removed it from what he believed to be its crucial function: that of providing spiritual nourishment to the whole of society. During his pedagogical experiments on his estate, Tolstoy came to doubt the artistic value of masterpieces that could be appreciated only by the privileged classes. He became convinced that artistic creativity did not belong only to the elite. He claimed that his peasant pupils produced writing that surpassed Goethe's and had no equal in all of Russian literature. In one of his pedagogical articles of this period, he writes:

I am convinced that a lyric poem such as [Pushkin's] "I Remember a Wonderful Instance," or a piece of music such as Beethoven's last symphony, is not so unconditionally and universally good as the song about "Van'ka Kliushnika" or the refrain "Along the Mother Volga," and that Pushkin and Beethoven please us not because of any absolute beauty that

⁶In emphasizing Rousseau's biographical image in the statement to Boyer, Tolstoy restates his lifelong belief that the moral character of an artist bears a direct relationship to the quality of the artistic production. In this conviction, Tolstoy had predecessors and successors. The Russian writer Nikolai Karamzin articulated this moral aesthetic in 1793 in his essay "What Does An Artist Need?" Malcolm Cowley recently gave a pithy version of the Tolstoyan relationship of character to art in his memoir *And I Worked at the Writer's Trade*:

And so, by a long detour, we come back to the original question, whether character and art are correlated. The answer is that they are, but in a complicated fashion. Masterpieces can be produced by saints of art or of the church; they can be produced by rascals or crazies or even, at times, by accident; but I refuse to think that they can be produced by genuine scoundrels, "men without honor or virtue." The artist, no matter what his sins may be, is bent on giving himself away; the scoundrel has no choice but to hide himself as best he can. In the end he cannot help revealing his scoundrelism--not so much in his subject matter or in what he seems to be saying about it, as rather in the shape and sound, the color and rhythm of his words. False, false, the reader unconsciously feels, closing the book. Once I made in my journal a statement that needs to be qualified, but that still holds a general truth. "No complete son-of-a-bitch," I said, "ever wrote a good sentence." (266)

The question of the relationship of character to art has a relationship to the larger debate over inspiration vs. technique, spontaneity vs. rhetoric, naiveté vs. craft, style vs. substance, that has been continuing since Plato's critique of the Sophists. Richard Lanham provides a useful summary of this dispute and its cultural implications in the first chapter of his book *The Motives of Eloquence*. Lanham distinguishes two fundamental approaches: the view that art consists fundamentally of craft and skills, the representative of which he calls *homo rhetoricus*; and the belief (which Tolstoy obviously shares) that art must contain a true expression of a consistent central self, the representative of which he calls *homo seriusus*.

is in them, but because we are as corrupted as Pushkin and Beethoven, because Pushkin and Beethoven equally flatter our monstrous irritability and our weakness. We usually hear the outworn tawdry paradox, that in order to understand the beautiful one needs a certain preparation. Who said this? Why? What proves it? This is just an excuse used to wriggle out of the blind alley into which we were led by the falsehood of our path of development--the exclusive possession of our art by one class. (*PSS*, 8, 114)

His pedagogical experiments thus planted the seeds of two social and political convictions that would lie more or less dormant while he worked on his novelistic masterpieces, but which would emerge after his crisis of the late 1870s into full articulation. One was his radical egalitarianism, based on his empirical evidence gained in his pedagogical experiments, that the privileged classes have no monopoly on genius and that intelligence and creativity are distributed evenly among all classes. The other was his suspicion that the privileged classes were mystifying categories and definitions and manipulating the accessibility of art in order to perpetuate their position at the top of an unjust social order.

Two decades after his pedagogical experiments, Tolstoy again attacked the elite's monopoly on the life of the mind. In his "Speech on Popular Editions," (1884) he states:

All our lack of success comes from the confusion of concepts: the people (*narod*) and we--the "non-people" (*ne narod*)--the intelligentsia. This division does not exist. We all from the working peasant to Humboldt possess equally the same kinds of knowledge and we have no others . . . The difference between people arises only from the fact that knowledge is more accessible to some and less so to others. (*PSS* 25, 528)

At this stage, Tolstoy has concentrated his criticism only on the unfairness of exclusive possession of the arts and sciences by the privileged few. He has not yet begun to argue his second conviction, that the upper classes use this monopoly to perpetuate social inequality in order to secure their positions at the top of the order.

Two years later, Tolstoy developed this political argument in his book *What Then Must We Do?* (*Tak chto zhe nam delat'?*). In this work, Tolstoy states unambiguously that he is not attacking knowledge and art themselves, but rather the social and political consequences of their exclusive possession by the ruling classes. Tolstoy's arguments at this point share remarkable similarities with those of Rousseau in his *First Discourse*, where Rousseau contends that progress in the arts and sciences since the Renaissance has not brought about the moral improvement of humankind, but has only abetted the consolidation of tyranny and the petrification of the political barriers between the powerful and the impotent. Intellectual and artistic progress, according to Rousseau's critique, do not merely destroy the foundations of political equality; they actually rob individuals of the will to preserve political freedom:

While government and laws provide for the safety and well-being of assembled men, the sciences, letters, and arts, less despotic and perhaps more powerful, spread garlands of flowers over the iron chains with which men are burdened, stifle in them the sense of that original liberty for which they seemed to have been born, make them love their slavery, and turn them into what is called civilized peoples. (36)

Tolstoy shares Rousseau's vision of a world dominated by inequalities and arranged only to pervert what is natural and excellent in the majority of its population.

Adopting the rhetorical stance of the misunderstood prophet, Tolstoy presses his attack on the misappropriation of the arts and sciences by ridiculing the anticipated objections of the intellectual elite:

"But sciences, art! You are denying sciences and art, that is you deny that by which humanity lives!" They constantly present me with this--not really a response, but a device they use to discard my conclusions without really looking into them. "He denies science and art, he wants to return people to savagery; why even listen to him or talk to him?" But this is not fair. I not only do not deny science and art, but say what I say in the name of that which is true science and true art, and only so that it would be possible for humanity to emerge from that condition of savagery into which it quickly descends thanks to the false learning of our times, only for that reason do I say what I say. (*PSS* 25, 363-4).

Tolstoy here shows a strong identification with Rousseau, whose *First Discourse* elicited the same response from his critics. Rousseau insists that he is not denying the value of the arts and sciences per se, but that he deplors the misuse of these institutions in the service of despotism and the consolidation of state power: "How can one dare blame the sciences before one of Europe's most learned Societies, praise ignorance in a famous Academy, and reconcile contempt for study with respect for the truly learned? I have seen these contradictions, and they have not rebuffed me. I am not abusing science, I told myself; I am defending virtue before virtuous men" (34). Nonetheless, a host of critics ignored Rousseau's claim and accused him of being an enemy of enlightenment.

In *What Then Must We Do?*, Tolstoy develops his critique of the exclusive possession of the arts and sciences by one class. Artists and scientists have freed themselves from the need to do physical labor by imposing it on others, in the firm conviction that they are providing these others with something valuable in exchange for their labor. These mandarins, like the priests of antiquity, believe that their pursuits are the most important in the world. They advance a false claim about the "division of labor" according to which they occupy themselves with mental and spiritual labor while the rest of the population performs the necessary physical labor. "They want to think this, and it seems to them that in actuality an entirely just exchange of services takes place where in fact occurs the simplest and oldest type of violence" (*PSS* 25, 348). Learned people have perpetrated this colossal fraud in order to preserve a way of life constructed on inequality. They have defended this arrangement by citing a social contract, supposedly concluded at some indefinite time in the past, according to which "the producer of spiritual nourishment says: in order that I might give you spiritual food, you will feed me, clothe me, and clean up after me. The producer of physical food presents no demands and yields up the physical food, although he has not received the spiritual food" (*PSS* 25, 349). Once this supposed contract was concluded, the classes benefiting from this division of labor, which include those people in government, church, and the sciences and arts, work only to increase the power of their institutions, not for the good of the entire body politic. The

inequalities, once instituted, remain in place because the interest groups who benefit from them work only to perpetuate their advantages.

In *What, Then, Must We Do?* Tolstoy draws as well on the arguments of Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality*. In this work, Rousseau provides a genetic narrative that examines the origin of the social and political inequalities he described in his *First Discourse*:

The stronger did more work; the cleverer turned his to better advantage; the more ingenious found ways to shorten his labor; the farmer had greater need of iron or the blacksmith greater need of wheat; and working equally, the one earned a great deal while the other barely had enough to live. Thus does natural inequality imperceptibly manifest itself along with contrived inequality; and thus do the differences among men, developed by those of circumstances, become more perceptible, more permanent in their effects, and begin to have a proportionate influence over the fate of individuals. (154-55)

The accumulation of property and privilege by the few at the expense of the many, what Tolstoy calls "the simplest and oldest form of violence," occurs during the initial formation of society. Once the strong have their possessions, however, they face the threat of organized predation. Moreover, they remain vulnerable to claims on their wealth because they have no formal, articulated moral or legal right to it.

Rousseau offers the idea that at some unrecorded time in the development of civil society, the people who had become powerful and rich perpetrated a fraudulent social contract with their poorer fellows in order to perpetuate the advantages they had gained through violence.⁷ In order to put an end to the threats and to bolster the pre-existing fact of their possession with an affirmation of its legitimacy, the rich, in Rousseau's reconstruction of human political history, perpetrated "the most deliberate project that ever entered the human mind," i.e. the contractual foundation of civil society:

Such was, or must have been, the origin of society and laws, which gave new fetters to the weak and new forces to the rich, destroyed natural freedom for all time, established forever the law of property and inequality, changed a clever usurpation into an irrevocable right, and for the profit of a few ambitious men henceforth subjected the whole human race to work, servitude, and misery. (160)

While Rousseau provides an actual genetic narrative, describing in detail the progress from the state of nature to that of extreme social inequality, and the sanctioning of this progress by a fraudulent social contract, Tolstoy argues that the elite classes of his time merely assume that such a contract was concluded in the past and cite it as a defense of their privileges. It hardly matters in Tolstoy's version whether the contract was actually

⁷This original social contract differs from the contract described in Rousseau's political work *On the Social Contract*. The historical contract concluded in *Discourse on Inequality* occurred when possessions and power were already in the hands of the few. The ideal social contract would not permit this unequal distribution, since its very reason for being involves the prevention of private interests.

concluded at some time in the past, whether the elite classes merely assume that it was, or whether the contract was express or implied: Tolstoy utters the essence of his genetic narrative in the phrase "the simplest and oldest form of violence."

The old man whom Nekhlyudov meets at the end of the novel *Resurrection* reproduces exactly Rousseau's account of the origins of civil society. When asked by an English visitor what he thinks should be done with people who refuse to obey the law, the old man replies: "The law! First they stole everything, took all the land, all the wealth away from people, took it all for themselves, killed all who opposed them, and then wrote a law that nobody should kill or steal. They should have written the law first" (404). Tolstoy does not differ from Rousseau's version. Rousseau simply devotes more time to imagining the historical circumstances of the contract.

Confronting this situation in which an unjust political system and self-perpetuating intellectual monopolies mutually reinforce each other, Rousseau in *On the Social Contract* and Tolstoy in *What Is Art?* contrast the present state of affairs with utopian alternatives. Rousseau locates his vision in the secular tradition of Natural Law, which regards the legitimate state as one founded by a social pact; Tolstoy refers to his ideal commonwealth as one based on true Christian principles. These differences in naming have little significance, for the new social order of both thinkers functions according to the same social dynamics.⁸ For both thinkers, the new social order does not call for a mutation of human nature, but rather a return of natural relationships among people.

Although Rousseau freely admits that the political institutions based on his ideal social contract belong to the realm of convention and artifice, they nonetheless restore and preserve what is most natural in humanity--the autonomy and independence human beings enjoyed in the primal condition described in the *Discourse on Inequality*. By introducing the concept of the general will, Rousseau changed the Enlightenment view of statecraft as the production of artifacts such as fixed laws and constitutions into a vision of government as the constant expression of the vital single will of its constituents. To be sure, constitutions and legislation occupy an extremely important part of Rousseau's scheme, but

⁸Tolstoy claimed that he differed from Rousseau in rejecting only false-Christian civilization, while Rousseau rejected all civilization. In a diary entry dated 6 June 1905, Tolstoy writes:

I am compared to Rousseau. I am very much indebted to R[ousseau] and I love him, but there is a great difference. We differ in that R[ousseau] denies all civilization, whereas I deny false-Christian civilization. That which is called civilization is the growth of humanity. Growth is inevitable, one can not say of it that it is good or bad. It is,--there is life in it. As in the growth of a tree. But a branch, or the powers of life growing in the branch, are wrong and harmful if they suck up all of the impetus of growth. This is the case with our false civilization. (PSS 55, 145)

One could argue, however, that any historical example of Tolstoy's true Christian civilization occurred as far back in time as any of Rousseau's ideal classical republics, and that the prospects for its earthly restoration are equally as remote as the possibilities of establishing a republic based on Rousseau's social contract.

these formulae become null once they no longer exist as the expression of the general will.

Rousseau returns government to a more elemental condition than the classic liberal conception of the state as an aggregate of separate orders, each pursuing its own interests, yet coexisting and benefitting the whole with these separate pursuits. For Rousseau, the general will does not foster consensus or compromise, but rather operates as the unanimous will of a body of people when all private interests are excluded or ignored. "In order for the general will to be well expressed, it is therefore important that there be no partial society in the State, and that each citizen give only his own opinion" (61). In the absence of private interests, these individual opinions coincide, and the general will emerges as an overriding principle uniting the constituents in an almost mystical fashion. Book IV of Rousseau's *Social Contract* begins with the following utopian paragraph:

As long as several men together consider themselves to be a single body, they have only a single will, which relates to their common preservation and the general welfare. Then all the mechanisms of the State are vigorous and simple, its maxims are clear and luminous, it has no tangled contradictory interests; the common good is clearly apparent everywhere, and requires only good sense to be perceived. Peace, union, and equality are enemies of political subtleties. Upright and simple men are hard to fool because of their simplicity; traps and refined pretexts do not deceive them. They are not clever enough to be duped. When, among the happiest people in the world, groups of peasants are seen deciding the affairs of State under an oak tree, and always acting wisely, can one help scorning the refinements of other nations, which make themselves illustrious and miserable with so much art and mystery? (108)

Accessibility of the language and processes of government, full participation of the members of the body politic, and the uniting of all individual wills into a single overriding general will--only these features constitute a legitimate political entity.

In *What Is Art?*, Tolstoy does for the aesthetic experience what Rousseau does for political activity in *On The Social Contract*: he transforms it from the production of artifacts into a vital process of social interaction. Sovereignty for Rousseau, like art for Tolstoy, must remain a process, a type of metabolism. As Silbajoris observed, for Tolstoy, "art is not something that *is* but something that *happens* between the artist and his audience" (18).

Rousseau and Tolstoy have removed what they consider to be the artifices and conventions separating humanity from itself. Their utopian projects call for the restoration of an activity they consider to be essentially and naturally human--the flight from the isolation of the self and the striving toward communality. Rousseau's ideal commonwealth would foster such a sense of belonging that the citizen would prefer death to exile. Tolstoy's aesthetic psychology features the dissolving of the boundaries between individuals through participation in an artistic event. A true work of art does that which, in the consciousness of the perceiver, annihilates the boundaries between him and the artist, and not only between him and the artist, but also between him and all the other people who are taking in that work of art. In this liberation of the personality (*lichnost'*) from its isolation from other people, from its loneliness, in this melding of the personality

(*sliianie lichnosti*) with others lies the main attractive power and the characteristic of art. (439)

While Rousseau dwells on the political structures of the legitimate state, Tolstoy assumes radical social and political equality and concentrates on the cultural sphere, specifically on artistic creation/performance that gives the community an emotional awareness of the highest aims of its organization. Tolstoy's treatise restores to the artistic event--the successful expression by an artist of his deep feelings through his art, and the reception of this art by an audience--its original and natural social role as dynamic dissolver of self.

In his later fiction, Tolstoy developed similar relationships between art and the dissolution of the boundaries of the self. The relationship between art and death recurs in Tolstoy's imaginative literature, for reasons that become clear in *What Is Art?* One thinks of the moment in the story "Master and Man" when Brekhunov lies atop the peasant Nikita to keep him warm during the blizzard: "He understood that this was death, and was not at all disturbed by that either. He remembered that Nikita was lying under him and that he had got warm and was alive, and it seemed to him that he was Nikita and Nikita was he, and that his life was not in himself but in Nikita. He strained his ears and heard Nikita breathing and even slightly snoring. 'Nikita is alive, so I too am alive!' he said to himself triumphantly" (320-21). The approach of death removes Brekhunov from his isolation and obsession with material gain by dissolving the boundaries between him and Nikita. In this case, the nearness of death brings an awareness of the higher meaning of life and has the same effect on Brekhunov that art would ideally have on a receptive audience.

In *Anna Karenina* Tolstoy develops a similar relationship between art and dying. The artist Mikhailov in Part V, Chapter XI sees painting as the process of "removing the shell of the idea," that is of removing accretions from something already present and restoring it to the whole. "He knew that much attention and care were needed not to injure one's work when removing the wrappings that obscure the idea, and that all wrappings must be removed, but as to the art of painting, the technique, it did not exist" (431). A few pages later Tolstoy describes the death of Levin's brother, Nicholas. Mary Nikolaevna, Nicholas' common-law wife, tells Levin that the end is near because Nicholas "has begun to clutch at himself." This puzzles Levin:

"Clutch? How?"

"Like this," she said, pulling at the folds of her stuff dress. And Levin noticed that all day long the sick man really kept catching at himself as if wishing to pull something off. (458)

Mikhailov's concept of art as a process of removing coverings corresponds to Nicholas' attempts to peel away his very flesh--both want to remove that which separates and isolates essences from the rest of the world. Here again art operates as the communicator of moral truths that would also occur to a person at the approach of death.

What is Art? explains the historical diversion of art from its original purpose as part

of the larger perversion of primitive Christianity from an egalitarian social organization to a hierarchical institution. What was once a vital organizational force, uniting people and propelling them toward a moral existence beyond themselves, degenerated when small groups within the society appropriated a sacerdotal function. Ecclesiastical Christianity replaced the true Christian community when churchmen began to work only for the security and enrichment of their institution.

The return of art to its proper function in society is only a part of the larger restoration of primitive Christianity in its social and political manifestations. Here, each member of the community would relate directly to God and to neighbors without hierarchies or intermediate associations.⁹ The profoundly political role of art as a centripetal force in Tolstoy's Christian commonwealth emerges in the following passages from Section 16 of his treatise:

The essence of Christian consciousness consists in the acceptance by each person of a filial relationship to God and proceeding from it the unity of people with God and among themselves, as is stated in the Gospels (John 17: 21), and therefore the contents of Christian art are such feelings as facilitate the unification of people with God and among themselves. . . .

Art, each type of art in and of itself, has the property of unifying people. Each art works in such a way that people, receiving the feeling transmitted by the artist, are united in soul, firstly with the artist and secondly with all people who receive the same impression. . . .

Christian art is only that which unites all people without exception--either that which evokes in people a consciousness of the sameness of their position in relation to God and their fellows, or that which evokes in people one and the same feeling, albeit the simplest, but not contrary to Christianity and proper to all people without exception. (*PSS* 30, 157)

For both Tolstoy and Rousseau, the historical enemies of unification are those partial societies which arrogate a middle position and only aggravate the citizen's desire to split off from the community and pursue the narrow interests of class and self.

⁹Both Rousseau and Tolstoy condemn the role of partial societies within the larger socio-political organization. Tolstoy objects to them because of the pressures they can exert on an individual to pull away from the community and follow his or her own selfish interests. Artists perform according to the demands of these interest groups rather than from compelling internal need; thus they produce counterfeit art, tailored to attract and please those who have money or power. While not all people can be artists, Tolstoy learned from his pedagogical activities of the 1860s that artistic genius occurs randomly in all segments of the population, so the ideal community must welcome the free expression of those members who feel a powerful internal compulsion to express themselves through art with no hope of private enrichment or secondary gain.

Rousseau deplures private interests because each one constitutes in itself a general will that conflicts with the general will of the larger community. In Rousseau's society, the citizen must express his private opinion without modifying it according to the demands of factions or interest groups. The political communication of Rousseau's citizen corresponds very closely to the artistic communication of Tolstoy's artist.

The similarities that Tolstoy's aesthetic writings share with Rousseau's political critique and the theory of *On the Social Contract* ultimately point to an origin in the psyches of both writers. Jean Starobinski, in his brilliant study *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: La Transparence et l'obstacle*, describes Rousseau as obsessed with the impossibility of human communication:

Dans le premier *Discours*, Rousseau fait déjà entendre la plainte qu'il répêtra inlassablement dans les années de la persécution: les acmes ne sont pas visibles, l'amitié n'est pas possible, la confiance ne peut jamais durer, aucun signe certain ne permet de reconnaître la disposition des coeurs. (15)

This painful inability to rely on his fellow humans led Rousseau to construct his ideal commonwealth in such a way as to foster unanimity and minimise the private competitive and acquisitive urges that would lead citizens to betray one another. In his treatment of personal relationships, Rousseau longed for a condition of transparency that would allow two separate souls each to experience the other's thoughts and feelings without mediation. Tolstoy had the same longings. Hints at a longing for transparency emerge in *Anna Karenina* Part IV, Chapter XIII, when Levin and Kitty "read each other's minds" by guessing each other's thoughts from only the first letters of the unsaid words. The two phases, resident and stranger, that Richard Gustafson uses to define the two emotional polarities of Tolstoy's existence, mark his fluctuations between the states of warm communality, featuring an openness of souls and diminution of the sense of self; and the painful isolation when access to the souls of others is hindered by an opaque covering. Tolstoy hoped art would provide him with the longed-for transparency, as he reveals in an early diary entry: "The letters will make words, the words --phrases, but how can you transmit feeling? Isn't there some way to transfer to someone else the look in one's own eyes at the sight of nature?" (Quoted in Silbajoris, 17). Perhaps this is the reason Tolstoy articulated his hopes for the restoration of human community, social justice and political equality in a treatise entitled *What is Art?*

WORKS CITED

- Berlin, Isaiah. "Tolstoy and Enlightenment." *Tolstoy: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Ralph E. Matlaw. Twentieth-Century Views. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 28-51.
- Cowley, Malcolm. *--And I Worked at the Writer's Trade: Chapters of Literary History, 1918-1978*. New York: Viking, 1978.
- Derathea, Robert. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et la science politique de son temps*. Paris: Vrin, 1988.
- Gustafson, Richard F. *Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.
- Kateb, George. "Utopias and Utopianism." *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Paul Edwards. Vol. 7. New York: Macmillan, 1967. 212-15.
- Lanham, Richard A. *The Motives of Eloquence*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1976.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The First and Second Discourses*. Trans. Roger D. and Judith R. Masters. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.
- . *On the Social Contract, with Geneva Manuscript and Political Economy*. Ed. Roger D. Masters. Trans. Judith R. Masters. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978.
- Silbajoris, Rimvydas. *Tolstoy's Aesthetics and His Art*. Columbus: Slavica, 1991.
- Starobinski, Jean. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: La transparence et l'obstacle, suivi de Sept essais sur Rousseau*. Paris: Gallimard, 1971.
- Tolstoy, L. N. *O literature: Stat'i, pis'ma, dnevniki*. Ed. F. A. Ivanova et al. Introd. L. D. Opuľ'skaia. Moscow: GIXL, 1955.
- . *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. 90 vols. Moscow: 1929-58.
- . *Voskresenie. Povesti, rasskazy*. Moscow: Xudozhestvennaia lit., 1976.
- . *Anna Karenina*. Ed. George Gibian. Trans. Aylmer Maude. New York: Norton, 1970.
- . *Short Novels: Stories of God, Sex, and Death*. Ed Ernest J. Simmons. Vol. 2. New York: Random House, 1966.

TOLSTOY AND BLOOMSBURY

GALYA DIMENT, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

....of the three great Russian writers, it is Tolstoi who most enthralls us and most repels.

Virginia Woolf

For most of members of the circle which came to be known as the "Bloomsbury Group,"¹ Tolstoy, unlike Dickens or Thackeray, was more of a contemporary than a writer from the previous era. Their connection with Tolstoy was constantly kept alive by those among them who were most active in England's burgeoning Tolstoy "industry" in the beginning of this century: David ('Bunny') Garnett's mother, Constance, was one of Tolstoy's English translators; Virginia Woolf and E.M. Forster were instrumental in presenting Tolstoy to post-Victorian generations; and Woolf's husband, Leonard, even attempted to learn Russian in order to translate and publish Gorky's *Reminiscences of Tolstoy*.² In their writings, letters, diaries, and public statements, Bloomsbury's writers, critics, historians and even painters often appeared to engage in a direct dialogue with Tolstoy and to formulate their own ideas by actively arguing or agreeing with his. This "intimacy" with a foreign writer may seem particularly strange if one remembers that these same people frequently had little more than disdain for Tolstoy's counterparts and contemporaries in their own literature.

¹I am using the term loosely, mostly applying it to Virginia Woolf and her large circle of friends and acquaintances. It is not my purpose here either to define what "Bloomsbury" was or to argue who rightfully "belonged" to it. I am aware that E.M. Forster is usually seen as having been but on the "periphery" of Bloomsbury while Katherine Mansfield, although on friendly terms with at least some of the "essential" members of the group (i.e. Virginia Woolf, her sister Vanessa, Lytton Strachey, Clive Bell, Maynard Keynes, Desmond MacCarthy, S.S. Koteliansky, etc.), is not at all considered to be a Bloomsbury "insider." Neither is Ottoline Morrell, even though she was a popular hostess for their gatherings and -- at times -- a good friend of both Lytton Strachey and Virginia Woolf. But those distinctions are irrelevant for this paper which uses "Bloomsbury" as a term of convenience for a generation of writers, artists and their friends who, because of their proximity to one another, affected each others' views and tastes and created an influential intellectual "subculture."

²Which he did with the help of S.S. Koteliansky and, sometimes, Virginia Woolf. Both works were published by the Hogarth Press which the Woolfs owned. "Our actual procedure in translating," writes Leonard Woolf in his autobiography, "was that Kot did the first draft in handwriting, with generous space between the lines, and we [he and Virginia] then turned his extremely queer version into English. In order to make this easier and more accurate, we started to learn Russian and at one moment I had learned enough to be able to stumble through a newspaper or even Aksakov" (Leonard Woolf, *Beginning*, 247).

The reasons for this affinity with Tolstoy vary. Some have little to do with Tolstoy as an artist. There was, for example, a political incentive to admire Tolstoy: Bloomsbury was a generation of pacifists, many of whom (Lytton Strachey, Clive Bell, and Duncan Grant, to name just a few) refused to fight in the First World War. As Alex Zwerdling points out in *Virginia Woolf and the Real World*, "Tolstoy was the first writer in modern times to link Christianity with an absolute refusal to fight, and his pacifist works were widely known in other countries" (Zwerdling, 391). Even though the vast majority of the group rejected Christianity, Tolstoy's pacifism was still powerfully influential. George Trevelyan's response to Tolstoy's views in 1904 is quite characteristic of the turn-of-the-century generation: "Tolstoi's letter in *Times* has set me thinking very uncomfortably -- or *feeling* rather. It fills me with (i) a new sense of doubt and responsibility as to my own manner of life (ii) as to this of war. I feel as if we were all living in the City of Destruction..." (in Russell, I, 294; his emphasis). Tolstoy's "The Law of Love and the Law of Violence" (1909) was of particular importance here since it was written only a few years before the "Great War" broke out.

Though attracted to Tolstoy's pacifism, Bloomsbury writers and critics were never blind to its possible shortcomings. In *Civilization and Old Friends* (1927),³ Clive Bell thus summed up the misgivings he and many other members of the group felt about Tolstoy's doctrine of "nonviolence":

Tolstoy may have conceived a world in which everyone would be so good that he would not wish to interfere with anyone else, a world cleansed of greed and hatred, envy and ambition, in which even if he had them a man would never act on his evil passions. More probably, Tolstoy believed that there would always be violent, meddlesome, greedy, and envious brutes who would follow instinct down any dirty alley, but held their existence unimportant so long as the others preserved their saintliness unspotted. Saintliness, argued Tolstoy, can be preserved by submitting passively and with a good grace. And so it can, and enormously increased to boot; but civilization would perish. (Clive Bell, I, 171)

Other reasons for Tolstoy's popularity with Bloomsbury can be directly linked to the group's general dissatisfaction with domestic literature. Not quite happy with the likes of Arnold Bennett, H.G. Wells or John Galsworthy and hating to have to learn from the Victorians against whose values they liked to rebel, Virginia Woolf, Lytton Strachey and E.M. Forster inevitably looked elsewhere for literary models.⁴ Russia was a logical

³Leon Edel even associates Bell's interests in "civilization" with Tolstoy: "[T]he strange conversion of the family *parvenu* spirit in Clive made him want to write a treatise on civilization, on the 'new renaissance,' on art -- very much as Tolstoy, a rough nobleman with the smell of the fields and manure about him, encountering life's subjects, wanted to write great essays: What was philosophy? What was art? What was life?" (Edel, 17).

⁴See, for example, Woolf's "Modern Fiction" (in *Common Reader*, 150-158), where she laments the state of the literary scene which is dominated by Wells, Bennett and Galsworthy. See also her famous essay "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown" (in *The Captain's Death Bed and Other Essays*, 94-119).

choice. The annual London performances of Diaghilev's Ballet Russe (both Diaghilev and Nijinsky were frequent visitors of Bloomsbury "salons," particularly that of Lady Ottoline Morrell⁵) helped to put that distant -- and therefore exotic -- country permanently in vogue. Not only Tolstoy but also Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Turgenev, Gorky and even Aksakov were widely read and frequently discussed. The interest in Russian literature was further stimulated by the 1917 Revolution and the presence within the group of several Russians -- among them, S.S. Koteliansky, Boris Anrep, and Maynard Keynes' wife Lidya Lopokova. Consequently, from the very beginning of its existence (1917), the Woolfs' Hogarth Press made a point of translating and printing Russian books. Richard Kennedy, who worked for Hogarth in 1928, echoed the sentiments of many Bloomsbury readers when he wrote in his diary: "I like the Russian books better than any others we publish" (Kennedy, 42).

Some critics believe that at least in the case of Virginia Woolf, the preference for Russian authors can be partially explained by fierce competitiveness with other English writers. Thus Phyllis Rose suggests that Woolf was simply "on safer ground" with foreigners: "They were from a different country, wrote in a different tradition. So she could read Colette and Proust with pleasure, while Mansfield and Joyce produced anxiety and irritation. Tolstoy, so distant from her in time, geography, and by virtue of his background, could evoke her strongest admiration" (Rose, 262).⁶ Rose's point may have some validity. Yet notwithstanding both Woolf's self-doubts and the sometimes political or even fashionable nature of Bloomsbury's fascination with Russia, it would be a great mistake to downplay the genuineness, seriousness -- and the possible consequences -- of their admiration for Russian writers in general and Tolstoy in particular.

"Nothing seems to escape [Tolstoy]," mused Woolf in "The Russian Point of View" (1925). "Nothing glances off him unrecorded.... Even in a translation we feel that we have been set on a mountain-top and had a telescope put into our hands. Everything is astonishingly clear and absolutely sharp" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 185-186). It was primarily this combination of precision and scope that seems to have drawn Woolf's generation to Tolstoy. "Tolstoy....," wrote E.M. Forster to Woolf in 1927, "could vitalise

⁵Barbara Bagenal's description of Morrell's parties during the Russian Ballet's early seasons in London (1912, 1913) shows the kind of excitement that the performances created: "Many of us who went to these parties were greatly influenced by the Russian Ballet and we often went to Ottoline's house straight from Covent Garden. Philip Morrell played the pianola for us and we all danced madly together -- probably still influenced by the ballet. They were great gatherings" (in Noble, 145).

⁶Rose is oversimplifying Woolf's attitude to Mansfield here. Despite Woolf's sense of rivalry she actually acknowledged liking several of Mansfield's stories (particularly "Prelude"), found it easy and exciting to discuss writing with her (Woolf allegedly told Mansfield that she was "the only woman with whom I long to talk work" [in Tomalin, 198]), and thought that Mansfield "has a much better idea of writing than most" (Woolf, *Letters*, II, 159). Upon Mansfield's death in 1922 Woolf noted in her diary: "I have the feeling that I shall think of her at intervals all through life. Probably we had something in common which I shall never find in anyone else" (Woolf, *Diary*, II, 227).

guillotines... as well as tea tables, could command certain moods or deeds which our domesticity leads us to shun as false" (in Quentin Bell, II, 134). Because of his ability to present one with a whole picture, Tolstoy, according to Forster, had no equals in English literature: "No English novelist is as great as Tolstoy -- that is to say has given so complete a picture of man's life, both on its domestic and heroic side" (Forster, *Aspects*, 7). Lady Ottoline Morrell's emotional and somewhat naive reaction to reading Tolstoy in 1916 likewise stresses the writer's satisfying "completeness": "I have just finished *War and Peace*. It is amazing, almost incredible that a man could have created it. It stretches over the whole life of Russia and Europe. It is tremendously august and beautiful" (Morrell, 153).

Morrell goes on to describe how she and Katherine Mansfield luxuriated in the sumptuous details of Tolstoy's narrative:

[W]e used to lose ourselves in scene after scene of *War and Peace* -- especially [Katherine] loved the chapters where the young girls washed and dressed themselves with excitement for a ball, or went on masquerading expeditions in sledges, and then the scene where Natasha slipped off the slippers from her little feet and jumped into her mother's bed while her mother was reciting her evening prayer, 'Can it be that this couch is my bier.' Natasha snuggling under the bedclothes, giggling to herself and then peeping out to look at her mother until she made her smile. Then she too got into bed and they began their evening talk. Recollecting these things with Katherine was like living them again with her. (Morrell, 186)

Morrell's description provides an excellent testimony to how much Katherine Mansfield must have really meant it when she wrote to Constance Garnett in 1921 that "the younger generation owe you more that we ourselves are able to realise. These books have changed our lives, no less" (in Drabble, 380).⁷

Mansfield's strong sentiments appear to go much deeper than merely a trendy fascination with exotic authors, and so do Virginia Woolf's feelings for Tolstoy, whom she considered "the greatest of all novelists" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 185). Woolf, in fact, felt so drawn to Tolstoy that she found solace -- and excitement -- in re-reading him during the first dark months of the Second World War: "*War and Peace* is the greatest novel in the world; and if I'm not bombed I shall read that and *Anna Karenina* this winter" (Woolf, *Letters*, VI, 361). "Always the same reality," she wrote in her diary in 1940, "like touching an exposed electric wire... his rugged short cut mind -- to me the most, not sympathetic, but inspiring, rousing genius in the raw. Thus more disturbing, more 'shocking,' more of a thunderclap, even on art, even on literature, than any other writer" (Woolf, *Diary*, V, 273).

⁷Mansfield appears to have been quite "intimate" with Tolstoy for she even used one of his characters to describe her own father: "Father's a Tolstoy character. He has just the point of vision of a Tolstoy character. I always felt that Stepan in *Anna Karenina* reminded me of someone -- and his well-nourished, fresh body was always curiously familiar to me -- of course -- it is my Papa's... the smile and the whiskers" (in Tomalin, 12).

When Rose describes Tolstoy as the writer who was in all respects "distant" from Virginia Woolf, she simply ignores Woolf's own statements as to how close Tolstoy could be to the English sensibilities she shared with her readers. "From his first words we can be sure of one thing...", Woolf wrote in *Common Reader*, "here is a man who sees what we see, who proceeds, too, as we are accustomed to proceed, not from the inside outwards, but from the outside inwards" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 185). In that she drew a major distinction between Tolstoy and Dostoevsky: it was Dostoevsky, not Tolstoy, who would appear to be "alien, difficult, a foreigner" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 185), and whose point of view ("from the inside outwards") was drastically different from what English literary audiences had been accustomed to.

Woolf's description of Tolstoy as "a man who sees what we see" is also noteworthy because it helps to underscore the crucial difference between her generation's perception of the writer and that of their Victorian predecessors. To many Victorian critics Tolstoy was, indeed, rather "distant." "[A]n English mind," wrote Matthew Arnold in 1887, "will be startled by Anna's suffering herself to be so overwhelmed and irretrievably carried away by her passion.... ...that Anna, being what she is and her circumstances being what they are, should show not a hope, hardly a thought, of conquering her passion, of escaping from its fatal power, is to our notions strange and a little bewildering" (in Knowles, 357).⁸ Arnold also used this occasion to congratulate his countrymen (and, presumably, countrywomen) on their superiority to the "Slavs": "I remember M. Nisard saying to me many years ago at the *École Normale* in Paris, that he respected the English because they are *une nation qui sait se gener* -- people who can put constraint on themselves and go through what is disagreeable. Perhaps in the Slav nature this valuable faculty is somewhat wanting; a very strong impulse is too much regarded as irresistible, too little as what can be resisted and ought to be resisted..." (Ibid.)⁹. But what Arnold saw as a "valuable faculty" of "decorum" and "constraint," Lytton Strachey (who in

⁸Arnold and his contemporaries did, however, find Tolstoy's 'moral sense' close to theirs -- "Our Russian novelist deals abundantly with criminal passion and with adultery, but he does not seem to feel himself owing any service to the goddess Lubricity, or bound to put in touches at this goddess's dictation" (Arnold, in Knowles, 359). "[Tolstoy's] daring is great, for he has withheld nothing in the story of Anna's shame. Yet from first to last his appeal is made entirely to the moral sense of the reader..." (W.J. Dawson, cited in Knowles, 362).

⁹It is highly ironic, of course, that while Arnold is castigating the Slavs for their passions, complimenting the English for their moderation, and praising Tolstoy for his moral sense (which enables him, in Arnold's opinion, to be less "shocking" to the English reader than Flaubert or other French writers), he appears to be totally unaware of Tolstoy's rather strong anti-English bias, which is quite evident in *Anna Karenina*. Far from sharing Arnold's view on the "excesses" in the "the Slavs," Tolstoy actually seems to find dangerous extremes in "the English." Thus there are strong indications in the novel that the way Vronsky (who, like Stiva, is an obvious Anglofile) and Anna (who likes to ride horses and read English novels) behave is much more "English" (*too* 'liberal,' 'progressive,' 'emancipated' and, inevitably, 'amoral') than "Russian" (more conservative, traditional and, ultimately, more 'moral'). It is Prince Shcherbatsky, Dolly and eventually Kitty and Levin who, in Tolstoy's scheme, represent the true "Russian" way of life.

Eminent Victorians mocked the Victorian 'faculties' of, among others, Arnold's own father, Dr. Thomas Arnold) condemned as nothing more than sheer hypocrisy and unwillingness to acknowledge one's true feelings. Many in Bloomsbury prided themselves on feeling much closer to Anna and her allegedly "Slavic" emotionalism than to Matthew Arnold and the Victorian 'prudishness' he esteemed.¹⁰

Hard as they may have tried, Woolf and her friends could not, however, ignore the fact that many of Tolstoy's ethical values were even more intolerant and unbending than those of their own Victorians.¹¹ Tolstoy's dogmatic views on art were notoriously difficult to take. And yet, as S.P. Rosenbaum points out in *Victorian Bloomsbury: The Early Literary History of the Bloomsbury Group*, "[f]or all the perversity of *What Is Art?*, its expressive, emotive, socially aware aesthetics permanently influenced Bloomsbury aesthetics" (Rosenbaum, 32). In this case, Bloomsbury painters and art critics were as affected by Tolstoy as were the Bloomsbury writers. Roger Fry liked to think that "the proper answer to Tolstoy's 'What is Art?' was the counter-question 'What isn't?'" (in Rosenbaum, 9) and that "the value of the aesthetic emotion... is clearly infinitely removed from those ethical values to which Tolstoy would have confined it" (in Clive Bell, II, 73), yet even Fry had to admit that "the first fruitful work in aesthetics had been done by Tolstoy" (Rosenbaum, 32).

Ottoline Morrell, being more religious and less artistically sophisticated than her Bloomsbury friends, did not appreciate the value they placed on nonjudgmental detachment in art, and must have heard plenty of discussions on the matter, when, in her diary in 1918, she strongly condemned Bloomsbury modernist views: "[A]ll these modern artists don't know what it means to have a love for humanity....They say it 'ruins their flame.' But how selfish they are, and by being so their flame flickers and dwindles, instead of becoming a torch of fire like Tolstoy's" (Morrell, 234). Morrell's close friend, Bertrand Russell, seems to have been of a similar opinion -- even though he did not particularly care for Tolstoy's skills as a philosopher. "What is valuable in Tolstoy, to my mind," Russell wrote in a letter to a friend, "is his power of right ethical judgements, and his perception of concrete facts; his theorizings are of course worthless. It is the greatest misfortune to the human race that he has so little power of reasoning" (Russell, I, 288).

Even though, unlike Morrell or Russell, the majority in Bloomsbury found it

¹⁰Arnold's pronouncement that "we are not to take 'Anna Karenine' as a work of art; we are to take it as a piece of life" (cited in Knowles, 353) was equally unlikely to please Bloomsbury craft-conscious aesthetes. It should be noted, however, that Virginia Woolf, who was often as attracted by Victorian sensibilities as she was offended by them, found much to admire in Matthew Arnold's work. Thus she often quotes his poetry in her diary and at one point makes a firm promise to herself -- "that I will one of these days read the whole of Matthew Arnold" (Woolf, *Diaries*, III, 226).

¹¹In this respect, the Bloomsbury modernists were more intellectually honest than Vladimir Nabokov, for example, who dismissed the moralist in Tolstoy much too lightly and preferred to see in him only that which he found attractive. See, for example, Nabokov's discussion of *Anna Karenina* in his *Lectures on Russian Literature*.

impossible to share Tolstoy's ethical values or his "anti-art" views on art, Tolstoy's overall popularity among them remained extraordinarily high. Not only Tolstoy's own works but also works about him became of great importance. Gorky's *Reminiscences of Leo Nikolaevich Tolstoy* seems to have been particularly revered. In a "Publisher's Note" to the 1934 edition of the work, Leonard Woolf gives the following description of the book's initial reception: "Fourteen years ago The Hogarth Press published Maxim Gorky's *Reminiscences of Leo Nikolaevich Tolstoy* and it is not an exaggeration to say that it was recognized almost immediately as one of the few masterpieces of modern biography. The first edition was exhausted in a few months and the book was reprinted before the end of 1920" (Gorky, 7). Gorky, Leonard Woolf noted, "makes one hear, see, feel Tolstoy and his character as if one were sitting in the same room -- his greatness and his littleness, his entrancing and infuriating complexity, his titanic and poetic personality, his superb humour" (Leonard Woolf, *Downhill*, 67). Gorky's faithful recording of Tolstoy's frank and even bawdy statements on sex and women must have particularly delighted Bloomsbury insiders since frank and bawdy discussions of this taboo subject -- in both its hetero- and homosexual varieties -- had been a trademark of Bloomsbury gatherings virtually from the start.¹²

From all this evidence it should be quite transparent that Tolstoy had a great impact on Bloomsbury's intellectual fervor. What is much less clear, however, is whether he directly influenced their artistic works; whether, for example, Bloomsbury's most prominent writers -- Virginia Woolf and E. M. Forster -- would have been any different as creative artists were it not for their contact with Tolstoy. This other kind of a "reaction" to Tolstoy -- expressed not with statements but with art itself -- is much harder to document. Yet it definitely deserves the most serious consideration.

That Russia and Russians were frequently on Woolf's mind as she was writing her novels is quite evident. In *Mrs. Dalloway*, Clarissa prefers reading "of the retreat from Moscow" to sharing the bed with her husband; her nemesis, Miss Kilman, a religious spinster competing for the heart and mind of Clarissa's daughter, is resolved to "think of Russia" whenever she needs a spiritual uplift (Woolf, *Dalloway*, 46, 195). In *Jacob's Room*, several Cambridge undergraduates come to the conclusion that Russian literature may be quite good "but these Slavs aren't civilized" (Woolf, *Jacob's Room*, 75). In

¹²Given Tolstoy's contemptuous and dismissive portrayal of a gay couple in *Anna Karenina* (two officers in chapter XIX of part II), hints of 'shameful' lesbianism in Betsy Tverskaia's circle of female friends (e.g. Sappho Stolz, who in addition to her conspicuous name is said to have a masculine way of shaking women's hands), and his scathing depiction of a high government official convicted on the charges of "muzhelozhstvo" (Article 995 of Russian Legal Code prohibiting homosexual intercourse) in *Resurrection* (Simon Karlinsky, for example, is convinced that Tolstoy used this episode, as well as other similar ones, "to illustrate the corruption and moral laxity of Tsarist Russia" which in his opinion was too tolerant of homosexuality [Karlinsky, 349]), it is of course highly unlikely that Tolstoy would have been sympathetic to Bloomsbury's homoerotic experimentations and practices. It is quite possible that E.M. Forster's frequent discomfort with Tolstoy and even his dislike for *Anna Karenina* could have something to do with what Forster may have perceived as Tolstoy's homophobia.

Woolf's tongue-in-cheek *Orlando*, the young protagonist falls in love with an impish French-speaking Russian princess (à la Natasha Rostov, whose first name as well as what could be a corrupted version of her patronymic -- Il'inishna -- appear in the princess's own onomastic concoction - Marousha Stanilovska Dagmar **Natasha Iliana** Romanovitch) whom he first beholds skating on ice (with the grace of Kitty Shcherbatsky yet also with the masculine agility and athleticism of Konstantin Levin).

Woolf liked to point out that "[t]he most elementary remarks upon modern English fiction can hardly avoid some mention of the Russian influence" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 157), and it only stands to reason that "the most elementary remarks" upon Woolf herself should mention "the Russian influence," especially that of Tolstoy. Yet Phyllis Rose is not the only critic who underestimates his possible impact on Woolf. For example in *The Victorian Heritage of Virginia Woolf*, Janis M. Paul states: "Woolf loved Russian fiction but found it ultimately alien to her sense of the factual world. ... The novelist who repeatedly elicits Woolf's praise is not Tolstoy but Defoe" (Paul, 32). This statement is particularly odd in light of the numerous instances of Woolf's extraordinary praise for Tolstoy, some of which have been cited earlier. And why would the critic want us to see Woolf's literary affinities in terms of either Defoe or Tolstoy but not both? As a matter of fact, Woolf scholars can sound downright parochial -- and even defensive -- when it comes to Woolf's reaction to Russian literature. Many of them downplay her strong sentiment that "if the Russians are mentioned one runs the risk of feeling that to write... any fiction save theirs is waste of time" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 157). Typically, in *Bloomsbury Aesthetics and the Novels of Forster and Woolf* David Dowling does not even mention Tolstoy as a possible ingredient of either "Bloomsbury aesthetics" in general or of Woolf's (and Forster's) literary background in particular.¹³ And then there are always those critics who appear to confuse their own vague notion of Russian literature with Woolf's, attributing to her the views she could not possibly have. Maria DiBattista, for example, suggests that Woolf considered "Chekhov, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy... novelists of the soul" (DiBattista, 5). Woolf, of course, knew better than to call Chekhov "a novelist" and she was also very careful to point out that, in her opinion, it was "life" that "dominates Tolstoy" and it was Dostoevsky who was a true "novelist of the soul" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 186).

Not all of Woolf's readers have been so blind or careless. Thus when *The Years* came out in 1937 one reviewer immediately picked up on what seemed to him was Woolf's contrasting her own sense of "discontinuity" of modern time with Tolstoy's feeling of "continuity of life": "This feeling is very strongly conveyed in *War and Peace*, and it is conveyed mainly by Tolstoy's unique apprehension of the simultaneity of life. His picture shows us all the generations at once, childhood, youth, middle age, old age, a changeless picture modified by ceaseless change: and it is this completeness that gives us the measure and the sensation of the passing of time. It also gives time its continuity. Mrs.

¹³To be fair, other "influential" foreigners -- like Sigmund Freud, who obviously was incorporated into "Bloomsbury aesthetics" -- are likewise ignored.

Woolf does not attempt continuity" (Edwin Muir, in Beja, 22). More recently, writing about *Jacob's Room*, Avrom Fleishman noted that a "wider vision of the space around Jacob is achieved by releasing the narrative perspective from its usual conventions and allowing it to move freely over the surface of the earth, as only novels like *War and Peace*... have been free to do" (Fleishman, 65). The critic also pointed out that the scene of war destruction in *To the Lighthouse* (the "Time Passes" chapter) is such "a vision of cosmic destruction" that it "bears comparison with Tolstoy's..." (Fleishman, 122). Another perceptive reader once remarked that Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* bears a resemblance to *Anna Karenina*: "Mrs Ramsay is a wonderful portrait of the mothering consciousness, and... the description of her relation with her children is unmatched in literature. The only thing I've read which can compare with it is Tolstoy's portrait of Dolly Oblonsky in *Anna Karenina*" (Juliet Dusinberre, in Warner, 140).

The truth is, Woolf found Tolstoy a great teacher. She envied his capacity for "sympathetic imagination": "The great novelist feels, sees, believes with such intensity of conviction that he hurls his belief outside himself and it flies off and lives an independent life of its own, becomes Natasha, Pierre, Levin, and is no longer Tolstoy" (Woolf, *Death of the Moth*, 157). While, like her friends, she was mostly "repelled" by the heavy moralism of later Tolstoy, she felt that his earlier works were much more artistic than they were "ethical." She even divined that in his best novels Tolstoy prized "detachment" as much as she -- or other modernist writers -- did: "Tolstoy only write[s] when the sediment is firm and the water clear" (Woolf, *Letters*, VI, 381).¹⁴ Woolf also found Tolstoy's narrative so powerful as to be haunting -- "Practically every scene in *Anna Karenina* is branded on me, though I've not read it for 15 years" (Woolf, *Letters*, IV, 4) -- and she revered his attention to details: "He notices the blue or red of a child's frock; the way a horse shifts its tail; the sound of a cough; the action of a man trying to put his hands into pockets that have been sewn up" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 186).

It was Tolstoy's precision, richness of suggestive details, and his way of creating characters that Woolf appears to have most wanted to match with her own art. She once described his characters as being "complex by means of their effect upon many different people who serve to mirror them in the round" (Woolf, *Common Reader*, 161). There exists no better description for the major characters of her own novels, from Jacob (*Jacob's Room*; 1922) to Clarissa Dalloway (*Mrs. Dalloway*; 1925) and, particularly, Mrs. Ramsay (*To the Lighthouse*, 1927), who are constantly "mirrored" in other characters who find themselves under their spell. Like Tolstoy's Anna, Woolf's protagonists thus become magnets who attract almost everybody around them -- or, to use Woolf's own metaphor, "lighthouses," whose light reaches, and is reflected by, many characters in the novel.

Woolf may have envied Tolstoy's narrative precision and attention to details, but her own achievements in both could be rivalled by only a few writers in this century.

¹⁴She was not the only modernist who felt this way: both Joyce and Nabokov were more than willing to see Tolstoy as a forerunner of the kind of art they liked to practice. For more on that, see my paper, "'Tolstoy or Dostoevsky' and the Modernists: Polemics with Joseph Brodsky."

"[W]hen Virginia Woolf mentions nice things," wrote E.M. Forster, "they get right into your mouth, so far as the edibility of print permits. We taste their deliciousness" (Forster, *Two Cheers*, 251). Anyone who remembers the dinner scene in the first part of *To the Lighthouse*, would find it hard not to agree with Forster. Interestingly enough, the most sumptuously detailed description in the scene -- that of a dish of fruit (as seen through the eyes of Mrs. Ramsay) -- immediately follows a conversation about none other but Tolstoy:

[Paul] had read some of Tolstoi at school. There was one he always remembered, but he had forgotten the name. Russian names were impossible, said Mrs Ramsay. "Vronsky," said Paul. He remembered that because he always thought it such a good name for a villain. "Vronsky," said Mrs. Ramsay; "Oh, *Anna Karenina*," but that did not take them very far; books were not in their line. ... Now [Paul] was thinking not about himself or about Tolstoi, but whether she felt a draught, whether she would like a pear.

No, she said, she did not want a pear. Indeed she had been keeping guard over the dish of fruit. jealously, hoping that nobody would touch it. Her eyes have been going in and out among the curves and shadows of the fruit, among the rich purples of the lowland grapes, then over the horny ridge of the shell, putting a yellow against a purple, a curved shape against a round shape.... (Woolf, *To the Lighthouse*, 162-163).

There are several Tolstoyan motifs going on simultaneously in this passage. There is Paul who, like Vronsky (whose name, ironically, he cannot even remember at first and, considering him a "villain," somehow associates with the English word "wrong"¹⁵), finds himself, at least momentarily, attracted to a married woman. Then there is, of course, the uninspired banality of Mrs. Ramsay's and Paul's conversation about Tolstoy. But it is the description of the dish which may be yet the most meaningful link to the Russian writer here. It was, after all, in a letter to her, in 1927 -- the same year as Woolf was completing the novel -- that Forster remarked that Tolstoy could "vitalise... tea tables," and by vitalizing her own "tea table" in *To the Lighthouse*, Woolf is most likely paying Tolstoy a genuine poetic tribute and, in a sense, matching her own professional skills against those of the author of *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*.

E.M. Forster's possible "artistic" reaction to Tolstoy is, in some ways, harder to define than Woolf's. "One's impulse, on tackling the question of influence," he himself wrote in 1944, "is to search for a great book, and to assume that here is the force which has moulded one's outlook and character. Looking back upon my own half-century of reading, I have no doubt which my three great books have been: Dante's *Divine Comedy*, Gibson's *Decline and Fall*, and Tolstoy's *War and Peace*.... But they have not influenced me in the least, though I came across them all at an impressionable age" (Forster, *Two Cheers*, 219). Whereas Woolf found Tolstoy "the most inspiring, rousing genius," even if not always "the most sympathetic," Forster seems to have been engaged in much more

¹⁵It was even easier to associate Vronsky's name with the English word 'wrong' if one was familiar with Matthew Arnold's article on Tolstoy. Arnold preferred the French translation of *Anna Karenina* to the English one and consistently used the French spelling of Russian names -- e.g. Wronsky, Warinka, Levine, Cherbatzky, etc.

of a love-hate relationship with the writer. Tolstoy truly "enthralled" and "repelled" Forster almost equally: he could lavish praise on him one moment -- "Most people agree that Tolstoy's *War and Peace* is the greatest novel that western civilization has produced" (Forster, *Two Cheers*, 223) -- and show spite the next. Forster may have considered *War and Peace* a truly great novel but it did not translate into eagerness to read other novels by Tolstoy: it was not until 1934, for example, that he finished *Anna Karenina*, which left him rather cold. He found the characters there "not really masterpieces" and thought that "Anna has been much overpraised and Kitty's nothing at all" (Forster, *Letters*, II, 123). Furthermore, when surveying his library in 1949 and describing, usually lovingly, the volumes it contained, Forster noted rather defiantly when he came to Tolstoy: "And, of course, I have some Tolstoy, but one scarcely wants Tolstoy in every room. Shakespeare, Gibbon and Jane Austen are my choice...." (Forster, *Two Cheers*, 304).

Forster seems to have been rather uncomfortable with Tolstoy not only as a reader but also as a critic: to him, the Russian always remained "one of the most complex and difficult characters with whom the historian of literature has to deal" (Forster, *Two Cheers*, 208).¹⁶ It is, perhaps, precisely in order to make him less frustratingly "complex" that Forster tends to oversimplify Tolstoy, suggesting, for example, that the writer is only concerned "with events and people" (Forster, *Two Cheers*, 226) or reducing "The Cossacks," "The Death of Ivan Il'ich,"¹⁷ and "The Three Hermits" to one common denominator -- "They all teach that simple people are best" (Forster, *Two Cheers*, 208). Unlike Woolf, who was usually more careful to draw distinctions between Tolstoy the artist and the preacher, Forster appears to blur them altogether, assuming that the primary purpose of all of Tolstoy's fiction was to "teach."

And yet Forster may have learned from Tolstoy more than he ever cared to acknowledge. Like Woolf, he was struck by Tolstoy's art in creating characters -- at least in *War and Peace*: "Tolstoy is conscientious over his characters, he has a personal responsibility to each of them, he has a vital conception of them, and though they are full of contradictions, those contradictions are true to life" (Forster, *Two Cheers*, 156). Interestingly enough, Lionel Trilling, one of the more perceptive Forster critics, noticed the same tendency in Forster's own characters and aptly compared them to Tolstoy's: "[Forster] is always shocking us by removing the heroism of his heroes and heroines...."

¹⁶In a letter to Ottoline Morrell in 1910, Forster actually admitted that Tolstoy (as opposed to Dostoevsky) made him uncomfortable: "But Dostoievffskie always makes one feel 'comfortable' -- again difficult to define. Tolstoi doesn't" (Forster, *Letters*, I, 106).

¹⁷There exists an interesting biographical anecdote concerning "The Death Of Ivan Il'ich" and Forster. After suffering a stroke in 1964, Forster was helped around by his friends, who wrote letters for him and read him books. An unidentified "American friend" was one day reading Tolstoy's story to him and, fearing, perhaps, that Forster himself was quite close to death, got so overwhelmed by emotion that he could not finish the story (see Furbank, II, 319). The choice of the story was, most likely, Forster's own -- a rather conspicuous choice if we are to believe his biographer: "It was clear to him [i.e. after the stroke] that his remaining days must be a preparation for death" (Furbank, II, 318).

It is a tampering with the heroic in the manner not of Lytton Strachey but of Tolstoy" (Trilling, 16). One should also bear in mind that whereas for Woolf, as a genuine modernist, preaching was an absolute taboo, Forster himself often brought into his works what George H. Thomson calls "a firm moral vision" (in Wilde, 63). It was Woolf, in fact, who was among the first to publicly link Forster to the school of moralists: "Speaking roughly, we may divide [novelists] into the preachers and the teachers, headed by Tolstoy and Dickens, on the one hand, and the pure artists, headed by Jane Austen and Turgenev, on the other. Mr. Forster, it seems, has a strong impulse to belong to both camps at once" (Woolf, *Death of the Moth*, 166).¹⁸

Forster did have a sermon he wanted to preach -- and it bore a certain resemblance to Tolstoy's. While Forster was not a proponent of religious faith, he did believe that in order to fulfill their human potential people have to come into contact with higher spirituality. What Mrs. Wilcox represents in *Howard's End* and what Mrs. Moore stands for in *Passage to India* is precisely that blend of 'earth' and 'heaven' (Forster's "prose" and "passion") that Kitty and Dolly also possess and that Levin finally reaches at the end of the novel. Forster wants us, in his (and Margaret Schlegel's) rather lofty words, to build "the rainbow bridge that should connect the prose in us with the passion. Without it we are meaningless fragments, half monks, half beasts, unconnected arches that have never joined into a man. With it love is born, and alights on the highest curve, glowing.... Happy the man who sees from either aspect the glory of these outspread wings. The roads of his soul lie clear.... Only connect! That was the whole of her sermon. Only connect the prose and the passion, and both will be exalted, and human love will be seen at its height. Live in fragments no longer. Only connect..." (Forster, *Howard's End*, 186, 187). Unlike Woolf, Forster does seem to have shared not only some aspects of Tolstoy's spiritual vision but also Tolstoy's conviction that a writer has to enlighten his readers.

It appears that in general Forster and Woolf esteemed Tolstoy for vastly different reasons. While Woolf appreciated Tolstoy's intimacy with everyday life and cherished his microscopic details, Forster admired Tolstoy for his 'monumental' concerns and the sheer epic scope of *War and Peace*. "After one has read *War and Peace* for a bit," he wrote in *Aspects of the Novel*, "great chords begin to sound, and we cannot say exactly what struck them. They do not arise from the story.... They do not come from the episodes nor yet from the characters. They come from the immense area of Russia.... Very few have the sense of space, and the possession of it ranks high in Tolstoy's divine equipment. Space is the lord of *War and Peace*, not time" (Forster, *Aspects*, 39). Forster's admiration for the epic scope of *War and Peace* differs markedly from Matthew Arnold's conviction that Tolstoy committed a blunder by writing such a monumental historical novel

¹⁸It is obvious here that even Woolf was not always above labelling Tolstoy simply as "a preacher." Another significant feature of this statement -- especially in the view of critics' tendency to downplay Woolf's preoccupation with Russian writers -- is how matter-of-factly Woolf places the Russian authors next to English ones. If nothing else, it shows that Russian literature was an integral part of Woolf's everyday critical vocabulary and domain.

rather than sticking to what he knew best -- his own period and his contemporaneous society. It was probably the reaction of Arnold and other Victorian critics to *War and Peace* that led Forster to blame English "domesticity" for finding Tolstoy's preoccupation with global and historical themes "as false."

Forster admired not only the epic scope of *War and Peace* but also the epic omniscience of its author -- and in that he differed even further from many of his contemporaries who were rebelling against what they perceived as the 'tyranny' of a strong authorial presence. A less stylistically innovative writer than Woolf (or Henry James, for that matter), Forster himself was close to Tolstoy in his rather traditional order of narrative progression and a more distinguishable (and, as we have seen earlier, at times even 'preachy') authorial voice. Consequently, in *Aspects of the Novel* Forster felt compelled to defend Tolstoy's narrative techniques (and, indirectly, his own) against the criticism of an influential literary theoretician of the period, Percy Lubbock, a strong proponent of Henry James' innovative strategy of highlighting not his own but his protagonists' points of view: "[W]e are bounced up and down Russia -- omniscient, semi-omniscient, dramatized here or there as the moment dictates -- and at the end we have accepted it all. Mr. Lubbock does not, it is true: great as he finds [*War and Peace*], he would find it greater if it had a view-point; he feels Tolstoy has not pulled his full weight. I feel that the rules of the game of writing are not like this. A novelist can shift his view-point if it comes off, and it came off with Dickens and Tolstoy" (Forster, *Aspects*, 81).

It is difficult to initiate a meaningful discussion of Woolf's and Forster's possible artistic reaction to Tolstoy in this brief consideration. What is clear, however, is that a strong "artistic" reaction to Tolstoy did exist, and that for Bloomsbury as a whole the Russian writer was much more than just another fashionable name or a trendy topic for high-brow conversation, as some critics would like us to believe. Tolstoy appears, in fact, to have found his way not only into Bloomsbury's air but also into its "soil": he became one of very few literary transplants from abroad who actually sent deep roots into Bloomsbury's fertile intellectual ground. Like his best characters, so aptly described by Woolf, he became a commanding presence for the whole generation of outstanding writers and artists who felt his tremendous effect upon themselves and often "mirrored" him "in the round."

WORKS CITED

- Beja, Morris, ed. *Critical Essays on Virginia Woolf*. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1985.
- Bell, Clive. *Civilization and Old Friends*, 2 vols. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1973.
- Bell, Quentin. *Virginia Woolf: A Biography*, 2 vols. NY: Harcourt, 1972.
- DiBattista, Maria. *Virginia Woolf's Major Novels: The Fables of Anon*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1980.
- Diment, Galya. "'Tolstoy or Dostoevsky' and the Modernists: Polemics with Joseph Brodsky," in *Tolstoy Studies Journal*, III (1990):76-81.
- Dowling, David. *Bloomsbury Aesthetics and the Novels of Forster and Woolf*. London: Macmillan, 1985.
- Drabble, Margaret, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. NY: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Edel, Leon. *Bloomsbury: A House of Lions*. NY: Avon, 1979.
- Fleishman, Avrom. *Virginia Woolf: A Critical Study*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1975.
- Forster, E.M. *Aspects of the Novel*. NY: Harcourt, 1955.
- . *Howards End*. NY: Random, 1921.
- . *Selected Letters*, 2 vols. Ed. Mary Lago and P.N. Furbank. London: Collins, 1983-1985.
- . *Two Cheers for Democracy*. NY: Harcourt, 1951.
- Furbank, P.N. *E.M. Forster: A Life*, 2 vols. NY: Harcourt, 1977.
- Gorky, Maxim. *Reminiscences of Tolstoy, Chekhov and Andreev*. Trans. Katherine Mansfield, S.S. Koteliensky and Leonard Woolf. London: The Hogarth Press, 1948.
- Karlinsky, Simon. "Russia's Gay Literature and Culture: The Impact of the October Revolution," in *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, Martin Bauml Duberman, Martha Vicinus, George Chauncey Jr., eds. NY: Penguin, 1989, 348-364.
- Kennedy, Richard. *A Boy at the Hogarth Press*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.
- Knowles, A.V., ed. *Tolstoy: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Morrell, Ottoline. *Ottoline at Garsington: Memoirs of Lady Ottoline Morrell 1915-1918*. Robert Gathorne-Hardy, ed. London: Faber and Faber, 1974.
- Noble, Joan Russell, ed. *Recollections of Virginia Woolf*. London: Peter Owen, 1972.
- Paul, Janis M. *The Victorian Heritage of Virginia Woolf*. Norman, Oklahoma: Pilgrim, 1987.
- Rose, Phyllis. *Woman of Letters: A Life of Virginia Woolf*. NY: Oxford UP, 1978.
- Rosenbaum, S.P. *Victorian Bloomsbury: The Early Literary History of the Bloomsbury Group*. London: Macmillan, 1987.
- Russell, Bertrand. *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell*, 2 vols. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

- Tomalin, Claire. *Katherine Mansfield: A Secret Life*. NY: St. Martin's, 1987.
- Trilling, Lionel. *E.M. Forster*. Norfolk, Conn.: New Directions, 1943.
- Warner, Eric, ed. *Virginia Woolf: A Centenary Perspective*. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Wilde, Alan, ed. *Critical Essays on E.M. Forster*. Boston: G.K. Hall 1985.
- Woolf, Leonard. *Beginning Again: An Autobiography of the Years 1911 to 1918*. NY: Harcourt, 1964.
- . *Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919 to 1939*. NY: Harcourt, 1967.
- Woolf, Virginia. *The Common Reader*. NY: Harcourt, 1925.
- . *The Captain's Death Bed and Other Essays*. NY: Harcourt, 1950.
- . *The Death of the Moth and Other Essays*. NY: Harcourt, 1970.
- . *The Diary*. 5 vols. NY: Harcourt, 1977-1984.
- . *Jacob's Room & The Waves*. NY: Harcourt, 1950.
- . *The Letters*. 6 vols. NY: Harcourt, 1975-1980.
- . *Mrs. Dalloway*. NY: Harcourt, 1953.
- . *To the Lighthouse*. NY: Harcourt, 1955.
- Zwerdling, Alex. *Virginia Woolf and the Real World*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1986.

TOLSTOY'S HAMLET

PHILIP ROGERS, SUNY BINGHAMTON

Rimvydas Silbajoris's thesis that Tolstoy's "anti-Shakespearean tree of discontent" has its roots in "the two writers' different perceptions of the relationship between reality and language" (142-3) appears to be strongly supported by the evidence of Tolstoy's marginal comments and markings in his copy of *Hamlet*.¹ Tolstoy's complaint in *On Shakespeare and the Drama* that in *King Lear* "thoughts arise either from the sound of the words, or by contrast" (409) is implicit in his *Hamlet* marginalia. While several of Tolstoy's comments obviously express objections to Shakespeare's morality and imply doubts about plausibility of motivation, the marginalia are, as George Gibian notes in his analysis of them, preponderantly directed against the artificiality of Shakespeare's language (40-4).² Tolstoy's pencil marked the margins of many passages notable for ornateness, elaborate rhetoric or word play. I quote here only a few characteristic examples.³

King Claudius' first speeches exemplify for Tolstoy the "inflated, empty language . . . Shakespeare always speaks for his kings" (*On Shakespeare*, 423):

King: . . . What wouldst thou beg, Laertes,
That shall not be my offer, not thy asking?
The head is not more native to the heart,
The hand more instrumental to the mouth,
Than is the throne of Denmark to thy father. (I,ii,45-49)

Polonius's convoluted word play elicited from Tolstoy the marginal comment, "тупо ни к чему" ("dull, pointless")⁴:

¹Listed completely in the appendix of this article. Tolstoy's annotations are in volume six of *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare* (Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz, 1844). Gibian's comments on Tolstoy's annotations (40-44) are based on S. Breitburg's transcriptions, published in *Internatsional'naiia literatura* in 1940. My comments on the annotations are based on examination and transcription of both Tolstoy's Tauchnitz *Hamlet* and of V.F. Bulgakov's transcription of Tolstoy's marginalia (unpublished manuscript) at Yasnaya Polyana. I am indebted to the Estate-Museum for permission to use its archive and to A.G. Dolgoff, who assisted me in transcriptions.

²Gibian discusses a few of the marginal comments I deal with here, but reaches quite different conclusions about them.

³Unless otherwise noted, my reference to marked passages refers to a single black pencil line in the text's margin.

⁴Tolstoy's concern with the lack of "point" in much of Shakespeare's language implied in the remark, "ни к чему" ("pointless"); his interrogative "к чему" ("to what end?"), noted three times; "не к стати" ("not to the point") twice noted; and "зачем" ("what for?") once, suggests the teleological motive Silbajoris

Polonius: . . . Your noble son is mad.
Mad call I it, for, to define true madness,
What is't but to be nothing else but mad?

Mad let us grant him then; and now remains
That we find out the cause of this effect,
Or rather say, the cause of this defect,
For this effect defective comes by cause. (II,ii,92-94;100-103)

Hamlet's poem to Ophelia, "Doubt thou the stars are fire,/ Doubt that the sun doth move,/ Doubt truth to be a liar,/ But never doubt I love." (II,ii,115-118) Tolstoy considers simply "глупо" ("stupid"). Tolstoy also marked the margin of Polonius's "short tale" of Hamlet's decline:

And he, repelled, a short tale to make,
Fell into a sadness, then into a fast,
Thence into a watch, thence into a weakness,
Thence into a lightness, and, by this declension,
Into the madness wherein he now raves." (II,ii,145-149)

The first meeting of Hamlet with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern is marked with the comment "всё один язык у всех" ("Everyone speaks the same way"). This marked passage, which unfolds from Hamlet's metaphor of Denmark as a prison, culminates in an exchange which indeed shows the three men to be speaking, stichomythically, the same figurative language:⁵

Hamlet: O God, I could be bounded in a nutshell and count myself a king of infinite space, were it not that I have bad dreams.

Guildenstern: Which dreams indeed are ambition, for the very substance of the ambitious is merely the shadow of a dream.

Hamlet: A dream itself is but a shadow.

Rosencrantz: Truly, and I hold ambition of so airy and light a quality that it is but a shadow's shadow. (II, ii,245-251)

Hamlet's playful self-description, "I am but mad north-northwest: when the wind is southerly I know a hawk from a handsaw" (II,ii,349-350) elicited from Tolstoy a marginal "б.с." [без содержания?] (without content?). The conceits of Hamlet's speeches to Ophelia in III,i,111-114;119-127;131-138 ("Get thee to a nunnery") likewise are noted with marginal lines and question marks.

identifies as fundamental to Tolstoy's aesthetic.

⁵Gibian finds Tolstoy's claim that all characters speak the same language to be simply "wrong in the matter of fact"(43). Neither Tolstoy's nor Gibian's generalization is valid: sometimes their speech is similar, sometimes individualized.

Hamlet's punning exchange with Polonius on the subject of his acting (marked again "б.с.") provides a nice example of what Silbajoris describes as the "word and its shadow grinning foolishly at each other" (143):

Hamlet: "What did you enact?"

Polonius: I did enact Julius Caesar. I was killed i' th' Capitol; Brutus killed me.

Hamlet: It was a brute part of him to kill so capital a calf there. . . ." (III,ii,88-94)

The entire passage from which the above exchange is drawn (III, ii,81-111), all marked "б.с.," offends too in Hamlet's bawdy, punning exchange with Ophelia on "country manners," of which Tolstoy singles out for separate underlining (not, presumably, because of its artifice), "That's a fair thought to lie between maids' legs." Tolstoy also objected to several passages in III,iv in which Hamlet confronts his mother in her room. The entire speech comparing his father to Claudius ("See what a grace was seated on this brow. . ." 56-87) is judged by Tolstoy as "искуств. ни одного натурального слова." ("artificial. not one natural word"). Of Hamlet's summing up of Claudius as "a murderer and a villain,/A slave that is not twentieth part of the tithe of your precedent lord. . ." (III,iv.98-100) Tolstoy underlines "twentieth. . .tithe," and dismisses the figure with the marginal sarcasm, "арифметика" ("arithmetic"). In the same scene he underlines as well two further instances of paradoxical word play, "Forgive me this my virtue," and "I must be cruel only to be kind" (III,iv,156;182). Also marginally noted here with a question mark are Hamlet's elaborately metaphorical advice to his mother, "No, in despite of sense and secrecy,/ Unpeg the basket on the house's top,/ Let the birds fly. . ./ And break your own neck down" (III,iv,196-200) and his figure for the planned revenge against Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, ". . .'tis the sport to have the engineer [sic]/ Hoist with his own petard, and 't shall go hard/ But I will delve one yard below their mines/ And blow them at the moon. . ." (III,iv,210-213).

The elaborate figures and stichomythia that characterize Hamlet's exchanges with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern again draw marginal fire from Tolstoy in IV,ii. where he inquires sarcastically, "должно быть [остроумно]"⁶ (This is supposed to be [witty]?)

Rosencrantz: Take you me for a sponge, my lord?

Hamlet: Ay, sir, that soaks up the King's countenance.

He keeps them, like an ape in the corner of his jaw,
first mouthed, to be last swallowed. When he needs
what you have gleaned, it is but squeezing you and,
sponge, you shall be dry again.

Rosencrantz: My lord, you must tell us where the body is and go with us to the King.

Hamlet: The body is with the King, but the King is not with the body. The King is a thing.

⁶"Остроумно" is a guess. The word is smudged and unclear.

Guildenstern: A thing, my lord?

Hamlet: Of nothing. (IV,ii,12-13;15-18;21-26)

Tolstoy's final marginal comment that appears to be directed exclusively at Shakespeare's language in *Hamlet* is seen in V,i, the dialogue between the gravediggers on the subject of Ophelia's death and burial:

Clown: "Here lies the water--good. Here stands the man--good. If the man go to this water and drown himself, it is, will he nill he, he goes; mark you that. But if the water come to him and drown him, he drowns not himself. Argal, he that is not guilty of his own death shortens not his own life" (V,i,13-17).

Of this whole passage (V,i,3-35) Tolstoy noted "глупо, скучно, претенциозно" ("stupid, boring, pretentious").

The evidence of these markings clearly supports Silbajoris' thesis that Tolstoy objected to Shakespeare's use of language as an end in itself; obviously Tolstoy disliked the above and many similar passages in *Hamlet* which to him appeared to disconnect language from human reality. Yet Tolstoy's *Hamlet* marginalia also raise a question which requires further interpretation of his response to Shakespeare's language: why does Tolstoy finally have so little to say about the language of *Hamlet* (or of any other play) in *On Shakespeare and the Drama*? While the quantity and vehemence of his marginalia suggest that Tolstoy planned to deal at some length with Shakespeare's language in the discussion of *Hamlet* he originally intended to include in *On Shakespeare and the Drama*⁷, the discussion of *Hamlet* says little about Shakespeare's language, focusing instead on Hamlet's lack of any character. Indeed, while the essay makes suggestive general comments on such topics as the lack of individuality in characters' speech and the inappropriateness of speeches to their dramatic context, it offers almost nothing in the way of specific objections to Shakespeare's language, especially in its relation to reality, beyond the observation, noted above, that in *King Lear* "thoughts arise from the sounds of words and from contrast" (409). Thus Silbajoris is perforce obliged to supplement Tolstoy's remarks with what "Tolstoy might have said" (143).⁸ So it is not after all surprising that, as Morson notes (126), Shakespeare's language is generally overlooked as the source of Tolstoy's animus.

In the remainder of this essay I would like to speculate on why Tolstoy did not in fact say what he "might have said" (and indeed appeared fully prepared to say) about language and reality in *Hamlet* and why too he may have abandoned his intention to treat

⁷Gibian (40) explains the evidence suggesting Tolstoy originally intended *Hamlet* as "the second target" in a "double-barreled attack."

⁸Silbajoris' reading of Tolstoy's mind here is to me both ingenious and fully persuasive. I question, however, his apparently unqualified seconding of Tolstoy's complaints about Shakespeare's language, especially the conclusion that Shakespeare "merely constructs complex literary texts" (145).

Hamlet as fully as he dealt with *King Lear*.

A critique of language in *Hamlet*, from the point of view Silbajoris assumes for Tolstoy, confronts the problem of the play's own consciousness of words and referents, for both Hamlet and *Hamlet* anticipate and thematize Tolstoy's position on language.⁹ The relation of word to matter in *Hamlet* is pervasively figured:

Polonius: What do you read, my lord?

Hamlet: Words, words, words.

Polonius: What is the matter, my lord?

Hamlet: Between who?

Polonius: I mean the matter that you read, my lord. (II,ii,188-193).

Tolstoy marked not merely the ornate, rhetorical passages of *Hamlet*, but also most of the passages whose subject points to Tolstoy's: the disjunction of words and matter, art and the nature it represents. His comments suggest that in choosing to criticize the artificiality of language in *Hamlet*, he is drawn into the thematics of the play itself. Hamlet has taken the "words, words, words" out of Tolstoy's mouth: his advice to the players, a passage Tolstoy heavily marked (both with pencil lines and the bending back of the page, as well as with marginal comments) is perhaps the single best known statement in any literary work about the "right," minimally-mediated relationship of words to nature in art's imitation of humanity:

Suit the action to the word, the word to the action, with this special observance, that you o'erstep not the modesty of nature. For anything so o'erdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure." (III,ii,15-20)¹⁰

The absoluteness of this assertion, especially its emphatic "both at the first and now, was and is" recalls the enunciation of a similar aesthetic credo: "Герой же моей повести . . . всегда был, есть, и будет прекрасен -- правда" ("The hero of my tale...always was, is, and will be beautiful--the truth") (PSS 4:59). Both the tone and content of Hamlet's indignation at the popular success of egregiously false art would not be out of place in *What is Art?*:

⁹A useful study of the thematics of disjoined words and referents in *Hamlet* is accomplished by Margaret W. Ferguson.

¹⁰Compare the early diary entry of Tolstoy, noted in Silbajoris' account of the development of his aesthetic thinking (14): "L'imagination est le miroir [de la] nature.... La plus belle imagination est le miroir le plus clair et le plus vrai..." ["Imagination is the mirror of nature.... The most beautiful imagination is the clearest and most true mirror."] (PSS 45:69).

O, there be players that I have seen play, and heard others praise, and that highly (not to speak it profanely), that neither having th' accent of Christians, nor the gait of Christian, pagan, nor man, have so strutted and bellowed that I have thought some of Nature's journeymen had made men, and not made them well, they imitated humanity so abominably." (III,ii,24-29)

On Hamlet's advice to the players Tolstoy commented "неуместная вставка" ("a misplaced insertion"). This is not surprising; inasmuch as the mirror principle Hamlet advocates conflicts absolutely with Tolstoy's perception of Hamlet's practice, the principle must be judged entirely out of place in his mouth. To seek a unified explanation of Hamlet's language theory and practice, the method in his word-madness,¹¹ would be to discover Hamlet in possession of a character, and that, of course, Tolstoy denies. Yet even if Hamlet is an inappropriate spokesman for naturalness of representation, his exposition of "the purpose of playing" (in effect, an answer to the question, "what is art?") nonetheless unsettles the basis of Tolstoy's critique of unnatural language in *Hamlet*. A play so pervasively concerned (as Tolstoy apparently recognized) with the ways in which figurative language (mis)represents reality--the very terms in which Tolstoy means to judge it--cannot plausibly be faulted for its figurative language, especially when the art of those same figures so often represents the "matter" of (mis)representation. Hamlet is not the only character in the play to comment on disjunctions of art and nature. Queen Gertrude's objection to Polonius' maddeningly circular speech on madness ("Your noble son is mad....") could be mistaken for one of Tolstoy's marginal complaints: like him, she demands "more matter, with less art" (II,ii,95). Did the Queen's impatience with Polonius's art perhaps infect Tolstoy? Polonius further enriches the play's concern with the problem of art and matter when, to placate the Queen he attempts artless speech: "Madam, I swear I use no art at all./That he's mad, 'tis true: 'tis true 'tis pity,/And pity 'tis 'tis true--a foolish figure./But farewell it, for I will use no art" (II,ii,96-99). Here Polonius enacts the predicament of an aesthetic that aspires to artless truthfulness in the renunciation of figures, yet discovers nonetheless not nature in the mirror, but its own foolish figuring. Not surprisingly, Tolstoy also finds this passage "ни к чему" ("pointless") for the purposes of his critique.

King Claudius too reflects on the disjunction of truth and art, nature and its representation in words. Here the theme takes on a moral dimension: his guilt is expressed as a disjunction that renders his prayers futile: "My words fly up, my thoughts remain below./ Words without thoughts never to heaven go" (III, iii, 97-98). Tolstoy marked a similar speech of the king in which the disjunction of deed and painted word is expressed in painted words: "The harlot's cheek, beautied with plast'ring art,/Is not more ugly to the thing that helps it/ Than is my deed to my most painted word" (III,i,51-53). Hamlet's exchange with Ophelia on the incompatibility of beauty and honesty presents the same disjunction in yet another context:

¹¹For which see Ferguson.

Hamlet: ...If you be honest and fair, your honesty should admit no discourse to your beauty.

Ophelia: Could beauty, my lord, have better commerce than with honesty?

Hamlet: Ay, truly; for the power of beauty will sooner transform honesty from what it is to a bawd than the force of honesty can translate beauty into his likeness. This was sometime a paradox, but now the time gives it proof. (III,i,107-114)

Tolstoy noted this assertion of the superior force of beauty to that of honesty ("Ay, truly...proof") with marginal line and question mark.

Hamlet likewise represents the obverse of such disjunction in the circumstance of false words representing truths. Thus the "false fire" (III,ii,243) of the "Mousetrap" (the play within the play) reveals the King's true guilt, and Hamlet's mad words conceal his method and expose the false rhetoric of King Claudius (Ferguson 293). Inasmuch as the dramatically central "false fire" of "Mousetrap" and mad words of Hamlet both imply concealment as the motive of artifice and require interpretation in the discovery of their matter, they suggest the "method" of reading the play's artful language generally.

Suffice it here to conclude that in questioning the language of *Hamlet* Tolstoy inescapably exposed himself to the infection of its own questioning. Thus his comments are best read as an argument with *Hamlet*, his thinking *with* the play, rather than a final formulation of it or of a critique of Shakespeare's language. "Искусств. ни одного натурального слова" [artific. not one natural word] and similar remarks reply to Hamlet's claim to hold a mirror up to nature, but do not suggest the basis for criticism that might deal with the complexity of the play's preoccupation with art and matter, language and reality. For scoring the palpable hit on Shakespeare that Tolstoy desired, *King Lear* was an easier target.

APPENDIX

In addition to writing marginal comments, Tolstoy marked his copy of *Hamlet* with vertical marginal lines (to indicate a passage of several lines), folded page corners, underlined words and sentences, and question marks. Except for one fingernail impression marking (a device he used fairly often in other books), and one in red pencil, all are in black pencil. Act, scene and line references are to the Norton edition. Because line numbering varies in different editions of *Hamlet*, I also provide here the first and last words of marked passages. Editorial speculation is [bracketed].

I.i.12-13. "If you do meet. . .bid them make haste." Marginal line. Additionally, "the rivals" is underlined.

I.i.40. "Peace, break thee off." Marginal question mark.

- I.i.49. "It is offended." Marginal question mark.
- I.ii.46-48. "That shall not be. . . .to thy father." Marginal line.
- II.ii.93-100. "Mad call I it. . . .and now remains." Marginal line. T. also wrote "тупо ни к чему (dull, pointless)."
- II.ii.115-118. "Doubt thou the stars. . . .never doubt I love." Marginal line. T. comments, "глупо (stupid)."
- II.ii.137-154. "Or looked upon. . . .when it proved otherwise?" Marginal line.
- II.ii.214. "You go to seek. . . ." Marginal line.
- II.ii.218. "My excellent good friends!" Marginal line.
- II.ii.231-248. "Then is doomsday. . . .shadow of a dream." Marginal line. T. comments, "Всё один язык у всех" ("Everyone speaks the same way")
- II.ii.302-327. "shall end his part. . . .their own succession?" Marginal line. T. notes, "не к стати" ("not to the point").
- II.ii.349-350. "I am but mad. . . .handsaw." T. notes "б.с." [без содержания?] (without content?).
- II.ii.351-369. "Well be with you. . . .the only men." Marginal line. T. remarks, "ненужная чепуха" ("unnecessary nonsense").
- II.ii.370-376. "O Jephthah. . . .old Jephthah." Marginal line.
- II.ii.380-382. "What follows then. . . .God wot'." T. notes "чеп[уха]" ("nonsense").
- II.ii.403-439. "One said there were no. . . .on the milky head." Marginal line. T. questions, "к чему?" ("to what end?").
- II.ii.440-454. "Of reverend Priam. . . .All you Gods." Marginal line.
- II.ii.460-462. "It shall to the barber's. . . . to Hecuba." Marginal line. T. questions, "Зачем он грубит Полониусу?" ("Why is he rude to Polonius?")
- III.i.1-9. "And can you. . . .some confession." Marginal line. T. asks, "Почему королю нужно узнать?" ("Why does the king need to find out?").
- III.i.48-55. "And pious action. . . .Let's withdraw, my lord." Marginal line. T. asks, "Поч[ему] знает?" ("Why does he know?").
- III.i.92. "well, well, well." T. underlined "well, well, well" and wrote a marginal question mark. [Some editions, e.g. Norton, amend this line to a single "well." Tolstoy's Tauchnitz edition retains all three.
- III.i.111-114. "Ah, truly. . . .I did love you once." Marginal line and question mark.
- III.i.119-128. "Get thee to a nunnery. . . .your father?" Marginal line.
- III. i. 131-138. "O, help him. . . .restore him!" Marginal line. Question mark. "If thou dost marry" underlined with fingernail marking.
- III.ii.1-29. "Speak the speech. . . .so abominably." page-long marginal line, page corner bent back. T. comments on Hamlet's first speech ("Speak the speech. . . .Pray you avoid it") "не к стати" ("not to the point"). Opposite the second speech ("Be not too tame. . . .so abominably.") he notes, "неуместная вставка" ("a misplaced insertion").
- III.ii.32-37. ". . . .for there be of them. . . .make you ready." Marginal line.

III.ii.81-111. "They are coming. . . .Ay, my lord." Marginal line. "That's a fair thought to lie between maids' legs." is underlined. The entire passage is marked "б.[ез] с.[одержания]."

III.ii.257-269. "A whole one. . . .he likes it not, perdy." Marginal line.

III.iii.8-21. "Most holy. . . .petty consequence." Marginal line. Tolstoy questions, "К чему?" ("To what end?").

III.iii.53-72. "That cannot be. . . .may be well." Marginal line in red pencil. T. notes (in black pencil), "Ни то, ни се" ("Neither this nor that").

III.iii.73-78. "Now might I. . . .To heaven." Marginal line. T. comments, "пошло" ("vulgar").

III.iii.79. "Why, this is hire and salary, not revenge." Underlined with marginal question mark.

III.iii.80-86. "'A took my father. . . .fit and seasoned." Marginal line.

III.iii.93. ". . . that his heels may kick at heaven," Underlined. T's note partly illegible: "Д.В." or "Д.С." [?]

III.iv.22-25. "What, ho!. . . .I am slain!" Marginal line. T. asks, "К чему?" ("To what end?").

III.iv.32-35. "Ay, lady. . . .thy fortune." Marginal line. T. asks, "Зачем?" ("What for?").

III.iv.56-82. "See what a. . . .not so mope." Marginal line. T. notes, "Искусств.[енно] ни одного натурального слова." (Artificial. Not a single natural word").

III.iv.82-87. "O shame. . . .gives the charge. . ." Marginal line.

III.iv.89-92. "O Hamlet!. . . .leave their tinct." Marginal line. T. notes, "вдруг" ("suddenly").

III.iv.98. "A slave that is not twentieth part the tithe. . . ." Underlined. T. comments, "арифметика" ("arithmetic").

III.iv.122-125. "And as. . . .thy distemper. . ." Marginal line. "Your bedded hair like life in excrements" underlined.

III.iv.153-159. "Infects unseen. . . .do him good." Marginal line. "Forgive me this my virtue" underlined with marginal question mark.

III.iv.161-175. "O, throw away. . . .desirous to be blest. . . ." Marginal line. T. notes, "говорит автор" ("the author speaks").

III.iv.182. "I must be cruel only to be kind." Underlined with marginal question mark.

III.iv.196-200. "No, in despite. . . .own neck down." Marginal line with question mark.

III.iv.207-213. "Whom I will. . . .most sweet. . ." Marginal line.

IV.i.25-45. "O'er whom. . . .and dismay." No marginal line, but T. comments opposite this passage "Король опять спокоен" ("The king is again calm").

IV.ii.9-26. "That I can keep. . . .all after." Marginal line. T. notes, "Должно быть [остроумно]." ("This is supposed to be [witty]?") The last word is blurred; the

interpretation is Bulgakov's.

IV.iii.8. "This sudden sending. . . ." No marginal line, but T. notes here "Все одно говорит." ("Always says the same thing.")

IV.iv.46-66. "To do't. . . .nothing worth." Marginal line. T. notes, "считает хорошим" ("[This he] considers to be good").

IV.vii.30-36. "That we are made. . . .to the queen." Marginal line. "our beard be shook with danger" underlined.

IV.vii.125-137. "No place. . . .your father." No marginal line, but T. notes of the speech, "как естественно." ("how natural").

IV.vii.182-186. "Alas, then. . . .these are gone." Marginal line. T. notes, "как мило" ("how sweet"). "Too much of water hast thou, poor Ophelia" underlined.

V.i.3-29. "I tell thee. . . .he had none." Marginal line. T. protests, "глупо, скучно, претенциозно" ("stupid, boring, pretentious").

V.i.141-164. " How long will. . . .flashes of merriment. . . ." Marginal line. T. notes, "пошло глупо" ("vulgar, stupid").

V.i.224-227. "What is he. . . .hearers." marginal line.

V.i.229. "Thou pray'st not well." No marginal line. T. notes, "грубо" ("crude").

V.i.239-245. "Until my eyelids. . . .forbear him." Marginal line. "Forty thousand brothers" underlined.

V.i.246-274. "'Swounds. . . .burning zone. . . ." Marginal line. T. notes, "Вдруг [полюбил]" ("Suddenly he [fell in love]"). The last word is blurred; the interpretation is Bulgakov's.

WORKS CITED

- Ferguson, Margaret. "Hamlet: Letters and Spirits." *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*. Ed. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, 1985.
- Gibian, George. *Tolstoj and Shakespeare*. 's Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957.
- Morson, G.S. "The Tolstoy Questions: Reflections on the Silbajoris Thesis." *Tolstoy Studies Journal* 4 (1991): 115-141
- Shakespeare, W. *Hamlet*. Ed. Cyrus Hoy. New York: Norton, 1992.
- Silbajoris, Rimvydas. *Tolstoy's Aesthetics and His Art*. Columbus: Slavica, 1991.
- Tolstoy, L.N. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii L.N. Tolstogo*. 90 vols. Moscow: GIXL, 1907-60.
- , *On Shakespeare and the Drama in Tolstoy on Art*. Ed. Aylmer Maude. London: Oxford U.P., 1924.

**WHEN A HOUSE IS NOT A HOME:
THE ALIEN RESIDENCES
OF *EFFI BRIEST* AND *ANNA KARENINA***

SUZANNE OSBORNE, CUNY GRADUATE CENTER

[A] home is much more than a shelter; it is a world in which a person can create a material environment that embodies what he or she considers significant. In this sense the home becomes the most powerful sign of the self of the inhabitant who dwells within.

(Csikszentmihalyi and Rochberg-Halton 123)

The idea of the home as a powerful sign of the selves of its inhabitants is vividly illustrated in two 19th-century novels, Theodor Fontane's *Effi Briest* and Lev Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*.¹ This commonality links two books that are otherwise so different that they would seem to have nothing in common apart from their generic resemblance as novels of adulterous women whose behavior leads to their social ostracism and ultimate death. In both, however, the author places his heroine for a crucial period in an alien domestic environment (a deliberate oxymoron) which affects and at the same time reflects important elements of her individual psychology, and of her relationship with her mate and with society. Furthermore, attentive reading reveals essential likenesses in Fontane's and Tolstoy's depiction of this interaction between house and inhabitants.

The theme of the house generally and its social and psychological importance is a crucial one in both books and is heralded in the opening pages. Tolstoy begins with the disturbance in the Oblonsky home -- Vladimir Nabokov has observed how the word "*dom*" resounds throughout the beginning of *Anna Karenina* (210). And Fontane starts with a leisurely description of the manor house where Effi lives with her parents, identifying it in the first sentence as the residence of the von Briest family for over 200 years.

But the houses on which I wish to focus are those where Effi and Anna live with the men who are their partners in the crucial emotional relationships of their lives. For Effi this is the house in the coastal town of Kessin to which Baron Geert von Instetten, the administrator of the district, brings her as his bride;² for Anna it is the country estate of

¹A brief version of this paper was delivered at the annual AATSEEL meeting, 1990. Although there is no documented evidence indicating a direct influence of Tolstoy on Fontane, the two novels of adultery have often been compared in the criticism, beginning with J. Stern's seminal article.

²In his English version, Douglas Parmée calls Instetten "governor," which is not really equivalent to "*Landrat*," although it is admittedly more concise than the "district (or county) administrator" which more accurately conveys the level of Instetten's position. Page references are to the Penguin edition cited below

her lover, Count Alexei Vronsky, to which they withdraw after society snubs her. Despite the differences in their legal status, the women's experiences in these houses are much alike, in that their hopes for contentment are soon replaced by the anxiety, isolation and uprootedness that help seal their fate. This similarity in their lives is reflected in the dwellings, for, little as the modest *Landratshaus* and the vast *Vozdvizhenskoe* resemble each other physically, their psychological portraits as embodiments of rupture and alienation are strikingly alike.

Each of these houses is also contrasted to another, normative home, which is characterized by continuity and integration. Both authors link these pairs by introducing the deviant place through the eyes of someone who comes to it from the valorized home. Fontane uses Effi herself, who (after a preview by Instetten) compares the house in Kessin to the home in Hohen-Cremmen where she grew up; Tolstoy depicts *Vozdvizhenskoe* from the point of view of Anna's sister-in-law, Dolly, who comes over from Levin's estate.

This contrast is not required to convince us that the alien houses are abnormal, since they are decidedly unusual by any standard, but it does define more precisely the nature and extent of their departure from the domestic norm. In this regard, it is interesting that both Fontane and Tolstoy illustrate the "alien" nature of the houses quite literally by making foreignness one of their salient features. It is also important that this is not the natural and inevitable foreignness of an abode in another country, but the intrusion of outlandish elements into a domestic environment in the homeland. In fact, ironically enough, the two couples settle down in these alienated residences after actually being abroad in Italy -- a real honeymoon for Effi and Instetten, an artificial one for Anna and Vronsky.

Effi's introduction to her new home is Instetten's commentary as they are driven from the train station upon their arrival in Kessin. As he informs her, her new environment, in contrast to the long-settled, homogeneous situation in the area of Hohen-Cremmen, is saturated with foreigners. The people of the countryside around Kessin are not Teutons but Slavs. Kessin itself, as a seaport, is populated by all sorts of strangers (that is, people whose parents or grandparents lived elsewhere). There is a Scot, a couple of Danes, a Swede, and a Portuguese. Alonzo Gieshübler, the apothecary whom Effi meets next day and who becomes her devoted friend, had an Andalusian mother and keeps an African servant.³ Even the dog, Rollo, is named after a duke of Normandy. Most notably, there was even a Chinese man, now dead and buried in the dunes just outside the cemetery.

Alien elements have also invaded the house. In the blaze of lamplight which dazzles Effi upon her entrance, she sees suspended from the ceiling a model of a ship under full sail, complete with canon ports, and behind it a stuffed shark and a young

unless otherwise noted.

³Perhaps we should not overlook "Marietta Trippelli," born in Kessin, the daughter of Pastor Trippel, who Italianized herself for the sake of her singing career.

crocodile. All three exhibits are out of their element, and the creatures are out of their habitat, far from their native waters. Nor is their presence justified and, as it were, domesticated by any logical connection to the Instettens, since they are left over from the occupancy of the seafaring Captain Thomsen, who had the house before Instetten.

Most foreign of all is another memento of the captain's tenancy, the ghost of the Chinese, who had lived in the house as his servant and friend until the day the captain married his niece (or granddaughter, no one is sure which she was) to another captain. This young woman disappeared without a trace from the wedding ball held in the drawing room upstairs after dancing with the Chinese, who himself died mysteriously a couple of weeks later. This unquiet spirit of domestic tragedy now haunts the place, alien not merely in the commonplace sense of coming from a far country, but even from another world.

Vronsky's estate is also permeated with foreignness, beginning with the English cob Anna is riding when Dolly first sees her. Like the *Landratshaus*, *Vozdvizhenskoe* is not in-tegrated with its native surroundings, for while the house had belonged to Vronsky's grandfather, he has completely redone it, leaving only the outside shell as it had been. Virtually everything inside and around the estate is aggressively new, costly -- and imported.

The sumptuous room to which Anna conducts Dolly, for instance, reminds Dolly of "the best hotels abroad" (646).⁴ The wallpaper is French, everything is done in the "new European kind of luxury" (647). In the nursery, all the equipment and furniture is "of English make" (649). Most of the personnel are also foreign, the wet-nurse being Italian (648) and the head nurse (whose "wanton" face Dolly does not like) English (649).

When they make a tour of the grounds, Vronsky welcomes the chance to explain to Dolly all the changes he has made, and to show her the new hospital he is having built. The hospital is spacious, quite luxurious and new-fashioned, with parquet floors, plate-glass windows, the latest equipment, all carefully planned and "everything straight from Paris," as Anna's aunt Varvara tells Dolly (651). Indeed, as *Sviashsky* remarks at dinner, the very planning is foreign, being done "American fashion" (661). For the work in the fields, Vronsky is replacing the Russian manual labor which Levin reveres (as the company at dinner mirthfully notes) with machines, and imported machines at that, Russian models being, in Vronsky's view, inferior.

Anna's books, of which she reads a great many, are also imported (she receives a box from *Gautier's* just before Vronsky goes to the elections); she orders "all the books favourably reviewed in the foreign papers and magazines she took in" (674).

While foreignness is perhaps the most conspicuous form of rupture and discontinuity evident in these houses, a number of others also reflect the isolation and estrangement which *Effi* and *Anna* experience in them. Sheer distance from their previous homes is one, as is interruption of the organic flow of family life, and separation from or suppression of nature is another.

⁴Page references are to the Penguin edition cited below.

For instance, Effi lived before her marriage in her parents' manor house, or more precisely, the house of her father's family, the seat of the von Briests, as the narrator tells us, "since the time of the Elector Georg Wilhelm" (15), that is, since the first half of the seventeenth century. In this balanced, stable environment Effi had been sheltered and doted upon all her young life, making few excursions outside its familiar, comfortable sphere. There we see her almost always out of doors, or at least by an open window, in constant contact with the abundant friendly sunshine, light and air, with freedom and easy access to companions.

When she marries, not only is she suddenly removed to a distant place where she knows no one (scarcely even her husband), the house she enters cannot compensate the loss with any equivalent social network or sense of continuity. It is simply Instetten's latest professional post, not his ancestral home. Indeed, it is no one's ancestral home -- even Captain Thomsen had come to it as a stranger late in life. Here Effi is virtually a prisoner indoors, cut off almost entirely from nature except for walks in the copse behind the house in fine weather, since the house has only a small, neglected garden and her husband is frequently too occupied with his work to be able to escort her on outings (a fatal problem once Major von Crampas, her seducer, is on the scene). Effi finds even the sunlight different in Kessin: wan, yellow and depressing.

The location of the house also limits her social life. In town, the couple is on visiting terms only with Gieshübler. The socially acceptable set is scattered widely about the countryside, almost impossible to reach even if they and Effi were not mutually antipathetic. In the house there are only the servants, of whom Johanna is covertly hostile, the mad Frau Kruse communes only with her black hen, Christel scarcely appears, and of course, the male servants, the valet and coachman, are not eligible as companions for Effi. Only the dog, Rollo, and later the nursemaid, Roswitha, provide emotional warmth. Nor does Effi, accustomed to the companionship of her friends and the devotion of her parents, have the inner resources to deal with her isolation. Unlike Anna, she is no reader, she has no intellectual life to help fill the lonely hours.

Certainly the single most socially divisive feature of the house is the ghost, which inhabits the entire upstairs, to the detriment of the household's peace of mind and the Instettens' living arrangements. Because of Instetten's curious determination to leave the several rooms upstairs derelict, despite their obvious potential for being delightful living space, the family must crowd into three rooms downstairs and sacrifice any place in which to entertain -- an interesting anomaly in this otherwise unswervingly conventional man. This state of affairs cuts the couple off even more from outside society and also drives a wedge between them, for not only has Instetten himself lived for three years with this awkward and melancholy arrangement and failed to adjust it when redecorating for his new wife, he clings to it in the face of her objections to it. When Effi suggests making two guestrooms out of the drawing room so that visitors, such as her mother, can stay with them, Instetten first agrees, then immediately reneges, giving the ridiculous reason that an identical space is available in the office across the street and that Effi's mother would be more to herself over there, as if that were what Effi or her mother would want. (We

cannot forget, or course, that Instetten had originally ardently courted Effi's mother and may now prefer to keep the woman who passed him over at some distance.)⁵ He even declines to cut the curtains in the rooms overhead, so that they won't make their disturbing brushing sound as they blow in the wind, saying "it's not certain whether it will help" (60). He likewise refuses to move out of this house, on the grounds they would lose face if the town knew they moved because the administrator's wife was afraid of spooks. He seems incapable of imagining that he could give the town some other reason for moving.

Many of the same issues are involved for Anna on Vronsky's estate, although superficially everything here seems idyllic, and she declares to Dolly she is "inexcusably happy" (644) and "perfectly at ease" (650) there. It is true that Anna has more control over the details of the household arrangements than Effi, first because she is an older and more selfconfident woman, and second because Vronsky is not as controlling as Instetten. Nevertheless, this place also epitomizes the discontinuity of Anna's life. First, the situation of Vronsky's house deep in the countryside emphasizes her removal from her previous home and connections. Second, as we have seen, although the house has been in Vronsky's family for three generations, his wholesale changes and artifices have utterly broken the organic flow of the place, distancing the inhabitants from family history and the natural life now around them.

Despite the fact that the house is in the country, nature is kept rigorously at a distance. We have already noted Vronsky's preference for machines for field work. After dinner, the company plays lawn tennis (an English game) on a carefully rolled croquet lawn, with gilt posts holding up the net. And, as Vronsky rather abruptly tells Dolly as they tour the hospital, it will have no maternity ward, despite the fact that, as she ventures to say, it would be much needed in the country.

This differs drastically, of course, from Levin's estate, which remains substantially as it was in his parents' day and is cherished for its ties to them, and where Levin's modifications are all designed to intensify the bond to the land and the peasants. And while Vronsky obviously has numerous horses and other animals, he is never depicted taking the kind of intense and intimate interest in them that Levin takes in the new calf on his return home from Moscow after Kitty refused him.

Although the number of guests at table during Dolly's visit might seem to challenge the notion that Anna is isolated, it is soon clear that this group does not provide her with a meaningful social nexus. Of those who reside in Vronsky's house, the architect, the doctor and the German steward are employees and socially impermissible as intimates of Anna, even if their personal qualifications recommended them. Princess Varvara, who, as Anna's aunt, might be expected to provide a sense of familial continuity and moral ballast, fails on both counts. She is not the aunt who raised Anna (and manoeuvred Karenin into marrying her), nor is she an exemplary woman, but a rather sleazy,

⁵See Brian Holbeche, "Instetten's 'Geschichte mit Entsagung' and its Significance in Fontane's *Effi Briest*," *German Life and Letters* 41 (1987): 21-32, for a fuller discussion of the effect on Instetten of his failed romance with Luise von Briest.

hypocritical woman who pretends to be sacrificing herself for Anna, but who is glad to have a luxurious roof over her head.

The others are transient guests. Sviazhsky, the district marshal, is not a bad person, but he is visiting primarily because he wants political help from Vronsky. Then there are Tushkevich, the recently overthrown lover of Vronsky and Anna's relation Princess Betsy, and the ebullient young Veslovsky (in his Scotch cap), whom Levin has recently thrown out of his house for flirting with his wife, neither of whom is a source of Tolstoyan moral fiber. Only Dolly is there for love of Anna, but she soon leaves because she finds the atmosphere so uncongenial.

Indeed, once summer is past, everyone else leaves, too, and the solitary life begins to wear on the couple, particularly on Anna. Vronsky, as she well realizes, can come and go at will, because he is a man and has business of various kinds in the world, because he is not penalized socially as she is, and because he has the money and the inclination. Anna, lonely, frightened and without resources, becomes more and more possessive, Vronsky, more and more determined to assert his independence.

Anna is the more vulnerable because, having rejected the task of mothering, she has no real work and is not central to the household. For instance, she laments in the nursery that she is "useless" there (650), and seems to have no sense of having control over that. At dinner, Dolly observes from Vronsky's behavior that it is he who runs the house, and that Anna is "as much a guest" as everyone else and is only in charge of the conversation (661). And, while Anna is involved in rebuilding the estate through all the research she does in books on architecture, agriculture, and other activities, and although she claims credit for launching Vronsky in this project to begin with, her participation in the work on the estate is conditional: It remains Vronsky's work, Vronsky's estate and employees, Vronsky's money, and if he were to stop, she would be unable to continue. And he might stop, for his life as a landowner, as the narrator says, is only a role he has chosen to play (674), the whole enterprise at bottom an absorbing (and lucrative) hobby, which he could drop, as he dropped the painting which had occupied him in Italy.

It would be easy in both cases to see the houses solely as constructs and reflections of the men, and the women as their prisoners and innocent victims. The men own the houses, after all, and since they hold the purse-strings, they also control all structural and decorative alterations. But this would be too simplistic a reading and would overlook the numerous, if subtle, indications that Effi and Anna contribute as much to the character of the houses as Instetten and Vronsky.

For instance, at least some of the foreignness in the house in Kessin is a matter of Effi's perception. When she joins her new husband in his room for breakfast, for example, on her first morning in the house, she remarks that the coffee is superb -- as good as hotel or café coffee, she says, such as they had in Florence, thus making it non-

domestic in two senses.⁶

As to the room itself, while the narrator describes Instetten's ponderous rolltop desk (a cherished heirloom), the right-angled sofa in the corner and the breakfast table before it, Effi herself remarks on the collection of weapons and trophies on the wall. Such displays were common in that markedly militaristic society, and even her father had a modest version of one. But for Effi, this one conjures up the memory of a picture she once saw in a book of a Persian or Indian prince, sitting on a red silk cushion, a billowing roll of silk at his back, the wall behind him bristling with spears, daggers, leopard skins, shields and Turkish guns. Effi declares her husband has only to tuck up his legs to look just like this prince.

Now, while Instetten's arrangement may be more lavish than her father's, it is unlikely to be worthy of an Eastern potentate, but in any case, the only description we have is of what Effi remembers from the picture book. She then reiterates her impression of orientalism, and says, "I feel all the time that there's something foreign about everything here ..." (59). This in spite of the fact that, certain exoticisms notwithstanding, most of the furnishings of the house are perfectly typical for homes of this class at that time: the grand piano, the old-fashioned wall stove, the new electric bell, etc. But Effi had shown from the first chapter a tendency to oriental fantasy, as when, after ceremoniously drowning some gooseberry hulls in the pond, she asserted that in Constantinople unfaithful wives were treated the same way (21).

It is also important to note that Effi reconciles herself to the necessity for her husband to leave her to attend on Prince Bismarck because she wants advancement even more, she says, than he does (77) and she accepts remaining in the haunted house from the same motive. And if she sees her husband as a prince, that is also a neat way of promoting herself to princess. This desire for worldly success above all else is another trait Effi has brought with her. We see this in an early conversation with her mother before her marriage, in which Effi treats love rather offhandedly, but says -- very seriously -- that she is for riches and a *very* distinguished house (36). She also scorns the idea of marriage to her cousin Dagobert, although she finds him entertaining, because he is too young, and Instetten is a man with whom, as she puts it, she can put on a show (38).

Effi also assists in the creation of the ghost. Her very first night in the house --

⁶This detail is not in Parmée's translation. The relevant passage reads:

'Der Kaffee ist ja vorzüglich,' sagte Effi, während sie zugleich das Zimmer und seine Einrichtung musterte. 'Das ist noch Hotelkaffee oder wie der bei Bottegone ... erinnerst du dich noch, in Florenz, mit dem Blick auf den Dom.'" (Goldmann ed. 52)

['The coffee is really superb,' said Effi, while she surveyed both the room and its furnishings. 'That's hotel coffee, or like that at Bottegone's ... do you still remember, in Florence, with the view of the cathedral.']

that is, *before* she has seen or heard of the curtains blowing across the floor upstairs, or heard the story of the miscarried wedding -- she is disturbed by a sound overhead as of dress trains or silk slippers sliding over the floor and "something like music" (59). A few weeks later, when Instetten is away and still before she knows the whole story, she wakes to the presence of the Chinese ghost. While others in the house have been disturbed by the sound of the curtains overhead, and Instetten clearly feels some affinity to the tale of the aborted wedding party, since he enshrined the scene of the ball, there is no indication that anyone else has actually encountered the Chinese himself.

And if we remember from our first view of Effi her pose as a midshipman, her longing for a ship's mast to climb, and her incessant desire for "something unusual," it would seem there might be some connection after all between her and the symbols of the sea hanging to such odd effect in the hall.

Anna, too, contributes to the unnatural shape and quality of life in her home with Vronsky, and not only by her active assistance in planning the estate (guided by foreign books, rather than Russian soul). First of all, if she has no real work here, it is because she has repudiated her natural role of mother. She is, of course, cut off from Seriozha, her son by Karenin, but she takes little interest in her daughter by Vronsky. It is clear to Dolly when they visit the nursery that Anna is a stranger there, not knowing where the baby's toys are kept, nor even how many teeth she has. In addition to not caring for her child, Anna is practicing birth control (although Vronsky seems not to be aware of this), in order to preserve her beauty and hold her lover. This horrifies Dolly, herself the frazzled mother of six (although she was dreaming of it, as she was dreaming of having an affair on her way to visit Anna), and in the Tolstoyan scheme of values marks a definitive turn in Anna's deterioration.

There are many indications in the text that the life lived here is not real life, but some form of fiction. Dolly finds the luxury of the place such as "she had only read about in English novels" (647). At the end of the day she feels she has been acting in a troupe all of whom are more skillful than she, and that she is "spoiling the show" (666). Anna herself suggests that the whole thing is an act when she tells Dolly that she is glad for all the company, for Vronsky needs an audience (651). The very house, gutted and redone, with only the facade remaining real, has the air of being a stage set.

Here again, there is a connection to what we have already learned of Anna. Early in the book, when Anna comes to help reconcile the Oblonskys, Dolly recalls that she had found "something artificial in the whole framework of [the Karenins'] family life" (80). Anna had always been a persistent reader of English novels, one of which absorbed her on her train trip home from the Oblonskys', when she imagined herself leading the lives of the characters. Play-acting in life is also nothing new, for even Anna's devotion to her son had been, as the narrator says, "the partly sincere, though greatly exaggerated role of the mother living for her child" (311).

It is worth remembering at this point that theater and other forms of fiction are also an important theme in *Effi Briest*. The curtains upstairs, for instance, suggest an empty stage. Then there is Effi and Crampas' participation in the play *Ein Schritt vom Wege* [A

Step from the Path], which contributes to the development of their relationship. And for Effi, fantasy often colors and even replaces reality, as in her constant enthusiasm for romantic stories (remember her storybook Persian prince), and her declaration that Instetten's description of the inhabitants of Kessin is "as good as six novels...." (50).

Clearly, then, while Effi and Anna both come to houses which are already in the possession and under the control of the men, the foreignness, unnaturalness, discontinuity and isolation which mark them can be attributed only in part to their owners. The traits the women bring with them also contribute to the nature of these abodes and the fate that overtakes them there.

Effi is as ambitious as Instetten and as ready as he to sacrifice domestic harmony to an idea of societal expectations. Her passivity matches his rigidity, his frozen inability to alter what has been handed to him. The extent to which this is a choice (however subconscious) is illustrated by Effi's decision when they move to Berlin to take an apartment in a brand new house, one without history, which she can furnish with her own things, and where they can start with a clean slate. Of course, the history goes with them after all, and the earlier failure to lay the ghost finally proves fatal, but that does not obscure the change in her behavior.

Anna also brings her values and character with her. Her fundamental lack of commitment to family, her devotion to foreign fictions and her refusal to regularize her position, lead to her increasing distance from Vronsky, and from nature and reality (we must not forget her morphine habit), and to her morbid self-absorption.

Given the close correspondences in these books, one cannot help speculating on the possibility that Fontane had read and been influenced by *Anna Karenina* before he wrote *Effi Briest*. It would have been possible for him to do so, for a German translation of Tolstoy's novel appeared as early as 1885, three years before Fontane began work on his novel, and nine before he finished it.⁷

One must be wary, however, of insisting on a connection, tempting as the thought may be. There is certainly no question of Fontane's trying to produce a clone, and possibly not even a conscious response to Tolstoy's work. *Effi Briest* is unequivocally "a Fontane," in style and subject matter. The theme of the adulterous woman was embraced by a wide range of writers in America, England, the European continent and Russia as they grappled with questions of the institution of marriage and the position of women in society and in the home that were raised by the profound social upheavals of the 19th century. and Fontane's output includes numerous nuanced studies of the predicament of women caught in the confines of the society of the time.

Furthermore, while Fontane knew and admired Tolstoy's work in general, he saw himself as a very different sort of writer. It is telling, too, that neither Fontane himself nor any commentator I have seen cites *Anna Karenina* as a source for *Effi Briest*, which

⁷This is a translation by Paul Wilhelm, published in Berlin by Wilhelm. There were also editions in French (Hachette, 1885), a language which Fontane knew at least to some extent, and English (London: Vizetelly, 1887), in which he was fluent.

is known to have had its principal genesis in an incident which took place in 1886 in Bonn.⁸ Many distinctive features in the book are also accounted for by Fontane's observations of life: Stanley Radcliffe has noted that the stuffed sea creatures and the ghost in the *Landratshaus*, for instance, were inspired by a house Fontane lived in as a boy (12). Nor does it strain credulity that two authors could arrive independently at the idea of using the domicile as a reflection of and agent in a troubled intimate relationship. Still, it is possible that, if he had read Tolstoy's book, Fontane then echoed in his own fashion, and perhaps unconsciously, elements that were apposite to his work.

In any case, each author has brilliantly used the depiction of domestic life in an alien residence to illuminate and explore the theme of alienation and incarceration.

⁸Hans-Heinrich Reuter quotes Fontane as acknowledging a debt of gratitude to Tolstoy and other writers of the "realistic school," while at the same time distancing himself from them and declaring his love for what he calls "true" Romanticism (539). The origin of the novel is attested by letters of Fontane to various correspondents, cited in the Goldmann edition, 318-322.

WORKS CITED

- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly and Eugene Rochberg-Halton. *The Meaning of Things: Domestic Symbols and the Self*. Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge UP, 1981.
- Fontane, Theodor. *Effi Briest*. Nachwort und Anmerkungen von Dr. Dirk Mende. N.p.: Wilhelm Goldmann, 1978.
- . *Effi Briest*. Trans. and intro. Douglas Parmée. Baltimore: Penguin, 1967.
- Mende, Dr. Dirk. *Effi Briest* (Goldmann) 277-360.
- Nabokov, Valdimir. *Lectures on Russian Literature*. Ed. and intro. Fredson Bowers. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981.
- Radcliffe, Stanley. *Fontane: Effi Briest*. Critical Guides to German Texts 6. Ed. Martin Swales. London: Grant & Cutler, 1986.
- Reuter, Hans-Heinrich. *Fontane*. 2. Band. München: Nymphen-burger, 1968. 2 vols.
- Stern, J. "'Effi Briest': 'Madame Bovary': 'Anna Karenina'?" *Modern Language Review* 52 (1957): 363-375.
- Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenin*. Rosemary Edmonds, trans. and intro. 1954. Harmondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1978.

Review Article

LEV TOLSTOY AND JAMES JOYCE: POST-COMMUNIST NEGOTIANS

ANNA TAVIS, WILLIAMS COLLEGE

L.N. TOLSTOY. *Krug chtenia, Izbrannye, sobrannye i raspolozhennye na kazhdyi den' L'vom Tolstym mysli mnogikh pisatelei ob istine, zhizni, i povedenii*. 2 vols. (Moskva, Politicheskaiia Literatura, 1991).

DZHEIMS DZHOIS. *Uliss*. Translated by V. Khinkis and S. Khoruzhii, *Inostrannaia Literatura* #1-12 (1989).

NEIL CORNWELL. *James Joyce and the Russians* (London, Macmillan, 1992).

The charismatic power that Leo Tolstoy and James Joyce exercised over their contemporaries far surpassed the immediate literary influence of their texts. Each appealed to different constituencies of readers. Tolstoy's moral persona towered over the late 19th century. His ostensible goal was to *infect* his readers with moral *feelings* and urge them to moral actions, away from the artistry of literary texts.¹ Joyce, following in Tolstoy's footsteps, killed the 19th century by exposing the futility of its dominant genres and styles.² In contrast to Tolstoy, Joyce's aesthetic agenda did not concern itself with any moral or didactic ends; he chose to lose his readers in novelistic labyrinths without authorial guidance. He decided that as long as he achieved his literary agenda, he cared little about the accessibility of his technique.³

When traditional moral constraints began to crumble and old aesthetic boundaries were being redrawn by the end of the 19th century, Russia and the West often found themselves arguing on different sides of the ideological quarrel. Tolstoy and Joyce, likewise, fought political battles in the literary sphere, thus contributing to the ongoing

¹Tolstoy's definition of art as articulated in his essay *What is Art?* describes art as a type of human activity which consists in "one man's consciously ... handing on to others feelings he has lived through, and other people are infected by these feelings and also experience them." Tolstoy, *What is Art?* (London: Macmillan, 1982): 51. For a comprehensive treatment of continuity in Tolstoy's aesthetics see Rimvydas Silbajoris, *Tolstoy's Aesthetics and His Art*. (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1990).

²T.S. Eliot, "Ulysses, Order, and Myth," in Manley, Seon, comp. *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism*. (New York: Vanguard, 1948): 201.

³As reported by Stuart Gilbert, *James Joyce's Ulysses: A Study*. (New York: Vintage, 1955): 16.

debate over the place of authority in individual and social life, the nature of freedom and subordination, continuity and subversion.⁴ The contrast between two outwardly dissimilar aesthetic positions reflects the two writers' different understandings of the literary process. What it conceals, however, is their ultimate agreement on literary goals. The two writers' reputations fluctuate according to dominant ideological currents in Russia and the West. Most recently, the old tendency to polarize the two writers on ideological rather than literary grounds has surfaced again in Russia's post-communist wave of literary rehabilitations. Tolstoy was reinstated as authority once again after a brief period of interrogation. By contrast, Joyce's sensational Russian reentry was short-lived as the scales of popularity tipped in Tolstoy's favor. More specifically, Russian readers responded in the predictable traditional way to two recently rehabilitated texts; the reprint of Tolstoy's long forgotten *Reading Circle (Krug chteniia)*⁵ and the first publication of a complete Russian translation of Joyce's *Ulysses*⁶ have prompted Russians to reflect on those historical and social continuities which determine the nation's attitudes to its authors.

In Tolstoy's homeland, ideological considerations have prevailed over aesthetics in the discussions of Tolstoy's and Joyce's work. In the decade between the early 1920s and the early 1930s, the question: "What to do with Joyce?" became a hotly debated subject in the Soviet press. Joyce's early Soviet apologists argued on his behalf citing his democratic origins and his anti-religious attitudes; he was defended as a practitioner of left bourgeois art, a "dustman and grave-digger of the capitalist world who [was] bent over its corpse, inhaling the decomposition of the world in the depths of its open grave."⁷ Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus, Joyce's advocates argued, were neither "superficial men" of the Russian novels nor anarchists indulging in negative illusions or agitating against the state.

By the mid-1930s, it became increasingly clear that literature was no longer to be considered an expression of a writer's individuality. Initial Party attempts to absorb the best "bourgeois" writers like Joyce met with strong condemnation from the new party elite;⁸ the final blow to Joyce was delivered in 1934, at the First Congress of Soviet

⁴Anna Tavis, "Authority and Its Discontents in Joyce and Tolstoy," *Irish Slavonic Studies*, #12 (1991): 41-55.

⁵Tolstoy, *Krug chteniia. Izbrannye, sobrannye i raspolozhennye na kazhdyi den' L'vom Tolstym mysli mnogikh pisatelei ob istine, zhizni, i povedenii*. 2 vols. (Moskva: Politicheskaiia Literatura, 1991).

⁶Dzheims Dzhois, *Uliss*. V. Khinkis and S. Khoruzhii, *Inostrannaia Literatura* #1-12 (1989).

⁷Miller-Budnitskaia, R.Z. "Kommentarii k 'Pokhoronam Patrika Dignema'," *Zvezda*, 11 (1934): 137. Quoted in Cornwell, 107.

⁸Joseph Schull offers a comprehensive overview of the fragmented cultural politics characteristic of the earlier Soviet period. See "The Ideological Origins of 'Stalinism' in Soviet Literature," *Slavic Review* 51.3 (1992): 468-484.

Writers.⁹ Speaking at the Congress, Karl Radek announced that "conveying a picture of revolution by the Joyce method would be about as successful as using a fishing net to catch a Dreadnought."¹⁰ Joyce's works according to Radek, were "medieval, mystical, and reactionary." At the same time as Joyce's chances for recognition declined, Tolstoy's literary reputation was supported by the authority of the new Soviet state. The old-style iconoclast was easier to present to new Soviet writers as a model for emulation than the exiled Irish saboteur. Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy alone could teach them how to represent "what is typical in the individual," the Party declared.¹¹ The official endorsement of Tolstoy and banishment of Joyce eliminated all discussion and demanded the homogeneity of readers' responses.

The sudden collapse of the old Soviet system has sanctioned rushed denunciations of Stalinism as the sole obstacle to the diversity of opinion among Russians.¹² Tolstoy and Joyce found themselves waiting among others for triumphant re-evaluation and rehabilitation. Contrary to most expectations, it soon became apparent that for these two novelists, no immediate reversals of fortune would take place. Once the initial euphoria of liberation was over, nostalgia for the secure authority of civic-minded and idea-centered narratives set in.¹³ The old dichotomy between Tolstoy and Joyce was revived in readers' responses to Tolstoy's *Reading Circle* and Joyce's *Ulysses*. While Tolstoy's little known work was welcomed as a long-awaited national revelation,¹⁴ the complete Russian language text of *Ulysses* elicited a perplexed response. Readers' reactions to Tolstoy's *Reading Circle* may be read as an answer to the old question of "what to do with Joyce?"

Obviously, Tolstoy's *Reading Circle* and Joyce's *Ulysses* are two completely

⁹Emily Tall, "The Soviet Debate on Modernism in Western Literature, 1956-1970" (Ph.D. diss., Brown U., 1974) and more recently, E. Tall, "Behind the Scenes: How *Ulysses* was Finally Published in the Soviet Union," *Slavic Review* 49.2 (1990): 183-199; and E. Tall, "Correspondence between Three Slavic Translators of *Ulysses*..." *Slavic Review* 49.2 (1990): 625-633.

¹⁰*Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s'ezd sovetskikh pisatelei 1934. Stenograficheskiy otchet.* (Moscow, 1934; reprinted Moscow, 1990): 316. Quoted in Cornwell, 104.

¹¹Karl Radek, "Contemporary World Literature and the Tasks of Proletarian Art" in *Problems of Soviet Literature*, ed. H.G. Scott (London, 1935). Republished as *Soviet Writers' Congress 1934: The Debate on Socialist Realism and Modernism in the Soviet Union. Maxim Gorky, Karl Radek, Nikolai Bukharin, Andrey Zhdanov and Others.* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977).

¹²Undifferentiated treatment of "totalitarianism" has been sufficiently criticized in the West, e.g. Hans Gunter, ed. *The Culture of the Stalin Period.* (London: Macmillan, 1990).

¹³Svetlana Boym, "Stalin's Cinematic Charisma: Between History and Nostalgia," *Slavic Review* 51.3 (1992): 536-543.

¹⁴Boris Sushkov, "Kogda my rehabilitiruem L'va Tolstogo?" *Literaturnaya Gazeta* 14, 1990.

different authorial projects. By composing his *Reading Circle*, Tolstoy intended to replace the regular daily calendar of readings with a Bible of his own making.¹⁵ He selected and organized thoughts from humanity's best minds: Plato, Voltaire, Ruskin, the Buddhist and Chinese prophets. Every day of the calendar year started with a philosophical theme or moral proposition which was supported with four to fourteen relevant quotations. In this manner, Tolstoy intended to teach his readers how to live uncompromising lives and mold their characters according to moral maxims prepared by him for their edification. In the words of a contemporary Russian reviewer, one finds in Tolstoy's texts a total affinity between different stages in the evolution of moral maximalism in an individual's life; a five year old child ("First Grief"), according to Tolstoy, joins company with a sixteen year old young man ("Voluntary Slavery") and later in life shares allegiance to the doctrine with the wisest elders on this planet, from Socrates to Tolstoy himself.¹⁶ One cannot imagine a text more alien to Tolstoy's edifying project than Joyce's twenty-four hour odyssey through the human mind. To Joyce, it was important to send his reader on a journey of self-discovery through life's contingencies and contradictions. When confronted with these disparate literary models, a Russian reader is faced with the difficult choice between the comforting security of Tolstoyan realism and the continuing dislocation of Joycean modernism.

It is hard to forget in the current Russian political climate that the opposition between Tolstoy and Joyce has remained a lingering ideological quarrel up to the present day. Characteristically, the opposition between Tolstoy and Joyce has never been an issue in the West where the process of questioning old paradigms of thinking is well underway. Political challenges to Marxist aesthetics on the one hand and the reopening of Bakhtinian dialog about formerly inaccessible textual meanings on the other, have provided a new scenario for the study of Tolstoy's and Joyce's personal and literary projects. Morson's study of Tolstoy's *War and Peace* introduced a radical re-evaluation of narrative and creative potentials in Tolstoy's prose.¹⁷ Morson has demonstrated that Tolstoy, like Joyce, created from potential. Speaking for Joyce, Dominic Manganiello has convincingly argued against Joyce's reputation as an "apolitical" writer. According to Manganiello, Joyce preached his own kind of ideology, a way of political thinking which resembled Tolstoy's vision of socialism without Marxism and anarchism without violence.¹⁸

Neil Cornwell's new study *James Joyce and the Russians* works well as a chronicle of Joyce's meandering journey through Russian cultural politics in the wake of Tolstoy.

¹⁵Tolstoy, "Predislovie," *Krug chteniia*: 18.

¹⁶Boris Sushkov, "Neizvestnaia kniga klassika," *Knizhnoe Obozrenie* 35 (1991): 3.

¹⁷Gary Saul Morson, *Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in War and Peace* (Stanford, CA: Stanford, 1987).

¹⁸Dominic Manganiello, *Joyce's Politics* (London: Routledge, 1980): 232.

An established British literary scholar, translator, editor, and the author of an acclaimed biography of V.F. Odoevsky,¹⁹ Cornwell puts to good use his insiders's understanding of complex entanglements between literature and politics in Russian culture. Cornwell's study focuses on different aspects of Joyce's contacts with Russia and, conversely, examines the evolution of Russian attitudes towards Joyce. Part One, "Russia and Joyce," examines Joyce's personal accounts of Russia and the Russians; Part Two, "Joyce and Three Russian Contemporaries," treats literary parallels between Joyce and his Russian counterparts; and the concluding Part Three, "Joyce in Russia," analyzes the history of the Soviet reception of Joyce's work from the early revolutionary days through the post-perestroika reassessment of old values. Although Cornwell limits his treatment of Tolstoy to one subchapter, "Tolstoy and the Rest," his entire survey bears direct relevance to the discussion of interconnectedness between Tolstoy and Joyce in the Russian context.

Needless to say, the story of Tolstoy's and Joyce's precarious Russian liaison is in itself instructive. Viktor Shklovsky was among the first to launch the idea of Tolstoy's stylistic anticipation of Joyce's "stream of consciousness." In the heyday of Russian Formalism, Shklovsky argued that had Tolstoy finished his first literary experiment, *The History of Yesterday* (1851), we would have had before us a book similar to the one Joyce was going to write many years later.²⁰ Other literary analogies readily offer themselves following Shklovsky's insightful proposition; the two novelists shared a common interest in Shakespeare and Homer, they demonstrated a propensity for the autobiographical form, and they were equally concerned with the minutiae of conscious and unconscious life. Even though Tolstoy dedicated his last years to writing confessions and prophetic statements, he had opened the doors of modernism for his younger Russian contemporaries. In the wake of Tolstoy's narrative experimentations, Bely, Rozanov, Nabokov, and Eisenstein in cinema, continued to work tirelessly at methods of representing interior psychic processes.²¹

There is no question that young Joyce was worlds apart from elderly Tolstoy on questions of religion, art, and the artist's role in society (not to mention his position on

¹⁹Neil Cornwell, *The Life, Times and Milieu of V.F. Odoevsky, 1804-1869*. (London: Athlone, 1986): ix-x.

²⁰V. Shklovsky, *Povesti o proze: razmyshleniia i razbory*. 2 vols. (Moscow: Khud. Literatura, 1966), II: 212.

²¹See among others, Peter Barta, "Childhood in the Autobiographical Novel: An Examination of Tolstoy's *Childhood*, Joyce's *A Portrait of an Artist*, and Bely's *Kotik Letaev*," in *Literary Interrelations: Ireland, England, and the World: 2, Comparison and Impact*, eds. Wolfgang Zach and Heinz Kosok. (Tübingen: Günter Narr, 1987): 49-55.

sexuality).²² Nonetheless, Joyce's political views dovetailed with Tolstoy's at many points. When Joyce first learned about Tolstoy's philosophy of non-violent resistance to evil he was captivated by the entire project. Joyce's source, Elzbacher's anthology on anarchism, was a pioneering volume examining various trends in anarchist thought and included chapters on Bakunin, Kropotkin and Tolstoy.²³ Tolstoy's improbable recipe of anarchism and pacifism appealed to Joyce and he enthusiastically embraced Tolstoy's doctrine of "non-resistance to violence."²⁴ Like Tolstoy, Joyce renounced nationalism and patriotism as equally unnatural, irrational, and destructive concepts and was repelled by the idea of subjecting the "non-invasive" individual to external will. Joyce left a remarkable comment concerning the nature of his interest in Russian literary style. It was not the Russian ability to take the reader on an "intercranial journey" that set him thinking about Russian literature, rather, it was the Russians' "scrupulous instinct for caste."²⁵ Joyce openly admired Tolstoy as a formidable Russian landowner who donned his aristocratic garb in order to join his people. Even though he remained skeptical about the sincerity of Tolstoy's cross-dressing (scratch the peasant and you will find an upper-class aristocrat with the feudal memory of his ancestors and a St. Petersburg accent),²⁶ he vigorously defended Tolstoy against the attacks of the "liberal" Western press. Joyce became particularly irate when at one time a British reporter accused Tolstoy of ignorance on the issues of war and peace. "Does that impudent, dishonorable journalist think he is equal to Tolstoy, physically, intellectually, artistically, or morally?" Joyce fulminated in response to his brother.²⁷ Stanislaus shared his brother's admiration of Tolstoy's heretical disregard for official hierarchies. "A man who can dispense with the Tsar in a sentence that would not suffice for a door-porter in one of his novels, has a fund of

²²Some comparative studies of immanent literary "devices" have been occasionally enlivened with references to Tolstoy's and Joyce's shared personal idiosyncrasies: their common fear of thunderstorms, their hydrophobias and their much discussed "monogamy." John Henry Raleigh, "Joyce and Tolstoy," in *Literary Theory and Criticism. Festschrift. Presented to René Wellek in Honor of his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Joseph P. Strelka. (Bern; New York: Peter Lang, 1984): 1137-1157.

²³Manganiello, *Joyce's Politics*: 72.

²⁴Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God and Peace Essays*, tr. Aylmer Maude. (London: Oxford UP, 1971): 1099.

²⁵Joyce to Stanislaus, *Letters of James Joyce*, in 3 vols., eds. Stuart Gilbert and Richard Ellmann. (New York: Viking, 1966), II: 106.

²⁶Joyce's reference to Petersburg demonstrates that he did not trouble himself with the details of Tolstoy's biography. Joyce to Stanislaus, *Letters*, II: 106

²⁷Joyce to Stanislaus, *Letters*, II: 107.

dishonorable thought equal to any journalist's," he concurred.²⁸

The infrequency and informality with which Joyce referred to Tolstoy's creative work may suggest that he was more willing to comment on Tolstoy's politics than to praise his literary virtues. For example, Joyce described Tolstoy's moralistic fable "How much Land Does a Man Need" as the greatest short story ever written.²⁹ He might have even had a hand in translating the story from German into English, Joyce's biographers suspect.³⁰ *Anna Karenina*, in Joyce's only reference to the novel, was remarkable because it exposed the Russian government's hypocrisy in thrusting the ignorant populace into the Russo-Turkish War. Tolstoy's last novel *Resurrection* earned Joyce's praise for the author's eloquent condemnation of the Orthodox Church. Joyce's most positive evaluation of Tolstoy's artistic genius is prefaced with a crescendo of understatements; "He is never dull, never stupid, never tired, never pedantic, never theatrical. He is head and shoulders over the others."³¹ We can always speculate to what degree filial anxiety over a strong precursor played a role in Joyce's reticence concerning Tolstoy's literary merits. One thing is obvious in this connection: even though Joyce shared Tolstoy's view that literature should usher in the spiritual liberation of people, he emphatically opposed Tolstoy's subjugation of art to propagandistic purposes. To take an active role in politics, Joyce insisted, would compromise the artist and would limit the effectiveness of his artistic message.

In the final analysis, both writers aimed at the individual's transformation through art. Joyce was primarily concerned with the fragility of the individual, hence his preference for subtle innuendos over browbeating. By contrast, Tolstoy always envisioned a congregation at his feet, hence the tone of urgency in his sermons.

²⁸Stanislaus to Joyce, *Letters*, II: 119.

²⁹Joyce to Stanislaus, *Letters*, I: 364.

³⁰The translation was published in *International Review* 2.6 (31 May 1916).

³¹Ellmann, *James Joyce*. (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1983), 217.

Report from the Field

AMERICANS WRITE TO TOLSTOY: A REPORT ON THE TOLSTOY-USA PROJECT

ROBERT WHITTAKER, LEHMAN COLLEGE, CUNY

Although this project emphasizes the West and Tolstoy more than the reverse, it still offers new information on the writer's views of the West and of the United States in particular. Initiated in 1987 by IREX and IMLI under a joint agreement between ACLS and the Soviet Academy of Sciences, the project continues despite wholesale *perestroika*. Its principal focus is the collection of over 1700 letters written by Americans to Tolstoy from the 1870s to 1910. Although there is no longer any major institutional funding on the American side, IMLI continues to provide formal (if not material) support in the form of invitations and local research support (especially for translation and editing). The original plan was to publish two volumes of the most interesting American letters, Tolstoy's responses, all with Russian translation, together with a complete inventory of the letters and a bibliography of US publications by and about Tolstoy through 1910. This ambitious plan scheduled the volumes for publication by Nauka in 1994. Recent events suggest that this plan will be significantly scaled down, and uncertainties at Nauka raise questions about a publisher.

Nonetheless, work continues. Over 500 of the American letters have been transcribed: after preliminary examination, these appear to have the most significant texts and therefore seem most suited for publication. The largest category (almost half) include Tolstoy's most significant two-sided correspondences (with Bernstein, Bryan, Creelman, Crosby, Dole, and Hapgood, for example). Large segments of these 500 letters concern American assistance to Russia during the famine of 1891-92 (80 letters), letters on social and political topics (like nonresistance and the single tax, 80 letters), on matters of faith and religion (70 letters), on philosophy, aesthetics, education (35 letters), and on publishing, literary questions, and specific works, e.g. *Kreutzer Sonata*, *Resurrection* (60 letters). Editing of these texts, in some cases, has already begun.

Work has begun on identifying, transcribing, and editing Tolstoy's letters. Part of the project has been devoted to locating the author's letters, both known and unknown, in US archives, and this effort has brought modest success. Also, the process of inventorying the remaining 1200 American letters continues: however, it appears that a very large proportion of these are either requests for an autograph or notes accompanying published materials sent to Tolstoy.

According to plan, the inventory process should be finished early in 1993. Editing and annotating the texts has begun, as has the translating, and this process will continue

into 1994. If the project gets adequate assistance from American and Russian scholars, principally in editing and annotating, the completed texts should be ready for submission by the end of 1994.

This is a report and an appeal. The project is in need of American scholarly help - Slavists interested and willing to participate in editing American letters. In particular we need editors for the letters on social and political topics and on philosophy, aesthetics, and education. For scholars unable to participate, but working on topics on Tolstoy's relations with the US, the project has developed a valuable data base of the American letters and bibliographical information. We have been able to supply colleagues with names of Tolstoy's correspondents on certain topics, and we have been able on occasion to supply texts of letters. I invite colleagues whom we might assist to write to me at my home address: 121 Alexander Ave., Hartsdale, NY 10530.

Bibliographical Abstracts

Cutshall, J.A. "‘Not Tolstoy At All’: *Resurrection* in London" *Irish Slavonic Studies* 10 1989 (1991): 31-40.

This article is devoted to a study of two theatrical adaptations of Tolstoy's famous third novel *Resurrection* (1899) which were staged in Paris and London in 1903. The Paris version by Henry Bataille shortened the work by eliminating approximately two-thirds of the characters and philosophical content in order to fit it into a three hour time span. While the French production was very successful and easily played over one hundred times, the British version by Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree and Michael Morton enjoyed less critical praise even though it focused more on Katyusha's evolution by depicting her moral journey from corruption to sainthood in five acts. These two dramatic adaptations clearly show that the piracy of Tolstoy's novel was widespread and yielded mixed results in terms of quality.

Emerson, Caryl. "Solov'ev, the Late Tolstoi, and the Early Bakhtin on the Problem of Shame and Love," *Slavic Review*, Fall 1991: 663-671.

While this article concentrates more on the early Bakhtin than on Solov'ev or the Late Tolstoi, its primary thrust is to show that the later two figures impacted strongly on Bakhtin's early critical development. Like Tolstoy and Solov'ev, Bakhtin rejected the polarization of Russian criticism between aesthetic and civic critics, preferring a criticism that combined form and ethics. Thus, all three were philosophers of religion (albeit in their own ways), who stressed ideas such as love, shame and moral responsibility. Tolstoy's definition of the three kinds of love in his work "Iunost'" led to a preference for active love over the fraudulent forms of love represented by sentiments directed toward the other and self-denial. Bakhtin is shown to draw upon this exalted version of love in his early writings which revolve around discussions of love and shame. As Bakhtin reached his more mature "high carnival period," the ethics of love and shame that are derivative of Tolstoy and Solov'ev tend to give way to a different emphasis.

Frost, Edgar L. "Building a Better Brekhunov: Tolstoj's *Master and Man*" *Russian Language Journal* XLV, Nos. 151-152 (1991): 111-119.

The author regards this story as yet another case of a Tolstoyan character undergoing a spiritual conversion at the moment of his physical demise. In this instance, the ex-peasant Brekhunov returns to his roots after spending much of his life as a money hungry merchant. To facilitate this transformation, Tolstoy establishes a set of signs and symbols. Most significant among these are 1)his change in attitude toward animals from assessing them for their materialistic value to valuing them as helpmates to humankind and

2)his selection of names which associates the name of the peasant Nikita with St. Nicholas and the concept of "victory of the people" (i.e. of the peasantry over the merchant class). Spiritual rebirth comes when Brekhunov gives up his two fur coats to warm the peasant Nikita, who is without a coat. At this moment Brekhunov not only dies physically but becomes one with Nikita, emphasizing both the peasant concept of collectivity (*sobornost'*) and the moral triumph of the peasant way of life.

Schefski, Harold K. "Tolstoy and Jealousy," *Irish Slavonic Studies*, 10 1989 (1991): 17-30.

The author demonstrates that jealousy plays an all-pervasive role in both the works and the married life of Leo Tolstoy. From the early trilogy to the post-conversion stories, jealousy serves as one of the primary emotions by which this writer's characters define their relationship with others. Moreover, what is amazing about this passion in Tolstoy's literature is that its increasing association with violence in the later stories conflicts with the movements of his overall philosophy towards a non-violent ideal.

Nowhere was jealousy a more formidable obstacle for the writer than in his own marriage to Sonya Behrs, whose similar nature transformed it into a reciprocal trait. A careful study of jealousy in the couple's marriage is important because there is reason to believe that it exerted an as yet undetermined influence on the all-too-simple explanation for the collapse of their relationship, namely, that Sonya clung tenaciously to her materialistic concern for family and property, while Tolstoy left just as much to find peace from the jealousy that had afflicted his marriage as to eliminate the hypocrisy between his life and his convictions.

Tavis, Anna A. "Authority and its Discontents in Tolstoy and Joyce." *Irish Slavonic Studies* 12 (1991): 41-55.

Using a Bakhtinian approach, Tavis challenges the commonly held view of Tolstoyan discourse as authoritarian discourse and Joycean prose as libertine. Tavis excoriates biographical critical approaches that generate such stereotypes and oversimplifications and suggests instead that close attention to textual dynamics reveals subversive anarchy in Tolstoy's prose. Conversely, Tavis traces the subtle recreation of ultimate authority in Joyce's works.

Tavis, Anna A. "Rilke and Tolstoy: The Predicament of Influence." *The German Quarterly* Spring (1992): 192-200.

Rilke is on record as rejecting Tolstoy's influence. Tolstoy, he claimed, was only a "cultural" influence, part and parcel of Rilke's general response to Russia. In this brief study, Tavis argues otherwise, claiming that "Tolstoy's image captivated Rilke's imagination as an artist who was struggling against his own creative genius." Tavis discusses Rilke's two meetings with Tolstoy, his response to Tolstoy's death, his reaction to the publication of *Resurrection*, and to Gorky's *Reminiscences of Tolstoy*. She finds that Tolstoy's views on art and the artist were seminal in Rilke's own struggle towards a coherent aesthetic, philosophy and practice.

Announcements

Friends of the Tolstoy Society: (Donations of \$100 or more)

Bonnie Gephardt

This issue, Volume V (1992): "Tolstoy and the West," is the first of two special issues. The next, "Tolstoy and Sexuality," will constitute Volume VI (1993) of the *Tolstoy Studies Journal*. Papers may be submitted until August 1, 1993. Contributors are advised to consult the "Style Guide and Information for Authors" at the back of this issue. Beginning with Volume VII, the Tolstoy Studies Journal will be edited by Professor Charles Isenberg. Please send all submissions for Volume VII to:

Professor Charles Isenberg
Russian Department
Reed College
Portland, Oregon 97202

The 90 Volume Jubilee Edition of Tolstoy's Complete Works was purchased by Professor Stanley Rabinowitz of Amherst College with the winning bid of \$2,000.

Affiliation with the Modern Language Association

The results of the balloting for possible affiliation with the Modern Language Association were as follows:

In favor: 37 Opposed: 10 No Opinion: 2

Affiliation with the Modern Language Association will provide additional opportunities for the Tolstoy Society to meet and present scholarly papers and workshops. The Modern Languages Association will permit the Tolstoy Society to organize up to three panels, special events or workshops for the annual MLA meeting, although the organization of such panels would not be obligatory. The Tolstoy Society would be able to utilize MLA lounges and facilities during the meeting. MLA membership will not be required for participation at meeting events. Plans for affiliation to begin in 1994 are in progress and will be discussed at the next annual meeting of the Tolstoy Society.

Style Guide and Information for Authors

Editorial Policy: The *Tolstoy Studies Journal* is a refereed journal and welcomes contributions on any topic relevant to Tolstoy scholarship. In addition to articles, the journal publishes review articles, roundtable discussions, news and events, notices of work in progress, special reports, and book reviews. Book reviews will normally be invited, but unsolicited reviews may be considered. See the inside front cover for addresses for submissions.

Submissions: Two copies of the manuscript should be sent to the Editor. Receipt of manuscripts will be acknowledged, and the author will be informed as soon as possible whether or not the manuscript has been accepted. The usual deadline for submission is June 1. Special issues may have special deadlines which will be announced in advance.

Style: The manuscript should be prepared in accordance with MLA Style, that is, references should be made in the body of the text to works that are listed in a WORKS CITED section at the end of the paper. Footnotes should contain commentary rather than bibliographical material.

Transliteration: Russian and other Slavic languages should be transliterated according to the Library of Congress system of transliteration. Russian surnames which have commonly been transliterated differently in English, e.g., Tolstoy, Tchaikovsky, should be given in their standardized form.

Quotations: Quotations may be given in cyrillic. English translations should also be supplied. Direct quotations longer than four manuscript lines should be set off from the body of the text by indenting three spaces from the left margin and omitting quotation marks.

Computer generated copy: To facilitate type-setting, the journal encourages the submission of computer disks in any format. When submitting the disk, please indicate the type of word-processing program used, the operating system and the title of the file.