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Introduction

1. “Прелюбодеяние есть не только любимая, но и единственная тема всех романов.” From chapter 9 of What Is Art? (Что такое искусство?), in Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (PSS), 90 vols. (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo khudzhestvennoi literature, 1928–58), 30:88. Further references are to this edition (PSS) and will be given by volume and page number in the text.

2. Herbert Lottman, Flaubert: A Biography (London: Methuen, 1989), 137. In addition to Flaubert, the editors of the journal Revue de Paris were also the targets of the lawsuit, but all parties were acquitted on February 7, 1857.

3. In a book chapter titled “The Miserable Marriages in Middlemarch, Anna Karenina, and Effi Briest,” Barbara Hardy attributes England’s lack of an adultery novel to “the cultural difference, which inhibited the representation of adultery in English Victorian fiction, as both Thackeray and Henry James complained.” She concludes, “An English novel’s heroine as sympathetic as Edith Newcome or Dorothea . . . could not be led or driven to adultery, but she could be in Russian and German novels.” In George Eliot and Europe, ed. John Rignall (Brookfield, Vt.: Scolar Press, 1997), 69.


5. I have the anonymous Reader 3 for Northwestern University Press to thank for this wonderful phrase.


8. One study that is contemporary to Tanner’s but was far less favorably received is Judith Armstrong’s The Novel of Adultery (London: Macmillan, 1976). The two more recent ones I have in mind are Bill Overton’s The Novel of Female Adultery: Love and Gender in Continental European Fiction, 1830–1890 (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996) and Maria Rippon’s Judgment and Justification in the Nineteenth-Century Novel of Adultery (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2002). The former contains useful sociological information.
regarding the Woman Question (the effect of declining birthrates, for example), but the latter discusses Russia with the language of backwardness that appears out of place in contemporary academic discourse, relies on English translations of its non-English-language novels, and even gets part of Tolstoy’s name wrong in the bibliography, listing Ilich instead of Nikolaevich as his patronymic.


23. Arendt, *Origins of Totalitarianism*, 162. She notes how Boulainvilliers’s division of the French nation into the Germanic Franks and the subjugated Gauls indicates that, “paradoxical as it sounds, the fact is that Frenchmen were to insist earlier than Germans or Englishmen on this idée fixe of German superiority” (164–65).


26. A former student of mine, Mary Lingwall, wrote an excellent paper in which she argued that precisely because of the critique of the middle class and its desire for wealth accumulation in *Madame Bovary*, Tolstoy’s novella *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*—whose protagonist dies of an injury sustained from a fall during the hanging of curtains in his brand-new house—makes a better companion to Flaubert’s novel than *Anna Karenina*.


30. Too many books to enumerate have been written on this topic, particularly on the Indo-British relationship, which has perhaps more than any other been cast in terms of rape. I would just like to mention my favorite study on the topic, Jenny Sharpe’s *Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).


33. Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans*, 16.


38. I use George Rapall Noyes’s 1917 translation: *Pan Tadeusz or the Last Foray in Lithuania: A Story of Life among Polish Gentlefolk in the Years 1811 and 1812* (New York: Mondial, 2009), 9. His and Jewell Parish’s translation of the title of Mickiewicz’s other, shorter poem—“Do Matki Polki”—I think misses the point with “To a Polish Mother.”


40. Regarding the idea of “Mother England,” I want to point out Cannon Schmitt’s study *Alien Nation: Nineteenth-Century Gothic Fictions and English Nationality* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), which performs a theoretical twist similar to mine when reading novels of adultery as symptomatic of national anxieties. Schmitt takes the English gothic, which has frequently been read as confronting repressed female sexuality, and reads it as “a nationalist narrative in miniature” (11).


42. Walicki, *Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism*, 2; emphases mine.

43. This discussion occurred on September 4, 2008, and can be accessed by the listserv subscribers in the SEELANGS Archive: https://listserv.ua.edu/cgi-bin/wa?S2=SEELANGS&m=32387&l=-3&L=SEELANGS&X=6594E170409737D6A2&a=august+2008&b=october+2008&c=No+-Match%3BMATCH%3BMatches&q=russia+she+or+it


46. Tolstoy makes a strong point of this when he describes how a real painter feels about Vronsky’s work, even employing the word смешно (ridiculous), while simultaneously taking the opportunity to draw an analogy to Anna and Vronsky’s
inauthentic relationship: “Он знал, что нельзя запретить Вронскому баловать живописью; он знал, что он и все дилетанты имели полное право писать что им угодно, но ему было неприятно. Нельзя запретить человеку сделать себе большую куклу из воска и целовать ее. Но если б этот человек с куклой пришел и сел пред влюбленным и принялся бы ласкать свою куклу, как влюбленный ласкает ту которую он любит, то влюбленному было бы неприятно. Такое же неприятно чувство испытывал Михайлов при виде живописи Вронского; ему было и смешно, и досадно, и жалко, и оскорбительно” (He knew he could not forbid Vronsky to toy with painting; he knew that he and all the dilettantes had a perfect right to paint what they pleased, but he found it unpleasant. One cannot forbid a man to make himself a big wax doll and kiss it. But if this man with the doll were to come and sit before a man in love and begin caressing his doll the way the man in love caressed the one he loved, the man in love would find it unpleasant. Mikhailov experienced the very same unpleasant feeling at the sight of Vronsky’s painting; he found it ridiculous, and annoying, and pathetic, and offensive) (PSS 19:47).

47. To demonstrate just how far this idea can be taken in places like contemporary Texas, consider the following report by *New York Times* columnist Gail Collins: “There are a couple of conservative-versus-crazy Republican school board primaries, and the results may influence a pending war over requiring social studies students to learn how Moses impacted the founding fathers.” February 21, 2014, http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/22/opinion/collins-texas-strikes-again.html?hp&rrref=opinion&_r=1.


53. Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, in *The Portable Kristeva*, ed. Kelly Oliver (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 282. A similar gradation can be depicted in the United States as well. While the North may collectively look down on the South, in the South residents of Georgia tell incest jokes about their neighbors from Alabama, while these in turn reply that if it were not for Alabama, Georgia would have to suffer the indignity of being neighbors with Mississippi.


Chapter 1


3. Some of the publications on colonialism and the role of Germany in Eliot’s fiction will be referred to throughout the chapter. The monograph on Italy is Andrew Thompson, *George Eliot and Italy: Literary, Cultural and Political Influences from Dante to the Risorgimento* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998).


17. From one of the rare essays that defend Will Ladislaw, especially against doubts pertaining to his masculinity, Gordon S. Haight’s “George Eliot’s ‘Eminent Failure,’ Will Ladislaw,” in *This Particular Web*, ed. Ian Adam (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 24.


20. For more on Russia’s suppression of the uprising, consult Nicholas Riasanovsky and Mark Steinberg’s *A History of Russia*, 7th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).


23. Mayhew, London Labour and the Poor, 421.


32. This information comes from John F. Kutolowski’s “Mid-Victorian Public Opinion, Polish Propaganda, and the Uprising of 1863,” Journal of British Studies 8 (1969): 86–110. Kutolowski does not discuss Middlemarch or suggest that Count Ladislas Zamoyski could have served as a model for Will Ladislaw; that inference is my own.


41. Ashton, The German Idea, 148. Eliot’s second major publication was also a translation of a German work, Ludwig Feuerbach’s The Essence of Christianity (1841), which came out in 1854.


45. Ashton, Introduction to *Selected Critical Writings*, xxv.
47. Beer, *Darwin’s Plots*, 140.
50. Spencer, *The Principles of Biology*, 456. To be fair to Spencer, although this hardly diminishes the impact of racial measurements in the nineteenth century, he relates jaw size to nutritional habits and goes on to write in the same footnote that “the Australian and Negro jaws are thus strongly contrasted, not with all British jaws, but only with the jaws of the civilized British.” Also, in a much later work, *Factors of Organic Evolution* (1886), he denounced the jaw/brain correlation.
51. These come from Wolff’s *Inventing Eastern Europe*; see p. 307 for Hegel, p. 315 for Herder, and p. 334 for Fichte.
52. Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe*, 342–43. Wolff claims that the attribution of the pamphlet’s authorship to Frederick the Great is erroneous, but I would add that it points to how well known Prussian hostility to Poland was at the time.
56. For a history of the novel’s compilation, see Jerome Beaty, *Middlemarch: From Notebook to Novel* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960). To be precise, Lydgate appears in *Middlemarch* prior to chapter 15, in chapters 11–13, but chapter 15 is one where the narrator “make[s] the new settler Lydgate better known” (132), and Eliot devotes the entirety of the chapter to his life story.
58. According to Paul Robert Magocsi, *Historical Atlas of East Central Europe* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 219,000 Jews lived in Warsaw by 1900, making up one-third (32.5 percent) of the city’s population.
62. In chapter 22 Klesmer is described as “not yet a Liszt” (238) and compared to Mendelssohn (240). Franz Liszt as the main inspiration for Eliot’s fashioning of Herr Klesmer has been well documented, especially in Gerlinde Röder-Bolton’s book, *George Eliot in Germany, 1854–55: “Cherished Memories”* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); see chapter 4, “Franz Liszt and His Circle.”
63. See Pinney’s “Another Note” for a review of these. Bernard Semmel might have been influenced by these arguments as well when he proposed the young

64. James, review of *Middlemarch*, 426.


66. It is important to keep in mind here that Liszt, being Hungarian and therefore Eastern European, was not, however, Slavic. The two categories are frequently conflated because the majority of Eastern Europe is Slavic. There are several exceptions, however: Hungary, Romania, Albania, and the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) have geographically and politically been considered Eastern European, but they are ethnically not Slavic.


68. Kovalevskaya visited Eliot one more time shortly before the latter’s death. The Russian scholar’s impressions of the English author were translated and published by Raymond Chapman and Eleanora Gottlieb under the title “A Russian View of George Eliot,” in *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 33 (1978): 348–65. Incidentally, in her account, Kovalevskaya reports being introduced to Spencer by Eliot as “a living refutation of your theory—a woman mathematician” (359).


76. Eliot, *Impressions of Theophrastus Such*, 161. The “Eastern Question” was the designation for the concern over the fate of South Slavic provinces in the Ottoman Empire, and it was used interchangeably with “the Slav(on)ic Question,” which I use in the title of chapter 3.

77. Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe*, 244.


79. For more on religious and national divisions in Eastern Europe, see Magocsi’s *Historical Atlas*; for Poland specifically, see p. 51.


83. Gates, “‘Dim lights and tangled circumstance,’” 144. My previous two references to Dorothea’s domestication in the Victorian decorum or mode are also inspired by Gates.

84. Gates, “‘Dim lights and tangled circumstance,’” 147.

85. Gates, “‘Dim lights and tangled circumstance,’” 152.
91. Eliot herself most likely did not realize the ethnic pun she was making when she described Ladislaw’s desire that Dorothea “should know that she had one slave in the world” in him (339).
94. In addition to appearing in the introduction to *Orientalism*, *Middlemarch* also belongs to Said’s list of English novels that participate in the imperial project, in *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993). Alicia Carroll argues that Eliot stands out as subversive among her contemporaries in *Dark Smiles: Race and Desire in George Eliot* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003). Nancy Henry’s book has been quoted earlier, and my discussion of Thornton Lewes’s Civil Service exam is partly informed by its second chapter, “‘Colleagues in Failure’: Emigration and the Lewes Boys.”

Chapter 2

6. Garland’s book (see n. 5 above) is considered the classic work on this segment of Fontane’s literary output, and my list of his Berlin novels mirrors his.
7. Thomas Mann, *Gesammelte Werke*, 12 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1960), 9:34. Mann’s more frequently cited comment on Fontane, one that is present in just about any article on *Effi Briest* or introduction to the novel, is that *Effi Briest* belongs among the six most significant novels ever written. See Thomas Mann, *Das essayistische Werk*, ed. Hans Bürgin (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag, 1968), 106.
12. Theodor Fontane, *Sämtliche Werke*, 24 vols. (Munich: Nymphenburg-er Verlagshandlung, 1959–1975), 7:222. Further references are to this edition (SW) and will be given by volume and page number in the text.

Regarding my assessment of Anna’s age, I base it on her son being eight in the beginning of the novel. Considering her young marriage, typical of Russian women at the time, and the assumption that she conceived shortly thereafter, also typical, I estimate that she is around twenty-seven.

26. Although *Fathers and Sons* is the more common English translation of Turgenev’s title, I use the literal translation here (from the Russian Отцы и деды), not only because it is more accurate, but also because it is more appropriate for the generational issues in Fontane’s novel. It should also be noted that Turgenev became known to Western Europeans earlier than Tolstoy or Dostoevsky because, unlike the two famous Slavophiles, Turgenev was a Western sympathizer and spent much of his life living abroad.

29. Craig, _Theodor Fontane_, 112.

30. See, e.g., Craig, _Theodor Fontane_, 187, though many scholarly works on _Effi Briest_ also point out this conversation as such.


32. Craig, _Theodor Fontane_, 113.

33. When his more liberal friend Oblonsky asks, “А слияние сословий?” (And what about the merging of the classes?), Levin answers, “Кому приятно сливаться—на здоровье, а мне противно” (Whoever likes merging—he is welcome to it, but to me it is disgusting) (PSS 18:179).

34. I use the years these works came out in book form for their publication dates. Each was serialized prior to that, _L’Adultera_ in _Nord und Süd_ in 1880 and _Cécile_ in _Universum_ in 1886.

35. In order to avoid confusion over the designations “Berlin novels” and “Berlin society novels” regarding Fontane’s literary output, Fontane’s first novel, _Vor dem Sturm_, is also his first Berlin novel and, as such, is the topic of the first chapter of Henry Garland’s _The Berlin Novels of Theodor Fontane_. This novel, however, as well as his second one, _Schach von Wuthenow_, belongs to the genre of historical novels. The Berlin society novels, on the other hand, are set in the contemporary Berlin of Fontane’s time. _L’Adultera_ is, therefore, Fontane’s third Berlin novel (and, concomitantly, it occupies the third chapter of Garland’s book) but his first Berlin society novel. Garland’s chapter on it opens with the following statement: “With _L’Adultera_ Fontane abandons the historical setting of the Napoleonic wars, transferring his attention to his own day and so beginning a series of social novels which has for its background the Berlin of Bismarck’s heyday and the first years of the young Emperor William II” (45).


41. Craig, _Theodor Fontane_, 190.

42. Chambers, _Changing Image_, 53.

43. It ought to be noted that for Fontane naming a novel after its heroine does not necessarily mean she is an adulteress. _Frau Jenny Treibel_, for example, _Mathilde Möhring_, and _Stine_ do not conform to that trend.

44. Röder-Bolton, _George Eliot in Germany_, 126.


48. Fontane’s grandfather’s decision is understandable given Prussia’s feud with France, especially after Napoleon humiliated the nation at Jena in 1806 (which, incidentally, is the theme of Fontane’s second novel, *Schach von Wuthenow*, usually translated in English as *A Man of Honor*).


62. Nance draws the contrast between Fontane as pro-Polish and Freytag as anti-Polish in *Literary and Cultural Images*.


67. Roswitha speaks a dialect, which highlights her subservient status. I use Hugh Rorrison and Helen Chambers’s translation of *Effi Briest* (London: Penguin, 2000) for rendering her speech in English.
Notes to Chapter 3


Chapter 3


8. In the last paragraph of chapter 39, part 2, volume 3, of the novel, Tolstoy describes the end of the battle of Borodino as “победа нравственная” (a moral victory) for Russia, a victory that “убеждает противника в нравственном превосходстве своего врача” (convince the opponent of the moral superiority of his enemy), and ends the chapter with “погибель Наполеоновской Франции, на которую в первый раз под Бородиным была наложена рука сильнейшего духом противника” (the destruction of Napoleonic France, upon which for the first time at Borodino the hand of an opponent mightier in spirit was laid) (PSS 11:265).

9. In her book *Unattainable Bride Russia: Gendering Nation, State, and Intelligentsia in Russian Intellectual Culture* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 2010), Ellen Rutten lists Natasha as one of the nineteenth-century literary heroines that embody the nation. Rutten also notes that Napoleon is described in the same novel as looking upon Moscow as a girl who has lost her virginity (presumably to him). But the most obvious example of the enormous role that the fictional Natasha Rostova has played in representing her nation shows in the title of Orlando Figes’s book on the cultural history of Russia: *Natasha’s Dance* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2002).


14. Tolstoy’s answer to Katkov’s objections was the following: “В последней главе не могу ничего тронуть. Яркий реализм, как вы говорите, есть единственное орудие, так как ни пафос, ни рассуждения я не могу употреблять. И это одно из мест, на котором стоит весь роман. Если оно важно, то всё важно” (In the last chapter I cannot touch anything. Vivid realism, as you say, is the only tool, such as neither pathos nor reflections could be. And that is one of the places on which the whole novel stands. If it is false, then everything is false) (emphasis Tolstoy’s) (*PSS* 62:139).


17. From a conference paper, titled “Ambiguous Harvest: the Tolstoyan Scythe as a Rhetorical Weapon,” delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies (ASEEES), November 20, 2010—which happened to be the centenary of Tolstoy’s death (new calendar)—on the panel “Imagining Peace, Engendering Strife: Russian Pastoral and Its Discontents.”


23. Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (*PSS*), 30 vols. (Petersburg: Nauka, 1972–90), 23:50, emphasis Dostoevsky’s. Further references are to this edition (*PSS*) and will be given by volume and page number in the text.

24. Tolstoy, in fact, names Paris Sodom twice in the same letter addressed (though not sent) to Turgenev from Geneva during the spring of 1857, after having just departed Paris: “Отлично я сделал, что уехал из этого содoma. Ради Бора, уезжайте куда-нибудь и вы” (I did very well to get away from that Sodom. For God’s sake get away somewhere yourself too); and: “Я прожил 1 ½ месяца в содоме, и у меня на душе уж много наросло грязи, и две девки, и гильотина, и праздность, и пошлость” (I spent 1 and a half months in Sodom, and there is
Notes to Chapter 3


25. See Milojković-Djurić, Panslavism, 105–11.

26. The title of Momo Kapor’s essay is “Serbia—Vronsky’s Last Love,” and it appears in his collection, A Guide to the Serbian Mentality (Belgrade: dereta, 2006). The essay takes the same naive approach to Russian and Serbian brotherhood that is so harshly criticized in the epilogue to Anna Karenina.


28. Matich, Erotic Utopia, 43.


30. Matich, Erotic Utopia, 43.


32. NOAB, 357.

33. NOAB, 1211–12.

34. For other biblical passages that mention the adulteress’s breasts, see Ezekiel 23:3, 8; and Hosea 2:2. In Tolstoy’s oeuvre, it is Hélène Bezukhova who is most frequently subjected to similar condemnatory rhetoric, as, for example, when her husband, Pierre, recalls how her own brother, Anatole, “целовал её в голые плечи” (used to kiss her naked shoulders) and she “позволяла целовать себя” (allowed herself to be kissed) (PSS 10:29), or when Natasha recalls, after a night at the opera, how the “голая с спокойною и гордою улыбкою Элен в восторге кричала браво” (naked Hélène, with a calm and proud smile, rapturously shouted “bravo”) (PSS 10:333).


36. Isaiah 47:3; NOAB, 1043.

37. Critics from Boris Eikhenbaum to Vladimir E. Alexandrov have read the parallels between Anna and Frou-Frou as intended by the author, especially given the similarity of language employed to describe Vronsky’s reaction to each “murder”: “бледный, с дрожащею нижнею челюстью” (pale, with shivering lower jaw) (PSS 18:157) with Anna and “бледный и с трясущею нижнею челюстью” (pale and with trembling lower jaw) (PSS 18:210) with Frou-Frou. I would like to add, however, that the reaction of Sergei Kasatsky, the future Father Sergei, to finding out that his fiancée had been the tsar’s mistress is almost identical: “Он вскошил и бледный как смерть, с трясучимися скулами, стоял перед нею” (He jumped up and pale as death, with trembling cheekbones, stood before her) (PSS 30:10). So is Vasily Kuragin’s in War and Peace, as Pierre
Bezukhov notices in the moment after his wealthy father’s death that Vasily, who was hoping for an inheritance, “был бледен и что нижняя челюсть его прыгала и тряслась, как в лихорадочной дрожи” (was pale and that his lower jaw twitched and trembled, as in a feverish shiver) (PSS 9:104).


40. Matich, Erotic Utopia, 43.

41. Regarding Tolstoy’s pacifism, this is another issue in which Anna Karenina occupies middle ground. Levin does not so much protest the war per se—though he acknowledges its horrors—as he does its being waged without official government sanction: “Да моя теория та: война, с одной стороны, есть такое животное, жестокое и ужасное дело, что ни один человек, не говорю уже христианин, не может лично взять на свою ответственность начало войны, а может только правительство, которое призвано к этому и приводится к войне неизбежно” (My theory is this: war is, on the one hand, such a beastly, cruel, and terrible thing that no man, to say nothing of a Christian, can personally take upon himself the responsibility of starting a war, but only a government, which is called to it and led into war unavoidably) (PSS 19:387).

42. Tolstoy was reading the complete works of the philosopher, and raving about him, at the end of the 1860s. See Eikhenabaum, Tolstoi in the Seventies, 145; and Orwin, Tolstoy’s Art and Thought, 150.

43. Eikhenbaum, Tolstoi in the Seventies, 146.

44. Viktor Shklovsky, Lev Tolstoy (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978), 436. For a more detailed review of the various interpretations of the epigraph, see Mandelker, Framing Anna Karenina, 44–47. Noteworthy also is Tolstoy’s statement, recorded by his wife, “что задача его сделать эту женщину только жалкой и не виноватой” (that his task was to make that woman only pitiable and not guilty) (PSS 20:577).

45. Cited in Eikhenbaum, Tolstoi in the Seventies, 145.

46. See Vladimir E. Alexandrov, Limits to Interpretation: The Meanings of “Anna Karenina” (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), 308 (fn. 3) and chapter 7 for more on the epigraph.

47. Alexandrov, Limits to Interpretation, 67, 69. The epigraph ought also to be considered in light of Anna’s suicidal motivation, which few scholars have done. As her relationship with Vronsky takes a downward turn, “death, as the sole means of renewing love for her in his heart, of punishing him and of gaining the victory in that fight which the evil spirit that had moved into her heart was waging with him, presented itself clearly and vividly to her” (PSS 19:331). Anna’s last words to Vronsky are, “You will regret this” (PSS 19:333), and a few chapters later she experiences “an uncertain anger and need for revenge” (PSS 19:341). Finally, as she considers which part of the train to jump under at the station, she thinks, “There, in the very middle, and I will punish him and escape for everyone and from myself” (PSS 19:348). Anna’s vengefulness is actually a toned-down version of the one wreaked by her real-life model, who left her
lover the following note: “You are my murderer. Be happy, if an assassin can be happy. If you like you can see my corpse on the rails at Yasenki.”


49. Hosea 1:2; NOAB, 1279.

50. Hosea 3:3; NOAB, 1282.

51. The phrase is Sofya Andreevna Tolstaya’s and is quoted here from Eikhenbaum, *Tolstoi in the Seventies*, 94.

52. For a review of the original serial publication dates in the *Russian Herald*, see William Mills Todd III’s article, “The Responsibilities of (Co-)Authorship: Notes on Revising the Serialized Version of *Anna Karenina*,” in *Freedom and Responsibility in Russian Literature: Essays in Honor of Robert Louis Jackson*, ed. Elizabeth Cheresh Allen and Gary Saul Morson (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1995), 159–69. As the dates show, regular monthly publication was interrupted each summer and fall.

53. In manuscript #88, for example, the naive Karenin thinks that Lydia is the only one compassionate toward him because she is the only true Christian among his friends (PSS 20:420).


56. The *svoi/chuzhoi* binary has become commonplace in Russian studies and is typically employed in discussions of Russia’s colonial past. For an excellent example, see Alexander Etkind’s article “Russkaia literatura, XIX vek: Roman vnutrennei kolonizatsii,” *Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie* 59 (2003): 103–24.

57. I am indebted for this insight, as well as a previous one regarding Mitya Levin’s recognition of *svoikh*, to Cathy Popkin, whose paper, “Occupy and Cultivate: Foreign Policy and Domestic Affairs (or The Case of *Anna Karenina*),” was presented and discussed at the University of Illinois Russian Reading Circle (*Kruzhok*), Urbana, November 10, 2005.

58. I wish to make a strong case for the specific translation I use for the opening line of the novel, one of the most famous opening lines in world literature. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, who are otherwise lauded for being literal, miss it with their rendition of “alike” for “похожи друг на друга,” as does Rosamund Bartlett in her more recent translation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). Marian Schwartz, however, publishing in the same year as Bartlett, gets it right—as did previously Aylmer and Louise Maude (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008) but not Constance Garnett—and here is, according to my humble opinion, why: “resemble one another” replicates the rhythm of the Russian “похожи друг на друга” to a syllable, while the repetitive sounds produced by “one another” mirror the repetitiveness of “друг на друга” and thus reinforce the very concept of resemblance.

60. Orwin points out the difference in meanings of Levin’s and Vronsky’s estate names. See Tolstoy’s Art and Thought, 182.

61. Morson, Anna Karenina in Our Time, 70.

62. The idea that Russia had two tsars, one on the throne and the other in Iasnaia Poliana, was wildly popular in the last decade of the author’s life, when he had become known worldwide as a great moral authority. The literary critic and publisher Aleksei Sergeevich Suvorin wrote in his diary in 1902, “Два царя у нас: Николай II и Лев Толстой. Кто из них сильнее? Николай II ничего не может сделать с Толстым, не может поколебать его трон, тогда как Толстой, несомненно, колеблет трон Николая и его династии” (We have two tsars: Nikolai II and Lev Tolstoy. Who among them is the more powerful? Nikolai II cannot do anything with Tolstoy, cannot shake up his throne, whereas Tolstoy, undoubtedly, shakes the throne of Nikolai and his dynasty). A. S. Suvorin, Dnevnik, ed. N. V. Potatueva (Moscow: Novosti, 1992), 316.
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1. Šenoa’s fifth novel was interrupted by the author’s early death, at the age of forty-three, and subsequently completed by Josip Eugen Tomić.


4. West, Black Lamb and Grey Falcon, 52.

5. One might take issue with this argument on forethought in Anna Karenina’s case, as her suicide is an act of jealous revenge, with her last words to Vronsky being “вы раскаетесь в этом” (you will regret this) (PSS 19:333), but that does not necessarily mean she has his death in mind, especially since it is living with regret that is its punishing aspect.
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10. The translation is taken from the bilingual Monumenta Serbocroatica (Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 1980), but I would like to suggest a more literal rendering of “srce ne iskali,” which has more cathartic connotations than “appease his anger”: “he did not release/empty his heart.”
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22. Unlike in Russian, the Croatian word *pravo* only means “right” as opposed to “wrong” or “not having rights/being disenfranchised”—the latter being the meaning that the party had in mind—and not “right” as opposed to “left,” though the latter would be apt in terms of the party’s political bent. The initial split between Pravaši and Narodnjaci, in fact, reemerged in the newly independent Croatia of the 1990s and is described by John Lampe as “the nationalism and liberalism that have survived to the present day in Croatia.” See John Lampe, *Yugoslavia as History: Twice there was a Country* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 60.

23. Seton-Watson, *German, Slav, and Magyar*, 89. The two bans who were in power during the writing and publication of *The Goldsmith’s Gold* both
came from the Union Party: Levin Rauch (1868–71) and Koloman Bedeković (1871–72).
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26. The Book of Judith mistakenly names the Assyrians as Israel’s national enemy of the time, which is one of the reasons it is considered apocryphal. The main reason is that it originates in the Greek Septuagint and does not appear in the Hebrew Bible.
27. Šicel, Hrvatska književnost, 81.
28. Rebecca West’s strong condemnation of the Ausgleich as a “very vulgar” love triangle is worth mentioning in relation to the theoretical framework of this study: “When the Dual Monarchy was framed to placate Hungary, the Croats were handed over to the Hungarians as their chattels. I do not know of any nastier act than this in history. It has a kind of lowness that is sometimes exhibited in the sexual affairs of very vulgar and shameless people: a man leaves his wife and induces a girl to become his mistress, then is reconciled to his wife and to please her exposes the girl to some public humiliation” (Black Lamb and Grey Falcon, 54).
29. Jelčić, August Šenoa, 22.
30. Antun Barac, August Šenoa (Zagreb: Narodna knjižnica, 1926), 55.
33. Lazarević, Sve će to narod pozlatiti, 131.
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8. Thomas Napierkowski, “Introduction to The Deluge,” in The Trilo-
though the essay primarily concerns, as its title indicates, the second novel of the Trilogy, the reference in the line quoted is to its first (“written ... in 1883”).

9. For more on this moral criticism—not unlike the one directed against Njegoš’s Mountain Wreath, discussed in the previous chapter—see Eile, Literature and Nationalism in Partitioned Poland, 115–16, 120–21.


11. http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/lau-
reates/1905/

12. The original statement of Sienkiewicz’s was made in French, in a letter to the French writer and critic Auguste Jean Boyer d’Agen, dated January 24, 1912, and published in Listy I, 99: “Il est incontestable que les persécutions dont souffrent les Polonais sous le joug de la Prusse et surtout sous le joug de la Russie, ont eu une influence considérable sur mes projets.” I came across it in a dissertation by Krzysztof Szymonik, “Romantic-Messianism in the Novels of Henryk Sienkiewicz” (University of Maryland, 1984), 288. The translation from the French is my own.


14. This was not only the case for Polish realism, but also for the realist move-
ment in Europe more generally. Bernard Semmel, in George Eliot and the Politics of National Inheritance, discusses how heavily George Eliot was influ-
enced by positivism.


16. Nikolai Berdiaev, “The Russian and the Polish Soul,” trans. Fr. S. Janos, 2009; ellipsis Berdiaev’s. This essay, first published in the newspaper Birzhevyte vedomosti under the title “Russia and Poland” in 1914 (October 10, no. 14610–14424), was reprinted in 1918 in the book The Fate of Russia, chapter 18. It is most easily accessible on the following website: http://www.berdiaev.com/berdiaev/berd_lib/1914_178.html

17. See John J. Pilch, “How We Redress Our Suffering: An Exercise in Actual-

18. NOAB, 441 [New Testament].


20. Sinead O’Connor has a song on her 1994 album, Universal Mother (an album “dedicated as a prayer from Ireland”), titled “Fire on Babylon.” It is the first song on the album and, in its reference to England, provides a strong con-
trast to the title of the album as a whole, which refers to Ireland.

21. My quotations from Sienkiewicz’s original Polish Quo Vadis come from the following online version: http://wolnelektury.pl/katalo-
g/lektura/quo-vadis.html, 2571, 2578. The numbers identify the paragraph as opposed to the page. Further references are to this edition, henceforth identified as QV, and are given by paragraph number in the text.

22. Walicki, Philosophy and Romantic Nationalism, 3 and 7, respectively.


24. See Eile, Literature and Nationalism in Partitioned Poland, 114, 115.
25. My information on the early church saints comes from the Catholic Encyclopedia. For Saint Lucina, see http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09410c.htm; for de Rossi, see http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04739c.htm.


27. The first two stanza’s of Blok’s lengthy poem are sufficient to convey his satire:

You have millions. We are numberless, numberless, numberless. Try doing battle with us! Yes, we are Scythians! Yes, Asiatics, with greedy eyes slanting!

For you, the centuries; for us, one hour. We, like obedient lackeys, have held up a shield dividing two embattled powers—The Mongol hordes and Europe!


32. Regarding Tolstoy’s abandonment of fiction for spiritual writings, an anonymous assessment in the American Dial of “Living Writers of Fiction” placed him in opposition to the rising Sienkiewicz in the following entertaining way: “Of the three or four great novelists that Russia has produced, Count Tolstoi alone is left, and from him there is little reason to expect any further work comparable with “War and Peace,” “Anna Karenina, “ or even with “The Cossacks.” The writer of almost first-rate fiction has become a producer of third-rate tracts, and literature mourns the defection. But the great Slavonic North has sent us of recent years, in the person of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the Polish novelist, a writer of fiction quite the equal of the Russian soldier turned pietist. His magnificent romantic trilogy devoted to the seventeenth-century wars of the Polish Commonwealth, and his subtle piece of psychological analysis called “Without Dogma,” are masterpieces in their respective kinds, and with them Polish literature renews the appeal to European attention first made by Mickiewicz half a century ago.” (16, no. 192 [June 16, 1894]: 352)

33. Eliot, Impressions of Theophrastus Such, 156.

34. Eliot, Impressions of Theophrastus Such, 147.

Conclusion


2. The juxtaposition is obvious in the title of Tolstoy’s letter, “Патриотизм или мир” (Patriotism or Peace), written in 1896 in response to the English jour-
nalist John Manson’s inquiry into Tolstoy’s position on the standoff between the United States and the United Kingdom over the Venezuelan crisis.

3. For an informative study on how both Hawthorne from the United States and Gogol from Russia built their national literatures in response to (Western) Europe, see Anne Lounsbery, Thin Culture, High Art: Gogol, Hawthorne, and Authorship in Nineteenth-Century Russia and America (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007).


7. Lawrence, Lady Chatterley’s Lover, 98, 254, 254, and 98, respectively.


10. Anderson, Introduction to Mapping the Nation, 8.

11. In 1991, when the poem was written, the war had not yet spread to Bosnia, where it began a year later. The Croatian town of Vukovar fell to the Serbian-dominated Yugoslav army in November 1991, which occasioned Ferida Duraković’s first war poem. The entire collection is titled, in homage to Joseph Conrad, Srce tame (The Heart of Darkness) and was translated into English by Amela Simić and Zoran Mutić (Fredonia, N.Y.: White Pine Press, 1998). The translation of the poem I use in the epigraph, however, is my own.

12. Another instance worth mentioning is a short recitation by the popular Serbian singer Đorđe Balašević, titled “Odjebi, JNA” (Fuck off, JNA). JNA is the acronym for Jugoslovenska narodna armija (the Yugoslav National Army), which led the fight against the seceding republics. Balašević’s statement, first made at a concert in Belgrade in 1992, the year in which the war spread from Croatia to Bosnia, was incredibly bold. He starts out by saying, “Dao sam ti jednu dobru godinu života” (I gave you one good year of my life), referring to the obligatory military service every Yugoslav male had to complete, which Balašević did, as his text reveals, in his nineteenth year. He goes on to say, “Ali . . . ja sam bar imao . . . 20-ty i 30-tye, za razliku od dečaka na čiji crno uokvirene fotografije svakodnevno nailazim na predzadnjim stranicama štampe” (But . . . I at least had . . . [my] twenties and thirties, unlike those boys whose black-framed photographs I come across every day on the second to last pages of the press). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KKWRyUTs7-w.

13. My reading of the possible political analogies for the beast is entirely influenced by the analysis of the poem performed by one of my doctoral advisees in her dissertation. The background information about the poem’s composition also comes from her. See chapter 2 in Kristine Kotecki, “After the Archive: Framing Cultural Memory in Ex-Yugoslav Collections” (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2013). Regarding the equation of “homeland” with “nation,” rather than the “state,” Kotecki points out that Duraković uses “homeland” as a synonym for “nation” by contrasting “homeland” to “state” in another poem (domovina and država in Bosnian). The world nacija can hardly measure up to domovina in the feelings of belonging and warmth that it evokes, and the
speakers of former Yugoslav languages, just like the Russians, are more likely to employ narod for “nation.”


16. From personal communication with the author I learned the following about her poem (I quote her e-mail in my own translation from Bosnian): “Because it was written then, the direct association is the Yugoslav National Army and the war in Yugoslavia and all that, but my reason was broader and higher (I remembered my own parents, who lost everything in World War II, and then other wars in the world at the time when ours broke out, Palestine, Vietnam, etc.)—I simply realized that ideologies raise boys so that they would die for them. Insofar every war is unjust. In that sense the poem relates to all the wars in the world, before and after ours. My stance in the poem is actually a civilian, powerless, politically unimportant, female perspective.” I find the last line of her explanation particularly enlightening regarding both the poem and my project because the female perspective assumes horrendous importance and power when utilized by men, whether it be the Hebrew prophets foretelling Israel’s demise for her unfaithfulness to God, Dostoevsky casting Russia in the role of the self-sacrificing mother of all Slavs, or contemporary world leaders and military commanders who keep “the deception of patriotism” alive.


18. Clarence A. Manning, trans., Taras Shevchenko, the Poet of Ukraine: Selected Poems (Jersey City, N.J.: Ukrainian National Association, 1945), 88. The English translation of the line from Shevchenko’s poem is also Manning’s.

