NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

THE DARK MIRROR

AMERICAN LITERARY RESPONSE TO RUSSIA, 1860 - 1917

Myler Wilkinson
Department of English
McGill University, Montréal
December, 1991.

A Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Ph.D.

ISBN 0-315-74628-9

ABSTRACT/SOMMAIRE

This thesis is an intercultural and intertextual study of the ways in which an American literary identity has emerged out of an intense imaginative and political dialogue with Russian culture. Early portions of this study trace the historical connections which have drawn American writers into the orbit of Russian literature and culture during the period, 1860-1917. A theoretical chapter attempts to explain the intensity of this dialogue on several related levels: the figural relationship between two literatures which constantly transform each other, the psychic experience of an *otherness* between individuals and cultures which leads to provisional patterns of literary identity, and the transformation of a purely literary dialogue into the realm of social praxis. The second half of the thesis examines the careers of three major American writers--Henry James, Willa Cather, and Sherwood Anderson--as each reads the figures of Russian literature against a native American tradition, and in the process incorporates this "other" literature into that tradition. A concluding chapter initiates a discussion of the ways in which literary influence is also bound up with the dialogue of politics and power.

Cette thèse est une étude interculturelle et intertextuelle sur la façon dont une identité littéraire américaine a émergé d'un dialogue imaginatif et politique avec la culture russe. Les premières portions de cette étude retrouve les rapports historiques qui ont mis les écrivains américains dans l'orbite de la littérature et la culture russes durant l'époque 1860-1917. Un chapitre théorique essaie d'expliquer, sur plusiers niveaux liés, l'intensité de ce dialogue: le rapport figuré entre les deux littératures qui se transforment constamment l'une l'autre, l'expérience psychique de "l'autre" entre les individus et les cultures qui amène des formes provisoires d'identité littéraire; et la transformation d'un dialogue purement littéraire dans le domaine de praxis sociale. La deuxième partie de cette thèse examine les carrières de trois écrivains américains majeurs--Henry James, Willa Cather, et Sherwood Anderson--comme chacun lit les figures de la littérature russe contre une tradition natale américaine et, en le faisant, incorpore cette "autre" littérature dans la tradition. Un chapitre final aborde une discussion des façons dont l'influence littéraire est aussi liée au dialogue de la politique et du pouvoir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Peter Ohlin, for his advice and critical guidance at each stage of the dissertation process, and to the other faculty members at McGill University who acted as project supervisors. Dr. Michael Bristol who directed my gaze toward the political dimensions of literature and Dr. Gary Wihl who taught me more than I was at first willing to admit about intellectual standards. I must also mention Professor David Stouck, of Simon Fraser University, whose literary judgement and human kindness I continue to depend on. The Social Sciences and Research Council of Canada generously provided a doctoral fellowship which allowed me to carry out postgraduate studies at McGill University. Cathy Fields made sense of an earlier manuscript version of this study and transcribed much of it onto computer. Hers was the kind of practical help which goes beyond thanks. Madame Hodges shared many rides to work and verified my French translations, both of which I am grateful for. To my extended family–Dorothy and Rundle Wilkinson, Lorraine and the late Walter Wlasoff–goes my deepest thanks for the emotional care and practical support which helped me to continue through years of research. Finally, thank you to Nathaniel, my son, for his patience with his father and his unerring insights into the mysterious workings of computers--may I be as much help to him when the time arrives.

For Linda, as always

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"Overcoming Long Held Emotions"

> I know some journalists and politicians who are already asking, who has won. This is an anachronism. What has won is common sense. . . . People want to know the truth about other people and build a universal brotherhood of cultures and people.
>
> (Mikhail Gorbachev
> American/Soviet Summit
> Washington, Dec. 8, 1987)

When this study on Russian/American literary relations was first envisaged, Mikhail Gorbachev had not yet come to power in the Soviet Union. The two super-powers were still locked in what seemed to be a continuance of cold-war mentality and policy of earlier decades. No one could have predicted the vast historical shifts which have taken place between East and West during the latter half of the 1980s and the early 1990s.[1] Whatever the underlying causes, or attitudes, the Russian and American people have started along a road which leads to increased contacts, dialogue and, hopefully, understanding.

The aim of this study is to take a place in that discussion, and, in addition, to make clear the profound literary/cultural ties which have existed between Russia and America since at least the mid-nineteenth century, even if that ongoing and important connection has been lost in the political rhetoric and policies of burgeoning super-powers. Both countries have something to learn from examining the historical depth of their shared literary pasts. A cultural *rapprochement* began between the writers of the two countries which preceded the current political *rapprochement* by at least a century.

[1] This sentence, written in the autumn of 1990, has taken on an historically portentous meaning during the last six months of 1991. In August, following a failed military coup directed against the policies of Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet Union was plunged into an accelerated social revolution. By late autumn, a new political order was beginning to emerge from the remains of the old Soviet system--a loose commonwealth of independent nationalist republics headed by Russia and Ukraine. As I write, on Christmas day 1991, Mikhail Gorbachev has announced his resignation as President of the now non-existent USSR, a victim of the revolution he himself helped to create. What final shape this revolution will take is still uncertain; what is clear is that an historical watershed has been reached between East and West, Russia and America, profoundly altering the views one can hold of the other, both politically and imaginatively.

It is perhaps significant that when the leaders of the two great world powers came together at the Washington Summit Meeting in late 1987, both men appealed to the poets of each nation. Mikhail Gorbachev spoke of the Summit as part of a process in "overcoming long held emotions and ingrained stereotypes," and then paraphrasing Emerson he went on to say that "'the reward of work is having done it' and now we must continue." In his turn, then-President Ronald Reagan found meaning in Tolstoy's observation that "'time and patience are the two most powerful workers,' and we need that in the future." Later, he spoke of Emerson's reflection that there is properly speaking "only biography" and said that the people of two nations had "made history today." In his own way, the President was appealing to something akin to Emerson's "over soul," a universal human consciousness held in common by both nations.

The needs of rhetoric will be served at critical historical moments, but that aside two world leaders in the late 1980s, when they groped toward imaginative understanding of one another, turned toward the writers of their two nations. The Soviet leader spoke for the citizens of many nations when he said that "people want to know the truth about other people." This study in Russian/American literary relations aligns itself with the idea that the time for "long held emotions" and "ingrained stereotypes" is past, that there is a shared literary "truth" or culture between American and Russian writers that many people want to know about.

This study, however, is not just a simplified story which contrasts literary "understanding" with cultural and political mystification, this would imply that there are literary "truth" claims which escape the dialectic of history. My argument is that there are only readings which make more, or less, sense of history and of literature, and further, that the sustained imaginative response of certain American writers to Russian literature has made "more" sense than the traditional political misreadings based not on contact and observation but on ignorance and projected fears. Writers such as Henry James, Willa Cather, and Sherwood Anderson have performed productive readings (and misreadings) of Russian literature, interpretations and transumptions of a "foreign" culture which have shaped the tradition of American literature in profound ways. In these writers, the typical understanding of the "otherness" of Russian culture,

has been transformed into a usable literary and cultural past. Traces of this otherness exist as part of an American literary identity.

In this reading of Russian/American literary relations I am following critical approaches as diverse as those put forward by Michel Foucault and Harold Bloom. In his meditation on "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," Foucault observes that "if interpretation were the slow exposure of the meaning hidden in an origin, then only metaphysics could interpret the development of humanity" (151). But Foucault goes on to say that interpretation is always an "appropriation" which imposes a new "direction" and bends to "a new will" our understanding of history. The "development of humanity is a series of interpretations," writes Foucault, and for him "the role of genealogy is to record its history: the history of morals, ideals and metaphysical concepts, the history of the concept of liberty or of the ascetic life, as they stand for the emergence of different interpretations, they must be made to appear as events on the stage of historical process" (151-52). Following from Foucault, the history of American literary response to Russia has its own genealogy, "concepts" of identity, "ideals" and "metaphysical" concepts, projections and figurations, which are interested and fit within the praxis of social history generally. A portion of this study will attempt to carefully explore this genealogy.

Dealing specifically with literature, the American critic Harold Bloom has subjected poetry itself to the wider cultural genealogy identified by Foucault. ". . . [A] poem is a dance of substitutions," Bloom writes, "a constant breaking-of-the-vessels, as one limitation undoes a representation, only to be restituted in its turn by a fresh representation. Every strong poem . . . has known implicitly . . . that every interpretation answers an earlier interpretation, and then must yield to a later one" (*Poetry and Repression* 26). Bloom's attempt to deal at the micro-level of inter-poetic relations (using his theory of misprision as the trace of psychic defence mechanisms) seems to me to have moved closer than have previous historical explanations toward an account of the ways in which both poets and poems are constructed within living historical moments. The theory of the anxiety of influence, as a necessary misreading of a previous poem's rhetorical authority, situates the individual author within a context which is both historical/intertextual and

personal Misreading as a defensive trope on prior meaning, becomes in Bloom's theory an explanation of why change should be inevitable and necessary within literary tradition, and in what forms it is likely to occur Bloom's insights into literary influence, its necessary figures and tropes which are projected onto a field of psychic desire, will be particularly important in the portions of this study devoted to individual writers For the moment, though, I want to step back in order to identify the perspective of the interpreter in the study which follows.

In his book, *Theory of the Avant Garde*, Peter Bürger has written that it would be a step forward in critical discussion "if it became a matter of course for every scholar and scientist to advance reasons for the choice of his topic and the problem to be dealt with" (3). I believe this is a question which should be answered by anyone attempting to reconstruct the genealogy of intercultural influence. Without necessarily sharing Bürger's political perspectives, one can also agree with his view that critical interpretation (or "science" as he calls it) is a "part of social praxis, however mediated it may be," that "it is not 'disinterested' but guided by interest". He writes:

> Not the view that makes the historian a passive recipient, but Dilthey's, who insists that "he who investigates history is the same that makes history," gains our assent. Whether they want to or not, historians and interpreters hold a position in the social disputes of their time. (6)

One assents to Bürger's methodological assumptions, his placement of the interpreter within the history (s)he interprets; one also admits that his view of the relation which exists between theory and practice is ethically defensible, as well as being a profoundly optimistic assessment of the critic's social function. Following from Bürger, part of my intention in this introductory chapter has been to advance "reasons" for the choice of topic, as well as to reflect on the "interests" which that choice implies. This is not *per se* a political study, or if it is, following from critics of a decentered misprision and a dialectic of figurality, trace, and absence, it is an argument for a potential unity in diversity, a polyphony of cultural voices, each dependent on the other for self-definition; the writers I have chosen to study recognized this intertextuality of Russian and American experience at an early stage. And if there is a positivistic aspect to this study, it is that the imaginative dialectic which has existed between American and Russian writers in the nineteenth and early

twentieth centuries may be a potential model for a more productive reading of both cultures than has existed in political and social cultures until very recently. The political/social aspect of this study is an argument in favour of shared cultural figurations which increase interdependence rather than lengthen the shadow of cultural isolation. In some respects the political cultures of Russia and the United States seem to have just begun the recognition of shared interdependencies which their writers have been aware of for many decades. And this is an understanding based not on timeless metaphysical and national "truths" but on creative readings and misreadings of the "other" culture, which can result in usable definitions of a national culture, literary and otherwise. The present writer is engaged in producing the very figurations which he examines in the shared literary histories of Russia and America.

The foregoing sets a critical tone or approach, but there is a much narrower literary perspective which will take up a significant portion of the study and focus on influence relations between specific writers.[2] The study breaks roughly into two major halves, the first being devoted to a theoretical discussion of literary influence and cultural reception as it relates to Russia and America, followed by a longer chapter which is historicist in character and examines the history of American awareness of Russian literature, and the impact that awareness has had. The second half of the study looks at three American writers, who found in Russian literature a usable tradition for their own artistic explorations. The chapter on James and the Beautiful Genius examines the seminal relationship which exists between Henry James and Ivan Turgenev,

[2] Given the historical importance of political relations between Russia and America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there has been surprisingly little investigation of the artistic dialogue which has existed between the two countries during the same time period. With the exception of a few scattered comments in recent articles and books (see E. P. Thompson's *The Heavy Dancers* and *Shared Destiny Fifty Years of Soviet American Relations*, edited by Mark Garrison) there has been virtually no sustained examination of interdependent cultural identities based on an experience of otherness. Perhaps the best overall cultural and literary examination of Russian and American interdependencies is Dorothy Brewster's *East-West Passage A Study in Literary Relations* (1954). But Brewster's work does not go beyond the source analysis, diachronic historicism, and aesthetic impressionism which is the ideological horizon of even the best scholarship of this earlier period. More specialized works such as Royal Gettmann's *Turgenev in England and America* (1941), Helen Muchnic's *Dostoevsky's English Reputation* (1969), and Dale E. Peterson's *The Clement Vision. Poetic Realism in Turgenev and James* (1975), all provide useful historical detail, but hardly speak to the figural reality of identity and otherness which is the methodological approach of the current study For that reason, my own exploration of intercultural dynamics owes most to theoreticians of figurality and otherness such as Harold Bloom., Paul de Man, Edward Said and, at an earlier date, Mikhail Bakhtin and Paul Valéry Drawing on these theorists, the following chapter attempts to locate the experience of Russian "otherness" within the political and psychic orbit of a repressed American "identity."

the chapter on Willa Cather and the Russians explores the wider scope of her response to Tolstoy and Turgenev; the chapter devoted to Sherwood Anderson and the grotesque attempts to reveal Anderson's debt to Dostoevsky A final postscript briefly looks at American literary response to Russian literature in the decades following W.W I and leading up to the wider political *rapprochement* of the 1980s and 1990s.

CHAPTER ONE

Figures of Literary Reception: Theory and Praxis

> No word comes easier or oftener to the critic's pen than the word *influence*, and no vaguer notion can be found among all the vague notions that compose the phantom armory of aesthetics. Yet there is nothing in the critical field that should be of greater philosophical interest or prove more rewarding to analysis than the progressive modification of one mind by the work of another. . . . Whether in science or the arts, if we look for the source of an achievement we can observe that *what a man does* either repeats or refutes *what someone else has done*--repeats it in other tones, refines or amplifies or simplifies it, but thereby assumes it and has invisibly used it. Opposites are born from opposites.
>
> We say that an author is original when we cannot trace the hidden transformations that others underwent in his mind; we mean to say that the dependence of *what he does* on *what others have done* is excessively complex and irregular. There are works in the likeness, and works that are the reverse of others, but there are also works of which the relation with earlier productions is so intricate that we become confused and attribute them to the direct intervention of the gods.
>
> (It would be necessary, in order to deepen this subject to speak also of the influence one mind has on itself, and of a work upon its author. But this is not the place.)
>
> When a work, or a complete oeuvre, acts on someone, not in all its qualities, but by certain ones only, then influence takes on the most remarkable values. The separate development of a quality of one author by the total power of another author rarely fails to result in *extreme originality*.
>
> (Paul Valéry, "*Lettre Sur Mallarmé*")

In the previous chapter I stated some of my critical, perhaps even ideological, presuppositions concerning literary/cultural relations between the United States and Russia. In the present chapter I want to establish some methodological and philosophical grounds for the study of literary/cultural relations and state as clearly as possible what this study is, and is not, about. American literary response to Russia is about influence (the specific relations which exist between individual writers), about reception (the reading of one culture's imaginative productions by *another*), and about intercultural reality (a form of contextuality which exists at the level of social or national identities, and is figural every bit as much as the texts upon which it is based) This study is not solely or even primarily about literary "source" scholarship, hard historical data

and textual analysis can be very important, even critical, in establishing a reason to begin thinking about influence, but it is only one of a complex set of relations which set in motion a pattern of intercultural influence As Harold Bloom has written, a writer may be said to have been influenced by another without ever having read that other (*Anxiety* 70) The passage of literary history, and its specific mode, influence, is not so narrow that it excludes a polyphony of voices sometimes at many direct removes from one another.

The argument of this study is that all the levels mentioned above impact on one another, from what might be termed the micro-level of one mind's impact on another, to the macro-level of cultural identities which depend for their very existence on the *difference* and *sameness* which is perceived between *self* and *other* Each level of analysis becomes a metaphor, or synecdoche, for the other. Historically, certain cultures have entered into highly charged and significant contextual relations with one another. There are political and economic reasons for these dramas, but there are also reasons of cultural and psychic desire. Edward Said has gone furthest in exploring the ambivalent cultural projections and transumptions which exist between East and West, and he has codified this transfiguration in the term, "Orientalism."

In several respects, my study will follow the very elegant lead provided in a book such as *Orientalism*, except that the present concentration will be on American response to that highly significant "other" known as Russia, whereas Said concentrates on the West's production of an exotic and controllable Orient, which is primarily Islamic. There will be more on this later in the chapter, and it is a highly political and polemical aspect of intercultural studies. But the present study is also, in the first instance, about the influence which one mind exerts on another as part of the larger web of cultural formation, this question is crucial for any understanding of how a human reality is created, and at the same time is one of the most difficult topics to speak about with any certainty. David Hume asked perhaps the hardest question concerning influence and causality back in the eighteenth century in his *Treatise of Human Nature* when he argued that "we can discover nothing other than the relations of contiguity and temporal succession. Insofar as 'causation' means more than contiguity and succession it is something that can never be demonstrated. When we say that one thing causes another, what we have in fact experienced is 'that like

objects have always been placed in like relations of contiguity and succession'" (Culler 87). Hume is arguing here for a radical indeterminacy of cause and effect, or of influence relations. The question that Hume set has been asked with increasing urgency right into the late twentieth century (and most recently by various deconstructive theorists from Derrida to Paul de Man), but has not received anything like a satisfactory answer--this kind of decentering of causality does not, in the words of one literary theorist, devolve into a simple "skeptical detachment" but leads to a clear recognition of "unwarrantable involvement, asserting the indispensability of causation while denying it any rigorous justificat. n" (Culler 88).

Paul Valéry in his classic *"Lettre Sur Mallarmé"* quoted as epigraph to this chapter stated the question of influence with something like its proper complexity, but he did not attempt to answer it. We still grapple with influence, "the progressive modification of one mind by another," as one of the most important but "vague notions in the phantom armory of aesthetics" (187). Our critical assumptions concerning influence evolve from the brilliant reflections of writers such as Valéry. We feel we know now that originality and tradition are two sides of a janus coin--that "*what a man does* either repeats or refutes what someone else has done--repeats it in other tones, refines or amplifies or simplifies it, but thereby assumes it and has invisibly used it" (188). We are not surprised by the dialectic of "opposites . . . born from opposites," nor do we quarrel with an originality which is imbedded in tradition and achieves "difference" only through the complexity and irregularity of its relationship to a usable past (See Bate 3-4). And in some ways we have gone beyond Valéry's reflections, have been influenced by him, and have moved from the realm of the individual and culture to the realm of language as the sign of culture. Valéry's psychic reading of influence has been transumed by recent theorists in a recognition that the formation of both individual and cultural identities are matters of figuration, transfiguration, mediation, projection and introjection. On one very important level, influence and cultural reception are about figuration as language, but these modes of potential reality are also about individuals who perceive themselves, and others, through the wandering medium of language, and about cultures which also create identities through similar figures of social (mis)understanding.

Some of Valéry's realizations concerning influence, though, have just begun to be explored. In terms of literary identity, he was one of the first to recognize that self was "other" to self--that any writer was constantly influenced by his "other" selves and his own works, which once written were dispersed into a freedom from determinacy or the authority of the author. This kind of recognition pre-figures the breakdown of self or "authorship" as central unities or structuring agents in late twentieth-century critical theory Contextuality and polyphonic influences extend even to the deconstructed identity of the self through which meanings flow, are deflected and transformed, on their ways to other cultural destinations.[1]

The remainder of this chapter will trace the dialectic of cultural figuration as portrayed in the work of three post-modern critical theorists of literary history and cultural influence. The three are. Harold Bloom, Paul de Man and Edward Said, and their ideas will act as a theoretical prologue to American literary identity in its relation to Russian "otherness." On the face of it no three current thinkers could be more different in their philosophical approaches. Bloom, the theorist of psychic desire and literary influence as a battlefield populated by the ghosts of literary forebears and the figures of belated latecomers, de Man, until recently the most authoritative spokesperson for a literary understanding based on rhetoric and figurality as opposed to willing "authors", and Said, the theorist of cultural and political dialectic, a student of Foucault and history based on "otherness," repression, and power relations inscribed in the textual fields of books and human beings. My argument will be that all of these thinkers have something important to say about intercultural influence and, in the language of the dialectic, each supersedes and preserves (carries traces

[1] The word "polyphony" has already come up several times in this study; it is an important word both in understanding the specific meaning of "otherness" which I try to develop throughout this work, and in terms of the wider process of cultural becoming as it is textured by literary influence. The concepts of polyphony and the dialogic of course come from the writings of the Russian theorist Mikhail Bakhtin, particularly *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* and *The Dialogic Imagination*. Bakhtin was perhaps the first twentieth-century theorist to fully recognize the inscription of many competing "unmerged" voices beneath the mask of self His concepts of the dialogic and polyphonic are early attempts to imagine a dialectic of otherness which exists on many levels. within the individual mind, within and through the voices inscribed in texts, and within the formation of cultural identity itself Bakhtin's dialogic novel is a text which embodies the process of influence, the formation and constant splitting of identity as new voices and ideas intrude on old forms In his theory of polyphony, Bakhtin seems to have understood that each new stage of identity carries within it the traces of otherness--that which has been apparently rejected or superseded but remains as a potent, if repressed, cultural reality. Bakhtin limits his dialogic perspective to the interior world of Dostoevsky's novels, but his ideas have much to say about the ways in which one literary culture develops usable identities through a dialectical relationship to the "otherness" of different literary cultures. This subject will be taken up at length in Chapter Five: "Anderson and Dostoevsky: The Form of Things Concealed."

of) the other in his critical approach. Bloom, who has written several books on the subject, has become the most prominent theorist of influence, but each writer whether concerned with subject-based literary desire, language-based figurality, or culture-based transumptions, has focused on the dance of substitutions, projections and introjections which make interpretation and knowledge possible.

Relying on his own prominent precursors, Freud and Nietzsche, Bloom has held in a complex way to the willing self, to desire as the ground of human consciousness. Bloom's vision of poetic tradition and influence between poets is not far different from Nietzsche's observation in *Beyond Good and Evil* that "life itself is *essentially* appropriation, injury, overpowering of what is alien and weaker; suppression, hardness, imposition of one's own forms, incorporation, and at least, at its mildest, exploitation . . ." (203). Out of this battleground emerged Bloom's own landmark contribution to the dialectic of imposition and appropriation in literary tradition. *The Anxiety of Influence* came out in 1973 and, as Bloom himself writes, seemed to "touch a universal nerve," causing consternation, giving "offense" and provoking extended critical debate. Bloom tells us that the "center of offense" seemed to derive from his insight "that no reader, however professional, or humble . . . or disinterested . . . or amiable, can describe his or her relationship to a prior text without taking up a stance no less tropological than that occupied by the text itself" (*Vessels* 30). Bloom here is talking of poetic misprision, perhaps the single most important concept raised in *The Anxiety of Influence*. Misprision or misreading (in all its forms--whether wilful or unconscious) is, according to Bloom, the one unavoidable given, and the motive power, in poetic history and for that matter human history as well. This stance derives from Bloom's critical belief that human reality is always a metaphorical construction willed into being by pragmatic personal and cultural needs. The poet misreads his precursors for two characteristic reasons according to Bloom. one, because it is unavoidable; all reading is in some sense a misreading, the transforming of one set of tropes into a personal interpretation which itself consists of tropes, and two, because each strong poet wishes to convince himself of the priority of his own metaphorical constructions, which amounts to a priority of both words and personal identity. This reality, which Bloom refers to as the poet's family romance (an inter-poetic struggle in which the latecomer has to

overcome the precursors to whom he owes most as poet), gives rise to an anxiety of influence. The model for this argument derives immediately from Freudian concepts of oedipal struggle and generational conflict.[2] Bloom writes that "we can never read a poet without reading the whole of his or her family romance as poet . True poetic history is the story of how poets as poets have suffered other poets, just as any 'true biography is the story of how anyone suffered his own family--or his own displacement of family into lovers and friends" (*Anxiety* 94) The poet seeks priority for his *Word*, the transcription of unmediated presence in himself, while at the same time he knows the impossibility of such a transcendence outside of temporality and tradition. In order to remain strong, to prevent his anxieties of belatedness from crippling him, the poet tells "a lie against time" (a misprision of his own poetic family history) through which he provisionally convinces himself of both personal authority and priority. For Bloom, the poet's lie against time is always and necessarily a lie told through defensive tropes, which correspond to formal symbolizing categories of the mind. Bloom identifies six categories, or revisionary ratios. They are. *clinamen*. a swerve away from prior meaning or a "corrective movement . . . which implies that the precursor . . . went accurately up to a certain point, but then should have swerved, precisely in the direction that the new poem moves" (14), (*clinamen*, the central category in Bloom's taxonomy of poetic revisionism, is closely related to the trope of irony); *tessera*: a fragment which completes prior meaning through antithesis, closely related to synecdoche, or part for whole; *kenosis*. fullness and emptiness, or metonymy; *daemonization*. a counter sublime closely related to hyperbole, *askesis*. the rhetorical trope of metaphor; and finally *apophrades*. a "return of the dead" in the voice of the living poet, so that the dead poet's "characteristic" work seems to have been written by the living poet (a ratio closely related to metalepsis or transumption) [15-16]. These ratios are, for Bloom, the inevitable modes of evasion, defense and misprision which the living poet will use in troping his predecessors, in establishing a difference and a personal myth of origins, what Bloom has

[2] As in so many other areas, Freud has offered seminal insights into the modes of psychic intertextuality, ideas which theorists such as Bloom have transformed into literary insights of their own. In the present context, which is primarily an exploration of cultural identity and otherness, see particularly Freud's papers. "Family Romances" and "The 'Uncanny ." The latter paper, in particular, revealing the "otherness" [*unheimliche*] which is concealed, but exists at the very heart of the known [*heimlich*], is particularly relevant to the intercultural argument of the present study.

called "the illusion of freedom" and "priority" (96). Out of this theoretical framework Bloom argues for a new approach to practical criticism. "Let us give up the failed enterprise of seeking to 'understand' any single poem as an entity in itself. Let us pursue instead the quest of learning to read any poem as its poet's deliberate misinterpretation, *as a poet*, of a precursor poem or of poetry in general. Know each poem by its *clinamen* and you will 'know' that poem in a way that will not purchase knowledge by the loss of the poem's power" (43). Bloom's insights into the relational, or contextual, nature of poems and poets have opened up new potentials for practical criticism. The method of this study, which extends intertextuality from the level of willing subject to the level of language, rhetoric and cultural figuration, owes much to his groundbreaking insights. My understanding of the ways in which writers as different as James, Cather and Anderson have responded to Russian literature draws on an awareness that "influence as a composite trope for poetic tradition, indeed for poetry itself, does away not only with the idea that there are poems-in-themselves, but also with the more stubborn idea that there are poets-in-themselves" (*Kaballah* 114). Like Hegel who understood the dialectic of history as an endless "becoming," Bloom understands literary history not as a static "category of being" but as a "*concept of happening*" (63).[1]

This is not to say, however, that Bloom's critical practice contains no "absences" of its own. His theoretical ratios for understanding poetic influence are powerful tools which he has not cared to extend to an analysis of the intertextual nature of historical culture. In addition, his theory of literary influence, based as it is on the Freudian oedipal struggle, says hardly anything at all about modes of influence which may escape the aggressive agon of male-dominated literary tradition. A growing number of feminist theorists on influence have argued that both the Freudian and Bloomian models are patriarchal and limited both historically and culturally by the exclusion of female voices from the discourse on tradition. Writers such

[1] On the concept of dialectical "becoming" see Carl J. Friedrich's "Introduction" to *The Philosophy of Hegel*: "... each stage in the forward movement of the mind negates the preceding stage, yet could not exist without its having that preceding stage to reject, it is built upon its antecedent. That which vanishes in the process must itself be looked upon as essential, yet not as something fixed which is cut off from what is true, as something outside.... What appears is the becoming and the passing away which itself does not become or pass away" (xxviii-xxix). For Hegel, "truth" is not a static concept, "a category of being," but a process which preserves within itself that which it negates or supersedes.

as Kolodny and Erkilla have suggested a different, less agonistic, model for literary influence based on their readings of relationships between female writers.[4] This feminist perspective, which I believe is an important counterweight to Bloom's theories, will play an important role in a later chapter devoted to Willa Cather and the Russians. Finally, Bloom has performed his own defensive manoeuvres in the polemic he has carried on with various post-modern theorists of rhetoric and language. Although he has clearly situated both poets and poems within a contextual field of literary tradition, Bloom has never been able to accept the priority of discourse, or language, over voice, or the willing human subject. For Bloom "influence remains subject-centered, a person-to-person relationship not to be reduced to the problematic of language" (*Map* 77). This strong psychological bias has a certain blindness to language as the expressive medium through which human beings know themselves. In this limited sense, language (as figurality) may well be prior to, or coincident with, human consciousness, although it is never perceived as such pragmatically.

Some of the most elegant meditations on this subject in recent years have come from Paul de Man. When one moves from Bloom to de Man, one shifts from the rhetoric of human desire to the rhetoric of figurality. In fact, de Man had relatively little to say about influence and tradition (his essays, "Literary History and Literary Modernity," and "The Rhetoric of Temporality" are notable exceptions to this rule). His relevance to this study, which focuses on inter-literary relations between Russia and America, lies primarily in his unparalleled reading of the structures of figurality which inform not only the dialectic of literary productions but human communication generally. In some important respects this structural approach to figural language as the bearer of human meaning is a corrective to Bloom's psychological theory of influence.

The difference between the theories of Bloom and de Man, as well as their points of underlying agreement, is seen most clearly in a brief review de Man wrote on *The Anxiety of Influence*. In that review de Man concentrates on the six revisionary ratios in *The Anxiety of Influence–clinamen, tessera, kenosis,*

[4] See Betsy Erkilla, "Dickinson and Rich: Toward A Theory of Female Poetic Influence", and Annette Kolodny, "Women Writers, Literary Historians and Martian Readers."

daemonization, askesis, apophrades--and reads them not as subject driven human desires, but as figural structures which determine the ways in which writers can conceive of themselves within tradition. The title *The Anxiety of Influence* de Man believes signifies an implicit "relapse into a psychological naturalism," and on the face of it Bloom's argument is a movement away "from a relationship between words and things, or words and words" and a "return to a relationship between subjects" spoken in "the agonistic language of anxiety, power, rivalry, and bad faith" (*Blindness and Insight* 271-72). But then de Man notices that there is an oddly self-contradictory tone to Bloom's book, as if quite another book were trying to emerge from the palimpsest of literary influence as oedipal struggle. Underneath this avowed subject, de Man reads a critical text which "deals with the difficulty or, rather, the impossibility of reading and, by inference, with the indeterminacy of literary meaning" (*Blindness* 273). For de Man, Bloom's "encounter between latecomer and precursor is a displaced version of the paradigmatic encounter between reader and text." Further, this encounter "*must* take place and . . . takes precedence over any other events, biographical or historical, in the poet's experience." De Man transumes Bloom's recognition that all literature is based on influence relations to say that all literature is intertextual--and this intertextuality implies a moment of "interpretation" which leads to Bloom's "main insight" that all interpretations bear within themselves an absence or misunderstanding which he has named "misprision," or misreading. From here de Man ignores the rhetoric of psychology in Bloom's text and concentrates instead on the structural pattern of misprisions, which de Man understands not as psychological defence mechanisms of the poet but as modes of rhetorical substitution. irony, metaphor, metonymy, metalepsis (Bloom himself takes up this taxonomy in his later book, *A Map of Misreading*). De Man closes his review of *The Anxiety of Influence* with his own significant questions concerning influence and literary history:

> What is achieved by thus translating back from a subject-centered vocabulary of intent and desire to a more linguistic terminology? If we admit that the term "influence" is itself a metaphor that dramatizes a linguistic structure into a diachronic narrative, then it follows that Bloom's categories of misreading not only operate between authors, but also between the various texts of a single author or, within a given text, between the different parts, down to each particular chapter, paragraph, sentence, and, finally, down to the interplay between literal and figurative meaning within a single word or grammatical sign. Whether this form of semantic tension can still on this

> level be called "influence" is far from certain, though it remains a suggestive line of thought. (*Blindness* 276)

This antithetical linguistic reading of "influence" has the effect of decentering the subject and throwing into question terms such as "cause, effect, center, and meaning." De Man himself opens up the potential for a polyphony of voices concerning literary influence when he recognizes that his own "linguistic" vocabulary does not take precedence over Bloom's psychological terminology. Resorting to a Hegelian vocabulary of his own, de Man writes, "the rhetorical terminology de-constructs thematic modes of discourse but it has no assertive power of its own. This assertive power (if it can still be called that) resides in the interplay between the various modes of error that constitute a literary text." My argument would be that these very "modes of error" are just what constitute the response of one literary culture to another, and guarantee the readability and transference of meanings between individuals and literary cultures.

Viewed from a distance, Bloom's debate with de Man is over humanistic versus linguistic grounds for the production of human meaning through misprision and substitution. This debate, like so many important ones, may finally be unresolvable, or undecidable, and may also come down to an ethical decision in the sense that de Man meant that term--that ethicity is inscribed within language as a categorical imperative; human beings are compelled to make a "referential" turn, and form value judgements of right and wrong out of language structures which always wander in figural "error" (*Allegories of Reading* 3/206).[5] In short, we know "truth" as a figuration and not as a transcendental reality. And yet we are all subject to a "moral imperative that strives to reconcile the internal, formal, private structures of literary language with their external, referential, and public effects." For de Man, the ethical is not grounded in a Kantian moral law but within the difference of language with its perpetual call on us to read, misread, and read again, and in those acts perform the error which is a necessity. make the referential turn which places our readings

[5] De Man's concept of the ethical imperative is a complex, and cryptically worded, argument which many critics have ignored in their desire to place his project wholly within a formalist, deconstructive pattern. Contrary to what many of those critics think, de Man was fully aware of both the ethical and political dimensions of figural language as it entered the world (and this awareness is made only more complex by the uncovering of de Man's Nazi connections in France during W.W. II). Two chapters in *Allegories of Reading* bear particularly on the ethical and figural. They are the "Introduction" and the essay on Rousseau entitled "Allegory (Julie)."

in he world and makes them ethical whether we wish it or not.

Following from this perspective, my own ethical prejudice, or closure, is not to lose the productive power of either critical approach by excluding one or the other entirely from the field of analysis. Rather, I prefer to think in terms of intertextuality, where the concepts human consciousness and linguistic structure do not become limiting or exclusionary terms. Exclusion always means loss, even if it is necessary for intellectual focus. In the sense that I want to use language, in the wide sense which includes all human interpretation and production of meaning, it does not limit a concept of the self; rather, it flows through and textures our very knowing of self. Similarly, Bloom's theories of influence, apparently arguing for a psychic locus of human desire and meaning, are deconstructed by the very figurality of the terms which Bloom uses to describe his ratios of influence--*clinamen, tessera, apophrades*. But Bloom's theory breaks back against the view of language as a machine which controls the emptied locus which we once knew as self or author. His constant argument is that we know ourselves not as the passive pawns of language, but as the active creators of meaning, as (human) beings who are influenced, who project and transume meanings. And Bloom himself seems to recognize this dialectic in a later book entitled *The Breaking of the Vessels* when he writes that "self and language alike *are* ironies, saying one thing or something, while meaning another or nothing," that what he is truly concerned with is the "lie of voice, where 'voice' is neither self nor language, but rather spark or *pneuma* . . . act made one with word. . ." (4).

For his part, de Man begins to move out of the formalism of purely linguistic, rhetorical analysis when he asks if we can "conceive of a literary history that would . . . account at the same time for the truth and the falsehood of the knowledge literature conveys about itself, distinguish rigorously between metaphorical and historical language, and account for literary modernity as well as its historicity" (*Blindness* 164). This is a "disquieting" task, he says, particularly if we see "that literary history could in fact be paradigmatic for history in general, since man himself, like literature, can be defined as an entity capable of putting his own mode of being into question" and if we understand "that the bases for historical knowledge are not empirical facts but written texts, even if these texts masquerade in the guise of wars or

revolutions" (165).

Taken together, the theories of Bloom and de Man are a tremendously productive "flowing through" of seemingly antithetical models for critical discourse concerning literary influence and literary history. The perspective of this study on how influence "happens" is that figurality is an inescapable mode of human consciousness, and that individuals know themselves as egos or desiring beings in and through figures. Both Bloom and de Man have recognized this truth from opposite ends of the dialectic. A synthesis might include both exclusionary terms in a more powerful understanding of literary reception. But as Hegel has taught us, the dialectic is an endless flowing through, or going beyond, with traces of the past inscribed in every potential future. Bloom and de Man lack (or knowingly bracket) one important perspective on the production of human meaning through influence relations, and that is the social/political reality which is inscribed both by human desire and desire as figural substitution. The approach of this study on American literary response to Russia is Bloomian: a psychic reading of individual writers who move beyond their own pasts by figurally transuming forebears, and it is de Manian insofar as it traces the ways in which language deconstructs itself and its own past, filling absence with new significations, but on the social level, this study follows theorists such as Edward Said and Michel Foucault who examine political structure and archival modes which limit, and make possible, what can be said or thought in any given period of history, social patterns of understanding which determine, for good or ill, the potential human realities we may inhabit, and human wills which constantly transfigure the relationship between perceived past and imagined future.

As a beginning to understand the ways in which figurality and substitution enter into cultural understandings of self and "other," I want to look more closely at the argument presented in Edward Said's *Orientalism*, a book which examines the ways in which the West has come to situate itself in relation to the projected "other" which is Islam (East). The misprisions and linguistic deferrals of Bloom and de Man are here employed on the level of cultural analysis, and the approaches of each of these literary theorists flow through one another, influence one another, and speak to the absences in one another's analyses of cultural

reception. The final section of this chapter will lead from Said's reading of the imaginative dialectic between East and West to specific reflections on American response to the "otherness" of Russian culture as expressed in its literature.

Said begins with the fundamental insight that the Orient has provided Western culture with "one of its deepest and most recurring, images of the Other," a place of darkness, mysticism, sensuality, and of absence which can be filled by a Western will to project its own fears and convince itself of its own right to power and control (*Orientalism* 1). Said's reading of a Western creation of a usable Orient is composed of both aesthetic imaginative elements and a political/economic will to cultural hegemony. He writes that "the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience" but adds that this same Orient "is an integral part of European *material* civilization and culture" (2). The discipline which developed into an observable "Orientalism" was a powerful set of practices, cultural and ideological discourses "with supporting institutions, vocabulary, scholarship, imagery, doctrines, even colonial bureaucracies and colonial styles" (2) which both created and guaranteed a usable image of the Orient in relation to a Western desire for cultural authority. Said's researches into this "other" Orient lead him to believe that there has been an "almost total absence in contemporary Western culture of the Orient as a genuinely felt and experienced force" (208). In Said's view, "the Orient is all absence, whereas one feels the Orientalist and what he says as presence; yet we must not forget that the Orientalist's presence is enabled by the Orient's effective absence." A dialectic of Occidental "presence" and Oriental "absence" is set up, though one should remember that the Orientalist's very presence is "enabled" or guaranteed by the Orient's "effective absence." The narrative which is developed has both aesthetic and political consequences, the Oriental "story" becoming a justificatory cultural mythology upon which political action can be based. We are given an Orient which is the result of Western desires to *substitute* and *displace* power both figurally and politically (although, even here, political praxis is a field of figuration which has real consequences for the human figures through which this language of domination is inscribed) [209]. And further, according to Said, Orientalism achieved such a powerful institutional presence in the West that

"no one writing, thinking, or acting on the Orient could do so without taking account of the limitations on thought and action imposed by Orientalism" (3). And out of this set of constraints (which Said bases on Foucault's conception of dor ' ıt cultural discourse as developed in books such as *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *Discipline ana . .h*[6]), which were also productive, Western and in particular European culture "gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self" (3). But this figural or imaginative dimension has an immediate impact on, and relationship to, praxis, in Said's view "ideas, cultures, and histories cannot seriously be understood or studied without their force, or more precisely their configurations of power, also being studied" (5). "The Orient was Orientalized," he writes, "not only because it was discovered to be 'Oriental . . . but also because it *could be*--that is, submitted to being--*made* Oriental" (5-6). The image of the Orient which emerged was governed not so much by empirical reality as by "a battery of desires, repressions, investments, and projections" (8). With this last insight Said moves very close on a political/cultural level to Bloom's theory of literary influence as psychic desire and Paul de Man's recognition of figurality and transumption as the governing forces behind human representations. Figurality, or misreading, applies to a variety of texts individual writers, language as human structure, and temporal/cultural identities. Said recognizes the force of language in cultural reception when he writes:

> In any instance of at least w itten language, there is no such thing as a delivered presence, but a *re-presence*, or representa .... [T]he written statement is a presence to the reader by virtue of its having excluded, displaced, made supererogatory any such *real thing* as "the Orient." Thus all of Orientalism stands forth and away from the Orient. that Orientalism makes sense at all depends more on the West than on the Orient, and this sense is directly indebted to various Western techniques of representation that make the Orient visible, clear, "there" in discourse about it. (21-22)

Here Said reveals just how dependent representations of "self" and "other" are on a dialectic of desired presence and willed absence. The very structures of language--absence, deferral, trace, figural projection--replicate, and are replicated by, human understanding of self, identity, and otherness. Nor does Said reduce this variant of cultural reception to "some nefarious 'Western' imperialist plot to hold down the 'Oriental

[6] Foucault discusses his concept of the cultural "archive" in *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. (London. Tavistock, 1972), especially: 127-31.

world", it is rather "a certain *will* or *intention* to understand, in some cases to control, manipulate, even to incorporate, what is a manifestly different (or alternative and novel) world. . ." (12). Said's reconstruction of Orientalism is a "discourse" which exists in "uneven interchange" with other structures of power from the political, intellectual, cultural, and moral spheres, and this heteroglossia of strata[7], with its internal, political constraints does not situate "culture" as a "demeaned" or secondary reality, rather, Said believes, we can better understand "hegemonic systems like culture [which include literature] when we realize that their internal constraints upon writers and thinkers were *productive*, not unilaterally inhibiting" (14).

Said's insights into the discourse he calls Orientalism have a great deal to say about the ways in which cultural identities are formed as textual narratives which involve "misreadings" of other "interested" cultures. In many respects, Russia, beginning in the nineteenth century and continuing on into the twentieth century, has become America's version of the Orient--that exotic and mysterious landscape of the mind which has been endlessly fascinating in its capacity to absorb America's own projected will to identity and power, as well as its national doubts and insecurities. There is, however, one important distinction to be made between Said's analysis of Orientalism and my interest in an American response to Russia. Said takes pains to specify a relationship in which the Orient was placed as a passive and silent partner into which could be read various European desires and fantasies. To a large extent this has been true of America's will to construct a Russian identity as well, but particularly in the post-revolutionary period, Russians have had at least a limited power to speak back against an American discourse of truth and freedom versus lies and darkness. This is to say, particularly on the social/political level, that the United States has had a more difficult and complex time in constructing a "Russia" which conforms to its own undeflected will to power--and only in the last few years does it appear that a new cultural discourse, which goes beyond the "dark empire," may have some potential for development between the two super-powers.

Said closes his introduction to *Orientalism* with two insights which I want to keep in mind throughout this study of American literary response to Russia. The first is his belief that "Orientalism offers

[7] Again, this term comes from Bakhtin. See particularly *The Dialogic Imagination*, 263-76.

a marvelous instance of the interrelations between society, history and textuality, moreover the cultural role played by the Orient in the West connects Orientalism with ideology, politics, and the logic of power, matters of relevance, I think, to the literary community" (24). Said's retrieval of a particular intercultural genealogy is "connected not only with Western conceptions and treatments of the Other but also with the singularly important role played by Western culture in what Vico called the world of nations" (24-25). And for Said, in this current world of nations, Western "cultural discourse" has been a dominant narrative, both a "danger" and a "temptation" for the inhabitants of the "colonized" other world(s). I believe that all of the foregoing can be applied with equal relevance to a study of Russian/American literary relations.

Secondly, Said moves his "Orient" close to the Orient of this study when he notes that "anyone resident in the West since the 1950s, particularly in the United States, will have lived through an era of extraordinary turbulence in the relations of East and West. No one will have failed to note how 'East' has always signified danger and threat during this period, even as it has meant the traditional Orient as well as Russia. . If the world has become immediately accessible to a Western citizen living in the electronic age, the Orient too has drawn nearer to him, and is now less a myth perhaps than a place crisscrossed by Western, especially American, interests" (26).

The world truly has become a place crisscrossed by interests conveyed with electronic speed and force, one of the most important geo-political interests I am aware of is the intertextuality which has existed between *Russ/America*[6] for the past 150 years. My study of Russian/American literary relations between the years 1860 - 1917 stands as a narrowly focused prologue to what one can only hope will be an ever increasing, and self-aware, intertextuality between the two nations. The final section of this theoretical introduction will be a brief recapitulation of the themes which are particularly relevant to an understanding of the productive "otherness" which Russian literature and culture have represented for Americans.

From the early nineteenth century, when Americans first began to realize historical parallels with

[6] This term comes from a long article in the *Mother Earth News* entitled "AmerRuss" (Winter 1986/87, 30-41) by Bob Fuller in which he imagines a united Russ/America.

Russian culture there has existed a significant contextual relationship between the two nations. Writing in 1938, Anna Babey recognized in her study *American's in Russia 1776-1917* that "American travellers to Russia reflected much of what characterized their background, local and national, their interests, predilections and prejudices. A trip abroad served as an expression of themselves. . ." (Brewster 80). America's own developments, whether in respect to Westward expansion, democratic institutions, education, emancipation of women, or the changing realities of capitalism "seemed to urge many Americans to look for the *presence or absence* [my italics] of such factors in Russia."

An American social observer as highly regarded as Henry Adams, writing at the end of the nineteenth century, clearly falls into a pattern of "Orientalism" as he attempts to come to grips with the projected "absence" which is Russia. "Russia is impenetrable," he says, "and any intelligent man will deal with her better, the less closely he knows her" (Brewster 133). In another letter rife with implicit will to authority, he writes that Russia and America are "the two future centres of power, and of the two, America must get there first. Some day, perhaps a century hence, Russia may swallow even her, but for my lifetime I think I'm safe." And in his clearest assertion of a dominant Western identity over Oriental obscurity, Adams writes to John Hays in 1901 that Russia "will need us more than we need her. . . . She is still metaphysical, religious, military, Byzantine, a sort of Mongol tribe, almost absolutely unable to think in Western lines" (135). One is reminded here of Edward Said's epigraph to his book *Orientalism*, which comes from Marx's "Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte". "They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented." Once again the East is projected as an obscurity, or absence, which must be narrated by a Western will to justify itself in relation to the "other."

A very different narrative is told by Mark Twain on his first visit to Russia in 1867. Along with other *Innocents Abroad*, Twain met the Emperor and Empress, was impressed with their characters, and believed in the potential for "genuine" friendship between Russia and America. When it came to the Grand Duchess Marie, then fourteen years of age, Twain reveals the kind of projection of desire which is so powerful because subconscious and based on the obscurities of personal psychology. As always with pretty

and charming girls of a certain age, Twain found Marie irresistible and even imagined her intervening with the Tsar to save a prisoner from exile in Siberia. Twain writes. "Many and many a time she might rule the autocrat of Russia, whose lightest word is law to seventy millions of human beings" (*Innocents* 260). So are private visions of history constructed. A more considered but no less dialectical view of Russia's relationship to America comes from T. S. Perry, the literary critic who was friend to Henry James and W. D Howells He theorizes that America, contrary to common belief, is intensely conservative and unlikely to radically change the basic structures or beliefs of the world. "These questions, it seems, will rather be decided by the Russians, who appear to be destined to take the place long held by the French. that, namely, of becoming the Greeks of modern times--in other words the people who shall carry out their ideas in action, who put their theories into practice. We are least of all a nation that lives on ideas" (*Evolution of the Snob* 177). Perry reverses the normal discourse on American identity based on a Russian "absence." In this dialectic, it is Russia who is the active partner, an actor and a "presence" on the world stage, while America is defined by an absence or passivity, a conservative immobility.

All three of the writers mentioned above exemplify the major point made by Said in his *Orientalism*. if one replaces the East in general with Russia in particular, it is true to say that Russia has provided American culture with one of its deepest and most recurring images of the "other"--that projected absence into which can be read a dialectical image of America's own national destiny.[9] Throughout the nineteenth and most of the twentieth century, the mutual fascination which has existed between these two nations has been expressed through images of antithesis. Russia becoming the dark other of America's own cultural self-definitions. Thus intercultural and intertextual dependency between America and Russia has

[9] From the Russian perspective, there are similar projections of cultural otherness onto the absence which is America. The social revolutionary, Alexander Herzen, writing in the 1860s, "believed that the Pacific Ocean would become the 'Mediterranean Sea of the future,' which Russia and America would jointly build" (Billington 380). As the cultural historian James Billington writes. "Russian radicals [of the 1850s and 60s] followed with romantic fascination the half-understood developments in the distant, continent-wide civilization [America], whose westward advance resembled the Russian eastward advance in so many respects. . . ." Billington concludes that in their identification with the image of America, many of the frustrated Russian radicals of the 1860s "compensated themselves with the vague and appealing idea that Russia . . . was a kind of America in the making." Again, one witnesses a process of figural projection which is powered by the will to cultural presence or identity.

most often been expressed through the rhetoric of opposition and ideological difference, and fostered as social mythology by the respective political/economic structures of each country. Following from theorists such as Bloom and de Man, we might speak of America's necessary misprision of the fact which is Russia. But I also want to argue that it has been the serious writers of American society who have been able to go beyond the simplifications of reductive social mythology toward a cultural interdependence based on a reading of the imaginative texts most basic to the Russian identity. Following in these writers' footsteps, I want to reflect on the pragmatic artistic bonds which have existed between the writers of the two countries. In the process I hope to reveal a common literary and cultural heritage which has been obscured by the rhetoric of difference and exclusion.

This contextual study of writers, and the cultures they emerge from, will be carried out on two levels. the figural or rhetorical, which are the tropes used to create a narrative of presence and absence--Russia imagined and even created by devices such as transfiguration, mediation, projection, introjection, transumption--the figures of (mis)reading recognized by both Paul de Man and Harold Bloom in their analyses of literature and literary influence, and the dimension of social praxis, which is the level on which this figuration is inscribed in the lives of human beings, becoming the images and beliefs upon which they act, and in turn are acted upon. As Edward Said has recognized, the contextual relationship between East and West has been controlled as much by "desires, repressions, investments, and projections" as by any empirical reality. My belief is that the study of cultural "repressions" which characterize America's relation to Russia gains a particular potency in writers such as James, Cather and Anderson because they were so clearly aware that the figural is also the real, that desire, projection, investment, transumption, define not only social reality but the act of imagining or narrating that reality.

The above writers found in Russian narratives of fictional identity a rich tropological field, figures expressed compellingly as human desire, and they transformed what they read and felt into their own art. This transformation, its specific modes and the richness of its effect on American literature generally, will be the subject of the second half of my study. For now, we turn to historical beginnings.

CHAPTER TWO

Historical Beginnings

"You Russians and We Americans"--Critics, Readers, Writers

> You Russians and we Americans! Our countries so distant, so unlike at first glance--such a difference in social and political conditions--and our respective methods of moral and practical development the last one hundred years--and yet in certain features, and vastest ones, so resembling each other. . . . the grand expanse of territorial limits and boundaries--the unformed and nebulous state of many things, not yet permanently settled, but agreed on all hands to be the preparations of an infinitely greater future. . . . the deathless aspirations at the inmost center of each great community, so vehement, so mysterious, so abysmic--are certainly features you Russians and we Americans possess in common. As my dearest dream is for an internationality of poems and poets, binding the lands of the earth closer than all treaties and diplomacy, as the purpose beneath the rest of my book is such hearty comradeship, for individuals to begin with, and for all nations of the earth as a result--how happy I should be to get the hearing and emotional contact of the great Russian peoples. To whom, now and here, I waft affectionate salutation from these shores, in America's name.
>
> (Walt Whitman,
> 1st Russian Edition
> *Leaves of Grass*, 1880)

Whitman was not the first American writer of rank to note the potentially related destinies of America and Russia, but no one before or since has expressed more warmly the dream of a shared international republic of the imagination. By the time Whitman wrote his address to the Russian people, 1880, America had already moved beyond its first sustained impressions and examination of Russian culture. That first period can be roughly dated from the early 1860s and the American Civil War.[1] During this period, a time when the freeing of the slaves in America coincided with the emancipation of serfs in Russia (1861-1865), a great deal of sympathy and curiosity was aroused amongst Americans concerning Russian culture. This was true especially of the American North, for obvious reasons (the slavery issue was seen as analogous to the question of serfdom).

[1] I have found Dorothy Brewster's book, *East-West Passage A Study in Literary Relationships* (London. Allen & Unwin, 1954), particularly helpful in my portrayal of early cultural relations between the United States and Russia.

When Whitman wrote his address to the Russians, he was, as is usual for this visionary poet, virtually alone in his ideas. By the 1880s Americans were stressing differences not similarities between the two great provincial powers--depending on what one read those differences could be either quaint and fascinating, or obscure and terrifying. Whitman's was a lone American voice stressing likeness, linked destinies, potential friendship, and perhaps most importantly the need for increased contact and communication. As with many other prophetic voices, wise or foolish, Whitman's insistence on linked destinies between the two emerging powers was heard by very few. His vision, emotionally high pitched though it was, had a basis in extended reflection and personal study. In the view of at least one early editor, the poet's interest in Russia and its potential influence on America marks "a fascinating unwritten chapter in the dawning of Whitman's inclusive international consciousness" (Brewster 116). Whitman's notes in the Ms. Division of the Library of Congress bear this out: the notes include a detailed geographic study of Russia, information about different races in the country, data on trade, education and society, and Whitman's own thoughts on how Russian society might be improved. Whitman was ahead of his time in his international outlook, and overly optimistic in his vision of Russia's immediate future ("The serfs have been freed," he wrote, "and now trade, intercommunication with the world is all that is needed" (Brewster 117)), but in his call for international communication he now seems amazingly prescient. His hope for an "internationality of poems and poets" which would bind "the lands of the earth closer than all treaties and diplomacy" is, in reality, a dream of a shared international republic of the imagination, a recognition of the need for creative interdependence between cultures (perhaps even as the basis for political judgement). In his own way, Whitman recognizes a "truth" that I attempted to argue for in the previous chapter--that human reality is created in the figural, and we may as well recognize that even the political/economic domains depend on the realm of poetry and imagination. Because Whitman's dream of poetic internationality has not been realized in any obvious way is no reason to reject it as illusory. The argument of this study is, in fact, that writers such as James, Cather, and Anderson, as they moved into the imaginative world of the Russians, did become part of an "internationality of poems and poets." And further, that internationality,

based on pragmatic literary debts, and gifts, became a "scene of instruction" (Bloom, *Map* 59) which may be an important model for inter-national understanding generally. Not all American writers, earlier or later, responded to the mystery of Russia with Whitman's generosity or wisdom. To those other writers we now turn.

The history of nineteenth-century literary relations between America and Russia can be broken into roughly four periods: 1.) The earliest beginnings, prior to the Civil War, when only the sketchiest information about Russian literature was coming out of the country; 2.) The Civil War period, when historical and political links led to increased interest in literature as an imaginative portrait of Russian society; 3.) The *Atlantic Monthly* period (1870s), which marks the first sustained aesthetic response in America to Russian literature (signalled by writers such as W. D. Howells, T. S. Perry and Henry James); and 4.) The period of the Russian Craze (1885-1900), which begins with the internationalism of Tolstoy, and extends at a slightly later date to the surreal fictional landscapes of Dostoevsky. These phases in the early American response to Russian literature will be dealt with in turn in the remainder of the chapter.

Beginnings

The earliest dawn of Russian/American cultural relations begins not with literature but with diplomacy. Within four years of the American Revolution, the Continental Congress commissioned a young patriot from Massachusetts to be the first Minister to Russia. Francis Dana was sent to convince the Empress Catherine the Great that the newly formed United States should be recognized as an independent republic (Babey 3). In a small irony of history, Catherine, ever the liberal autocrat, refused to recognize the American colonies, neglected to receive Dana and firmly rejected any recognition of the American "revolutionists." Francis Dana was not the man to convince the Russian autocracy of the value of a revolutionary state, but in 1781 Dana hired as his personal secretary and French interpreter a fourteen year old man/child named John Quincy Adams who, 28 years later did become America's first Minister to Russia and later the sixth

President of the United States.

While diplomatic relations between the two countries began to flourish, American knowledge of, and interest in, Russian literature remained at a rudimentary level for several decades to come. As serious English interest in Russian culture began with British involvement in the Crimean War (1854) so, too, with America it took a vast political event, the Civil War (1862-1864), to spark investigation of the cultural and social realities of the Russian enigma. The word "enigma" is used pointedly here, the great Russian writers of the Golden Age of Russian literature--Lermontov, Pushkin, and Gogol--had all finished their work by 1850. Yet as late as 1887, Mathew Arnold could write that "the Russians have not yet had a great poet" (Brewster 45). By 1855 Turgenev had published perhaps his single most beautiful work, *A Sportsman's Notebook*, Dostoevsky had written his first novel, *Poor Folk*, and Tolstoy had published *Childhood* and *Youth*, volumes one and two of his autobiographical first novel. Yet Russia remained, in Britain and in America, a cultural enigma, its steppes wrapped in an imaginative mist, its vast depths a repository for the wildest myths and projections of cultural uncertainty. As Dorothy Brewster puts it in her seminal study *East-West Passage*, the Russia which the average American imagined in the first five decades of the nineteenth century was still a surreal wilderness where "the cold and the wolves have the traditionally undue emphasis, travellers are pursued by large packs, and the unnatural mother once more throws her children to the wolves, and goes insane. . . " (50). In all this, one sees a projection of "otherness," of Western presence versus Eastern "absence," which is a variant of the "Orientalism" portrayed by Edward Said in his book of the same name. Amidst these unreal projections, which may stand as psychological analogues to certain Cold War attitudes of the twentieth century, the first stirrings of real interest in the Russian imagination began to be felt in America. Brewster notes that a Philadelphia magazine, *The National Gazette and Literary Register*, has a disputed claim to having discovered Russian poetry for the English-speaking world in 1821 (46 ff). That claim rests on a very slim footing: a few lines of long forgotten poetry by a Neledinski-Meletski, a writer of sentimental folk songs, translated by W. D. Lewis from the original Russian. Although first in the field, the American effort really can't stand up to Sir John Bowering's

Specimens of the Russian Poets (1821), in which translations from historically significant writers such as Derzhavin, Karamzin, Lomonosov, Zhukovsky, and Krilov appear. Over the next two decades books and articles by Americans about Russian literary culture are few and far between. In 1827, a review of *Russian Tales* from a French translation by Xavier de Maistre, appears in the *North American Review*. The reviewer is probably Edward Everett, and he praises the stories as "a faithful description of Russian manners." A year earlier in October, 1826, the same *North American Review* turned the tables on American readers and published the account of a Russian who travelled and lived in the United States for a number of years. Americans found that their country suffered from "a certain lack of cleanliness, chiefly in taverns and inns, and more noticeable in the south than in the north" (47). Southern society, though dirtier, is more refined than elsewhere, and that sadly because of the slavery which supports that refinement. The Russian observer is disturbed over the lack of an organized police system, and wonders about the weakness of executive powers in a republic, as well as a lack of financial incentive to enter public life. One sees that Americans were not the only ones to understand the institutions and culture of a foreign land through the restrictive vision of the place from whence they came. This time it is the Russian observer who projects his own discourse of cultural "truth" on the absence which is America.

With the advent of the Crimean War in 1854, the joint invasion of Southern Russia by Britain and France suddenly focused the political attention of Europe. Some of this attention spilled over into the pages of American journals. The *North American Review*, in 1856, briefly reviews seven recent books on the subject of Russia. Most of these books the anonymous reviewer dismisses as expressly written to defame Russia's role in the Crimean War (Brewster 48-49). But it appears that this reviewer may have a firmer grasp of the cultural realities of Russia than do the books which s/he reviews. S/he begins to discuss serfdom in Russia and describes how historically a free people had been slowly and by degrees reduced to possessions of an aristocracy. S/he rejects the argument that either American slaves or Russian serfs, because they are happy in their bondage, should remain there. All this proves, s/he says, is the degradation which attends human subjugation. In an effort to draw out the shifting tide of ideas and sentiment

surrounding Russian serfdom, the reviewer then turns to a literary source. Ivan Turgenev and his *A Sportsman's Notebook*. A long excerpt is printed from a German translation, and is taken from Turgenev's story "Lvov," in which an unnamed narrator (a mask for Turgenev himself) stops to talk with a serf, subtly, almost without noticing it, the reader is drawn through the realm of art into the living conditions and social reality of a Russian serf. One gains an historical picture of the social and human costs of serfdom, and all of this is told without proselytizing, through the attitudes of the serf, Lvov. The reviewer is impressed with both the artistry and the social awareness of Turgenev. The sketches, s/he says, come from "a masterly hand and bear the stamp of truth"; Turgenev creates "a series of pictures of Russian country life of an incomparably graphic genuineness" (49). Both Turgenev and his uncle Nicholas, also a writer, are described as "unexceptionable witnesses" to the corrupting power of serfdom within the totality of Russian society. This American translation of a German translation marks the first serious Russian fiction to come in front of an American audience, and significantly it is a response which moves from the literary to the political and back again. Unfortunately this anonymous reviewer stands somewhat removed from his/her countrymen, for not until twenty-nine years later in 1885 did a full American translation of *A Sportsman's Notebook* appear. And even then the best American responses to Turgenev (written by Howells, James, and T. S. Perry) confined themselves almost exclusively to questions of aesthetics and artistic form to the exclusion of Turgenev's profound vision of the social responsibility of the artist. The first reviewer was also in some ways the most prescient. S/he saw at the beginning that Turgenev was not only the "artist's artist" but saw himself as a citizen poet who spoke out of the political realities of his time. That vision in America's cultural/literary understanding of Russia was lost for almost thirty years before it was recovered in the American discovery of Tolstoy.

Civil War Period to 1870

In the summer of 1863 an apparition appeared in New York city harbour. at the height of the American Civil War the Russian Imperial fleet sailed into the port of America's largest city. Some legend surrounds this visit. It is said that the Russian government was acting in support of the Northern cause, at the very least was there to offer "moral support" to the abolitionist side. History shrouds political intent in this instance, Russia, herself, was experiencing a Polish insurrection at this time, and she may have simply been seeking political allies and open water in the event of either French or British intervention in her affairs.

A young American just graduated from Columbia Law School, a man of real literary and future diplomatic ability, made the acquaintance of several officers of the Russian flagship. His name was Eugene Schuyler, and he felt an immediate kinship with the Russians. We are told by his relative, Evelyn, in the introduction to Schuyler's memoirs that the opportunity to learn a new language was too great to be resisted (*Memoirs* 20). Schuyler became the pupil of a priest in the Greek Orthodox Church and proved himself a remarkable student--so remarkable, in fact, that within three years he was able to translate Ivan Turgenev's great novel *Fathers and Sons* (1861) into English. The book was published in 1867, the same year Schuyler became American consul at Moscow, and the translation became a landmark event in the American response to Russian literature. it was, in fact, the first complete English translation of a major novel by a Russian writer. By the time he had completed work on *Fathers and Sons*, Schuyler had already made contact with the novelist himself, and Turgenev had blessed Schuyler's undertaking. Schuyler was in many ways a remarkable man, one of those bearers of cultural sanity who happily appear at moments in history which otherwise seem in many respects inimical to imaginative understanding between nations. Asked to edit a translation of the *Kalevala*, that saga of Europe's far North, Schuyler taught himself the Finnish language (*Memoirs* 20); in later years he went on to a distinguished career in Slavic diplomacy and was recognized as an authority on Russian affairs. In 1867, on his way to his Moscow post, Schuyler stopped in Baden to

meet personally with Turgenev, and the writer gave him a letter of *entrée* to the house of Prince Odoievsky, the last surviving member of the descendants of Rurik. Into this house Schuyler was welcomed due to his connection with Turgenev, and it was here that he first met Leo Tolstoy (*Memoirs* 208). A first meeting turned into an acquaintanceship, and this turned into a warm and lasting friendship. (Schuyler was also the first American to translate a fictional work by Tolstoy. *The Cossacks* was published in America in 1878). Years later Schuyler wrote an important early essay in English on Tolstoy, the man and the artist. "Count Leo Tolstoy Twenty Years Ago" published in *Scribner's* magazine in 1889 introduced many American readers to Tolstoy's art and his ethical/social vision. And it was that social vision, and only to a lesser extent the novels, which had such a deep impact on American social thinkers of the 1890s.

Schuyler visited Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana several times (*Memoirs* 274), and his essay describes not only the life of the estate, but also touches upon Tolstoy's novels (particularly the background to *War and Peace* and the personalities of *Anna Karenina*), on his educational theories, as well as on the complex and volatile relationship which existed between Tolstoy and Turgenev. Schuyler is a refreshingly accurate guide through the Byzantine literary relationship which existed between Russia's two great writers in the period 1860-1880. But Schuyler's critical work on Tolstoy lies in the future. In July, 1867, as Schuyler set out for Moscow, a first review of his translation of *Fathers and Sons* appeared in the *North American Review*. In at least one important respect, this review set a tone for almost all American criticism of Russian literature through the 1870s. the reviewer, and editor of the *Review*, Charles Eliot Norton, saw Turgenev's aesthetic mastery and chose to concentrate on it to the exclusion of Turgenev's social/political themes in the novel (see Brewster 88 ff). Nihilism, and the new Russian positivists of the 1860s, were not yet terms or realities in the American vocabulary. Just come out of their own internal Civil War, men like Norton and later W. D. Howells, T. S. Perry and Henry James preferred to map the formal, aesthetic territory of the new novel which they credited Turgenev with creating. In the Norton review there is a positive shying away from any recognition that characters in a novel may, like human beings, act as members of a political or social group and still remain psychologically complex. Perhaps foreshadowing a much later American

fear of the Russian collective mind, Norton is concerned that the desire to portray social types mars the development of individual characters in the novel. Norton recognizes the social/psychological clash between fathers and sons--the romantic dreamers of 1840s and the new men of the 1860s, the scientific and social radicals--but this very struggle between types lessens the novel's impact. Norton also recognizes that *Fathers and Sons* is a novel of ideas, but he is not interested enough to reflect on the relationship between those ideas and the state of Russian society, or why Turgenev should have written a novel in which individual lives are examined in the context of a particular historical moment, that of Russia in the 1860s, and the growing radicalization of the younger intelligentsia. One is not really surprised by Norton's inability to follow Turgenev in his exploration of individuals shaped by the political pressures and ideologies of their times. American literary critics of the 1870s were simply unaware of the long cultural tradition in Russia which demanded "ideas" and social commitment from its writers. Turgenev was responding to what he called the "body and pressure of time" (Lowe 82), and what he thought of as an artistic responsibility to explore the vast historical shifts which were beginning to take place in his country. Unfortunately, other American critics followed Norton in his incomprehension regarding both artistic and political realities in Russia during the last 25 years of the nineteenth century. In the case of Turgenev, and early American criticism, one is left with the unmistakable impression that the critic simply was not equal to the task of understanding the complexity and commitment of the writer--thus was the first English translation of a major Russian novel received in America.

One must remember that at this stage, in the late 1860s, there was nothing like what Royal Gettmann has described as a Russian "craze" in America (110).[2] Only a select group of writers and critics, most of them associated with an Eastern establishment, were seriously reading and commenting on Turgenev. But Turgenev had found an audience in the United States. No less than 16 translations, six of them books, appear between 1867 and 1873 (Brewster 89-90). *Smoke* is translated in 1872, and *Rudin* finds

[2] Gettmann's book, *Turgenev in England and America* (Urbana. University of Illinois Press, 1941), is an invaluable source study for early American literary response to the novels of Turgenev. I have drawn on his historical research, particularly in the section of this chapter which deals with the *Atlantic Monthly* group.

a translator in T. S. Perry by 1873 (he later translated *Virgin Soil* in 1877). Even the more popular magazines became interested in the Slavic mystery. *Lippincott's* published "Mumu," Turgenev's powerful story of a deaf and dumb serf (who again stands for an entire system which demands deafness and dumbness, a society based on the systematic subjugation of the majority of its people), as well as pieces by Pushkin, Griboyedov (author of one of Russia's great satirical dramas, *Woe From Wit*), and Tolstoy. In the same magazine for May, 1871, A. C. Dillman surveys the known world of Russian literature for Americans. He discovers one element which goes on to become a commonplace for many decades in American criticism. the Russian writers are dark and melancholic, they paint life in sombre hues, they are unfair to the sunnier aspects of human existence. In much of this criticism there are the moral remnants of a New England provincialism. It was an attitude which would adversely affect even Henry James' view of the Russians for many years, even as he learned from them, and particularly Turgenev, what the limits of the new dramatic novel could be. To go back to Dillman's overview. he is unsure why the removal of serfdom has not also swept away the black dog of the Russian psyche. In Pushkin there is a "Byronic misanthropy" which is typical of the Russian character, and Lermontov, coming slightly later, suffers even a greater melancholy. Only Turgenev is an "idealist" without a trace of the "polemical tendency" which might "imperil the originality of the poetical impression," and even Turgenev paints a dark picture of his native country (Brewster 90). Dillman concludes that there are dark times in Russia, and darker days ahead populated by nihilists, "iconoclasts and conspirators" and their "detestable doctrines" (91). Like Charles Eliot Norton earlier, Dillman feels the social pressure in Turgenev's novels, but he does not attempt to understand its causes, or why Turgenev should occupy himself with such issues. At best he can say that honest Russian writers cannot deal with the beautiful (the true aim of all ideal art) until the anarchy and misery of Russian culture is overcome. Until then the true writer, even against his artistic instincts, must "accuse" the destroyers of civilization. In this separation of "ideal" art from the political reality of the society in which the artist lives, Dillman points the way to the very influential group of critics who began to populate the pages of the *Atlantic Monthly* through the 1870s.

The Atlantic Monthly Group

W. D. Howells, T. S. Perry, Henry James

> To know what is going on and what is going to go on, one must look toward Russia, the writers of that country make their contemporaries elsewhere look like a very artificial, ungenuine lot. . . .
>
> (T. S. Perry, letter to John Morse, 1905)

A remarkable group of young men came together at the very beginning of the 1870s at the *Atlantic Monthly* magazine in Boston; together, out of their discussions and writing, they set a theoretical agenda for the novel, which they themselves could use. The central members of the group were W. D. Howells, who came to the magazine from the Midwest in 1866, and by 1871 was in a position to determine overall editorial policy; Thomas Sergeant Perry, who became the chief reviewer of foreign books in 1871, and Henry James who was at the beginning of his career as critic and novelist. Deeply read in the continental literature, especially the English didacticism and what was known as French paganism, these young Americans were not completely comfortable with either cultural model, and turned instead to another provincial, from Russia, who had already stormed the bastions of literary authority. Ivan Sergeevitch Turgenev became, at least through the 1870s, a literary guide whose practical aesthetic as worked out in novels such as *Fathers and Sons*, *Virgin Soil*, *On the Eve*, and *A Home of the Gentry*, became a standard by which these young writers judged their own achievements, and literature generally (Peterson 8).[3]

Why should a writer such as Turgenev, a Russian, and known to the group only through indifferent French and German translations at this time, have become a central figure in the new realism, or dramatic novel, which was then being formulated? It was true that Turgenev had gone a long way in developing an authorial detachment, an impersonality, which allowed character to speak and act for itself, and forced the reader to decide on meaning coming out of the shifting perspectives of the novel itself. But Turgenev was

[3] Dale E. Peterson, in his book *The Clement Vision. Poetic Realism in Turgenev and James* (Port Washington, Kennikat Press, 1975), has done valuable historical research into American cultural reality during this period.

not the first to experiment with these techniques, which were usually associated with a French *avant garde*. One answer may be that Turgenev provided the young American provincials with a middle ground between formal consideration of technique (the coldness and aridity which James was to complain of in the French writers whose chief concern was technique) and human grounds for ethical judgement in the novel. However much they might, like James, seek admittance into the lofty *cénacle* dominated by Flaubert, these Americans were never quite comfortable with its amoralism, shifting into cynicism.

For the space of five or six years in the mid-1870s the *Atlantic* group amounted almost to a cult of Turgenev. Perry, who had spent the mid-1860s in Europe immersing himself in continental literature, was arguably the best read man in America upon his return in 1868. His familiarity with the views of influential European critics such as Edmond Scherer and Julian Schmidt, who wrote extensively on Turgenev, led him to place Turgenev in the first rank of living novelists (Peterson 10-12). By 1871, W. D. Howells appointed Perry chief reviewer of foreign books for the *Atlantic Monthly*, and almost immediately he began to bring Turgenev's name before a larger American public. By Royal Gettmann's count, Perry wrote of Turgenev in the *Atlantic* no less than twelve times during the period 1871-77 (44). But Perry's championing of Turgenev was not limited to criticism. In 1871 his translations of Turgenev's stories "A Correspondence," and "Faust" were published by the *Galaxy*. *Lippincott's* brought out Perry's translation of "Mou Mou" in the same year. Still later, Perry translated from the French versions of Turgenev's *Rudin* (1873) and *Virgin Soil* (1877). Perry was the first of the Atlantic group to make serious comment on Turgenev's art, and what he had to say in many ways set the standard for what Howells and James would say soon after. He valued most in Turgenev his "artistic realism." The Russian was "a realist in the sense of hiding himself" (Harlow 79) and bringing forth his characters. "He always makes us acquainted with the people by what in life is the only effectual means, by letting us see them face to face, so to speak, and not merely telling us about them" (80). Irina, the heroine of Turgenev's novel *Smoke*, provides an example of this dramatic method of presentation. "We see her in different circumstances, and have to make up our minds ourselves, and it is only later in the story that a full perception of it [her

character] begins to dawn on us." Perry's earliest criticism of Turgenev indicates the path Howells and James would take in their own experiments with dramatic presentation of character and limited point of view, but after his translation of *Virgin Soil* in 1877 Perry only rarely commented publicly on Russian literature. In later life he became in many respects a private scholar and a very serious one. His love of Turgenev, however, and of Russian literature generally, remained undiminished. He had tried twice earlier in his life to master the Russian language, but finally in 1905 at sixty years of age he made a concerted effort. He learned to read the language within a few years, and in his old age was once again ahead of his American countrymen reading widely in contemporary Russian literature. Perry was one of those enigmatic and fascinating figures in the history of American culture whose great intellectual and imaginative powers, evident to all who knew him, never came to full flower. Perhaps the most signal service he performed in the advancement of American culture was to act as intermediary between Russian literature and the great talents of his friends--W. D. Howells and Henry James.

W. D. Howells

> Life showed itself to me in different colours after I had once read Turgenev, it became more serious, more awful, and with mystical responsibilities I had not known before. My gay American horizons were bathed in the vast melancholy of the Slav, patient, agnostic, trustful.
>
> (Howells, *Literary Passions* 170-71)

By now it should be clear that the first American response to Russian literature was a response to the novels and stories of one man--Ivan Turgenev. Looking back on his early years as editor of the *Atlantic*, W. D. Howells believed that his "most notable literary experience without doubt was the knowledge of Tourguenief's novels" (*Literary Passions* 169). The "otherness" of Russian life, as presented by Turgenev, had a tremendous impact on the way in which Howells began to conceive of American experience--an

experience which "became more serious, more awful, and with mystical responsibilities [he] . had not known before." Howells' response to the Russian was really not surprising given his friendship with T. S. Perry, that early American translator and champion of Turgenev's works. Howells admitted that he "lived upon" his friend's wide learning and criticism, that he "had learned from him the new and true way of looking at literature" (Gettmann 52). But unlike Perry, and to some extent James as well, there were at least two distinct phases to Howells' appreciation of the Russians. He began, like his literary friends, admiring Turgenev's broad human vision as well as his technical virtuosity, from Turgenev he learned the potential for a truly dramatic novel in which character relations come to the fore and the intrusive author is less evident. Of Turgenev, he wrote that the author's personality, his moral prejudices, were absent, "the characters" were free to "work out" their own plots (*Literary Passions* 170). It was only in the 1880s when Howells began to read Tolstoy that he began to change his views regarding Turgenev's pre-eminence. And it should be noted that it was not so much Tolstoy the artist but Tolstoy the social and spiritual visionary who affected Howells the most. The influence was so profound that by the 1890s Howells believed Tolstoy was the greatest novelist of any age, but Howells' immersion in Tolstoyan philosophy came later than his introduction to Turgenev and will be dealt with in a succeeding section of this chapter; through the 1870s it was Turgenev who held his attention, and this for aesthetic as well as moral and social reasons. Royal Gettmann, in his study of Turgenev's reception in America, has written that the "underlying purpose" of Howells' early criticism of the Russian was to refine "public taste" and improve the art of fiction (54). Gettmann argues, and I think convincingly, that Howells' interest in Turgenev's technical craft stemmed naturally from an "attitude toward life" (55) which he found in the Russian's work. If life, for Howells, was "more serious, more awful" after he had read Turgenev, at least there was an unflinching examination of the emotional depths of contemporary men and women in the Russian's pages. As Howells noted in his earliest reviews of Turgenev's work, this was an art which was written for "mature readers," readers who might experience the emotions of Turgenev's characters "without losing their self respect" (Gettmann 53), it was the opposite of so much of contemporary American fiction, which Howells found to be escapist both

in its aesthetic and moral choices. As Royal Gettmann writes, Howells "sought to close the gap between literature and life, for he believed the essential fact about modern literature was its fusion with the experience and ideals of the common man. Howells felt that in a democracy literature should embrace and present truthfully all aspects of contemporary life" (55). In Turgenev, Howells found an artist whose formal aesthetic and attitude to life appealed to both the artist and man of social conscience in himself.

But what did Howells, and by extension Turgenev, expect of the "mature reader" they were writing for? The first thing to disappear from Howells' novels, under the impact of Turgenev's fiction, was the omniscient author or narrator, the reader was judged competent to evaluate fictional characters and events without the help of overt stage directions from the author. Literary understanding was to emerge out of the complexity of relations between characters, and for Howells this aesthetic seemed closest to the actual lived conditions of human perception. This view is stated most clearly in *My Literary Passions*. Turgenev's fiction "is to the last degree dramatic. The persons are sparely described, and briefly accounted for, and then they are left to transact their affair, whatever it is, with the least possible comment or explanation from the author. The effect flows naturally from their characters, and when they have done or said a thing you conjecture why as unerringly as you would if they were people whom you knew outside of a book" (170).

In early Atlantic essays of 1873 and 1874, Howells describes Turgenev as the "most self-forgetful of the story-telling tribe" (Gettmann 55); or again, Turgenev "leaves all comment to the reader. Everything necessary to the reader's intelligence should be quietly and artfully supplied, and nothing else should be added" (55). All of this reveals the direction of Howells' own imaginative work. he was an artist who had grown tired of what he called "the deliberate and impertinent moralizing of Thackeray, the clumsy exegesis of George Eliot . . . the stage-carpentering . . . of Dickens" (*Literary Passions* 170).

The delicate ability to let character reveal itself within the context of fictional relations was, for Howells, a mark of Turgenev's aesthetic and human sophistication. He realized that the Russian's scope was narrow, "the narrowest great novelist . . . that ever lived, dealing nearly always with small groups, isolated and analyzed in the most American fashion" (Gettmann 59). But out of that very narrowness came

Turgenev's strength, a more intense portrayal of human character, and of relations between men and women, realities which Howells himself was attempting to translate to American fictional experience.

In a small irony of literary history, perhaps we can learn more specifically what Howells took from Turgenev by examining what Turgenev liked about the American's fiction--because Turgenev was reading Howells' work from about 1876 on (Henry James came to know Turgenev soon after he moved to Paris in 1875, and James gave the Russian "master" several of Howells' novels). Turgenev actually wrote to Howells saying, "I have spent the night reading *A Chance Acquaintance*, and now I should like to visit the country where there are young girls like the heroine" (Rudolph and Clara Kirk 80). Turgenev never did visit America, although he assured James he was deeply interested in the democracy where his books were so well received. But Turgenev was interested in the heroine of Howells' novel, *A Chance Acquaintance*--Kitty Ellison. In Howells' portrayal of the young American woman, Turgenev read a tale which reflected one of his own central preoccupations as a novelist, the emergence of a female consciousness which was not isolated in itself but through its vitality questioned the basis for male values as well. This shift in point of view away from the dominant public attitudes of the male toward the inner psychology of the feminine is one of the hallmarks, and great achievements, of Turgenev's fiction, and we witness the same general shift in Howells' novels from the mid-1870s on. However much Turgenev's technical brilliance and "dramatic" method may have affected Howells' own practice as a novelist, it was the discovery of a new type of female character in the Russian's pages which ultimately influenced him most. Throughout the 1870s and 80s, a series of youthful American women dominate Howells' novels. Kitty Ellison in *A Chance Acquaintance*, Florida Vervain in *A Foregone Conclusion*, and Marcia Gaylord in *A Modern Instance*, and these young women bear a marked resemblance to the young heroines of Turgenev's fiction--Natalie, Lisa, Elena--all of them deeply engaged in the discovery of life, questioning the relationships which exist between men and women, and grounded by an inner generosity of spirit. In the works of both novelists the women are complex, admirable, and imperfect beings, who often make their male counterparts seem pale and undecided in comparison. This pattern emerges most clearly in Turgenev's early novel, *Rudin*, which has much in

common with Howells' *A Foregone Conclusion*.[4] In both works, brilliant but undecided young men, Rudin and Don Ippolito, fall in love with the female protagonists, Natalie and Florida. In both works, the developing relationship between the young people is watched over by worldly, and highly attractive, mothers who deny their daughters the sensual knowledge they themselves already possess. In both works, the young women attempt to help the men recognize, and overcome, the self-division in their own natures. Natalie argues passionately that Rudin can translate his grand ideals into practical action, while Florida tries to convince Don Ippolito to give up the priesthood for his true calling, which is scientific. In both works, the men fail in the high estimate the women have of them. Natalie and Florida recover from their intense relationships, but Rudin and Don Ippolito remain trapped and wandering within the labyrinth of self. Although a wide cultural continent lies between the characters of Florida Vervain and Natalie Mikhaelovna, they are both representative of a new type of young woman in fiction, not just a love interest, but a complex, thinking creature of real moral force who often possesses more interest, and ultimately more depth, than her male counterparts.

As late as 1882, when Howells' *A Modern Instance* was published, he was still fashioning the portrait of the new American woman, a portrait which was based in large measure on the Russian heroines found in Turgenev's novels. At the same time that Henry James, under the influence of the Russian novel, was giving the world his own *Portrait of A Lady*, Howells was creating a darker portrait in the person of Marcia Gaylord, a woman who risks much for passion, and for men, and finds herself trapped in a downward spiral of moral deterioration. Howells spoke truly when he admitted that life revealed itself "in different colours," that it became "more serious, more awful" after he had read Turgenev. What he found in the Russian's pages was a tale of human character and of passion, especially as it revealed itself in the relations between men and women. As Howells worked through his own creative potential, he drew on a

[4] Howells first reviewed *Rudin*, commenting on the impression made by female characters, in the September, 1873, issue of the *Atlantic*. Less than a year later, he began writing *A Foregone Conclusion*, which portrays a similar love triangle between mother, daughter and unexpected lover. The impact of his first reading of *Rudin* stayed with Howells to the end of his life. Commenting on "Recent Russian Fiction" in 1912 with T. S. Perry, Howells remembered the Russian novel "as one of the most interesting books I ever read" (Rudolph and Clara Kirk 81).

feminine consciousness which itself was part of a Russian "otherness." Paradoxically, Howells' identification with Turgenev was also an identification with the feminine in himself. The Russian's prior achievement gave permission for that "other" voice to emerge in American fiction written by men. In creating a space for the feminine, Turgenev was not Howells' only guide (a good case can be made for the fertile counter-influence James and Howells had on each other), but at a critical stage in Howells' career when he was attempting a more subtle rendition of inner human geography, he followed in a terrain already charted by the Russian.

Henry James

> Henry James went to Europe and read Turgenev. W. D. Howells stayed at home and read Henry James.
>
> George Moore, *Confessions of A Young Man*

Although James began reading Turgenev in French and German translation years before Howells could have been aware of the Russian (Perry and James were still teenagers vacationing with their families in Newport when they first came across Turgenev's stories in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*), he did not write a major critical piece on Turgenev until 1874, a year after Howells had reviewed Turgenev's work in the *Atlantic*. Although James' first long critical essay on Turgenev came late, the review is unquestionably the single most influential assessment in establishing Turgenev's American reputation, and it immediately linked James' name and artistic practice with Turgenev's. (In fact, more than one English journal of the period disparaged James' slavish imitation of Turgenev's method. *Blackwoods*, for instance, remarked that James' *Confidence* resembled Turgenev's *Smoke* in much the same way "as a reflection in the water . . . does of the object reflected," while the *Saturday Review* argued "that as good as some of James's work was, it was too often a lifeless imitation of Turgenev" [Gettmann 74]).

James wrote several other essays on Turgenev (among them a review of *Virgin Soil* in 1877 which throws much light on James' own ambitions in writing *The Princess Casamassima* (1886) and later a long and profoundly moving eulogy on Turgenev's death (1884), but none of these essays sheds as much light on Turgenev (or James) the artist as the first. Purporting to be a review of German translations of *The Torrents of Spring* and *A Lear of the Steppes*, the essay actually ranges through Turgenev's entire *oeuvre* to 1874: *Rudin* (1853), a study of "moral failure" (*French Poets and Novelists* 284), that most interesting of subjects which fascinated James through his entire career, *A Nest of the Noblefolk* (1858), *Helène*, or *On the Eve* (1859), which James singles out as the author's greatest triumph commingling "realism and idealism" (285); *Spring Torrents*, Turgenev's classic exploration of the fatal woman, *Smoke*, which James felt lacked the "underlying sweetness of most of its companions" (296), *Fathers and Sons*, Turgenev's great portrait of generational conflict; and *A Sportsman's Notebook* (1852), the story cycle which James recognized as a perfect marriage of political awareness and artistic principle--the artist's response to the social reality of his time.

In many ways, as one reads through James' judgements in this essay, one realizes that a self-portrait is beginning to emerge--that one young artist of major ambitions is projecting his own potential literary identity onto the figure of another artist of major achievement. Turgenev is made to speak in the voice of young Henry James, his story becomes James' story at one remove, an act of literary and figural hubris which does not provoke anxiety because the contents of personal narrative have been projected onto the other. We are told of Turgenev that it is the Russian theme he depicts, a Russian type which "perplexes, fascinates, inspires him. His works savour strongly of his native soil, like those of all great novelists, and give one who has read them all a strange sense of having had a prolonged experience of Russia. We seem to have travelled there in dreams, to have dwelt there in another state of being" (*French Poets* 280). And then, significantly, he adds. "M. Turgénieff gives us a peculiar sense of being out of harmony with his native land--of his having what one may call a poet's quarrel with it. He loves the old, and he is unable to see where the new is drifting. American readers will peculiarly appreciate this state of mind, if they had

a native novelist of a large pattern, it would probably be, in a degree, his own" (280). Here we have a rather naked expression of the young Henry James' own dreams, frustrations and fears. He, too, is out of harmony with his native land, and within a year will move permanently to Europe in a decision very similar to Turgenev's own, he too loves the old and is disturbed by the drift of the new, he too has a poet's quarrel, an endless fascination with an America he retreats from, the land of his dreams which he takes us to constantly is the American provincial in Europe, the collision between old and new. It is James, too, who has already discovered within himself the potential for a "large pattern" of consciousness and expression growing out of a similar cultural tension he discovered in Turgenev.

And this attitude, or more nearly cultural self-discovery, is borne out by James' analysis of Turgenev's great novel of generational conflict, *Fathers and Sons* (1861). James begins by noting the parallels between Russian and American culture in the mid-nineteenth century. ". . . Russian society, like our own, is in a process of formation, the Russian character is in solution, in a sea of change . . .", a mixture of "old limitations" and "new pretensions" (281). And then James moves from individual character to an analysis of a "larger battle" of which individuals are but the shadowy symbols. This is "the battle of the old and the new, the past and the future, the ideas that arrive with the ideas that linger" (296-97). Reflecting on Turgenev's historical melancholy, and perhaps his own, he says, "half the tragedies in human history are borne of this conflict, and in all that poets and philosophers tell us of it, the clearest fact is still its perpetual necessity." Both authors came back to this theme constantly. Turgenev most particularly in his portrayal of generations and the passage of time which constantly places the living present in the past, and James with his life long meditation on European culture and American self-creation.

In the narrative of personal literary origins which he is constructing, James tells, and justifies, his own American story through the experience of the Russian other. Turgenev is a man disappointed "in the land which is dear to him" (315). He clings to "the old Muscovite virtues" which are already fading into the dimness of "tradition". The Russian provincial is "clever" and "ambitious," but he cannot digest all of European intellectual tradition at a single sitting. James describes the social confusion of a marginal society

in rapid transition. "The fermentation of social change has thrown to the surface in Russia a deluge of hollow pretensions and vicious presumptions, amid which the love either of old virtues or of new achievements finds very little gratification" (316). This is the kind of society which produces superfluous men, and even worse those who "flounder" happily in confusion and waste, toying with the latest intellectual trends (316) Turgenev's Russia here acts as a palimpsest for the America James himself was attempting to understand and escape from at the same time, an America which he much later described as providing only "the freedom to grow up blighted . . . for the smaller fry of future generations" (*American Scene* 137).

From this brief sociological analysis of Turgenev's work, James moves to a philosophic level which reveals much of the wellspring of James' own art. Offered at one remove through the figure of Turgenev, James gives his own ideal intellectual self-portrait, answering a question he had asked earlier. "what, in the last analysis, is . . . [a man's] philosophy?" (309). James' answer, self revealing as it is, deserves to be quoted at length:

> [Turgenev's] sadness has its element of error, but it also has its larger element of wisdom. Life is, in fact, a battle. . . . Evil is insolent and strong; beauty, enchanting but rare, goodness, very apt to be weak; folly, very apt to be defiant; wickedness, to carry the day; . . . But the world, as it stands, is no illusion, no phantasm, no evil dream of a night; we wake up to it again for ever and ever; we can neither forget it nor deny it nor dispense with it. We can welcome experience as it comes, and give it what it demands, in exchange for something which it is idle to pause to call much or little, so long as it contributes to swell the volume of consciousness. (318-19)

In a world of mingled "pain" and "delight" there is one "rule, which bids us learn to will and seek to understand." Turgenev has been an eminent representative of this exacting standard--offering "no meager account of life," but doing "justice to its infinite variety." Turgenev's standards, here, are evidently James' own, and he is telling the reader that the new novel which Turgenev represents is a voyage rather than an arrival; that if one can speak of morality seriously in relation to aesthetic choice, then it must be somehow related to increasing the "volume of [human] consciousness," to the artist's deepest engagement with the world around him, no matter what the colours or dark hues that world may reveal to him. In his identification with the Russian other, James is projecting his own imagined literary destiny. He, too, will offer "no meager account of life", he, too, is determined to create a literature which "contributes to swell

the volume of consciousness."

The 1874 essay, as well as being an extended allegory of the self, is also James' prelude to leaving America for good, the following year he moved to Paris and became an intimate of Turgenev's circle. The year James spent in the French capital, before moving to England, may well have been his final university. It was Turgenev who introduced him to Flaubert, Daudet, the young de Maupassant, and it was Turgenev, too, who kept himself separate from what James soon came to view as the cultural chauvinism of the French. At a critical moment in James' own imaginative life, Turgenev offered the living model of a great writer whose experience of cultural otherness--between Russia and Europe, self and other--was the wellspring of his art. The Russian's example gave James permission to remain in Europe and from there define his own "poet's quarrel" with the absent other which was his native land. James, too, formed a literary identity out of an experience of cultural otherness, a crossing between native origins and foreign shores.

During his lifetime, James returned constantly to the image of Turgenev as he attempted to work out his own narrative of cultural origins and personal identity. In all, he wrote seven essays on the Russian, and of these the most moving and possibly revealing is the eulogy following Turgenev's death which was printed in the *Atlantic Monthly* (1884) and later reprinted in *Partial Portraits*. With his literary father truly dead, James was free to remember all that he had taken from him, and the memories are exquisite. the Paris of Flaubert and the *cénacle*, the free, almost innocent, conversation of Turgenev from which James always took a germ of literary value, the masculine size of this great white-bearded figure which would have made it "perfectly lawful" for him to be "brutal," and yet his gentleness, even "softness" which James associated with men of great reach and strength (*Partial Portraits* 295/304), the discussions of Russia--nihilism, social change--which led James to understand that the "great drama" in Turgenev's life "was the struggle for a better state of things in Russia" (322). There are places, James tells us, which he "can think of only in relation to some occasion on which he [Turgenev] was present" (312). Like the young boy who decades earlier had a vision of culture and tradition in the *Galerie d' Apollon* of the Louvre (*A Small Boy and Others*

361-64), James goes over in memory all that this Russian had meant to him--a living embodiment of what culture and art was capable His portrayal of the final meeting with Turgenev takes the form of a work of art, as James recreates the passionate melancholy and human irony which Turgenev had portrayed in his own work. In this stylistic admission of literary inheritance, James' identification with Turgenev seems almost complete But as Turgenev becomes a figure in James' own narrative, we begin to see just how complex the relationship is a delicate balance between identification (with a person and a tradition) and projection of an imaginative space where James' own literary identity, or voice, may emerge. In "placing" Turgenev within his narrative of the literary past, no matter how admired, James is at the same time asserting his own will to literary authority. This move, which is both psychic and figural, has much in common with the final ratio of Harold Bloom's theory of influence. *apophrades*, or the return of the dead. Bloom refers to this final revisionary ratio as a "metalepsis or transumption," a trope which reverses earlier tropes (*Poetry and Repression* 20). Bloom argues that *apophrades* is always a balance between introjection (or identification) and projection (or casting out the forbidden). What the poet introjects is the precursor's earliness or priority, what he projects is his own "affliction of belatedness."

Most particularly, as it applies to James' final remembrance of Turgenev, in the return of the dead the living writer "virtually turns his precursor into a 'character' in the later poet's own work, inventing for himself a manageable tradition" (Rowe 53). For Bloom the poet's defense mechanisms are never simple, the praise which one writer heaps on an important precursor is a measure of psychic control over an overburdening past, and is a way of moving to an open place for artistic expression which is not yet occupied by the dead poet.

We see, as James concludes his eulogy, how in fact Turgenev becomes a "figure" in James' own artistic retelling. like characters in the Russian's novels, they had been visiting at Turgenev's villa in Bougival, above the tree line stretches the villa at Marly, Turgenev has been very ill but has recovered slightly (*Partial Portraits* 321). It is November, 1882, and James shares Turgenev's carriage as they drive into Paris together. For one-and-a-half hours Turgenev almost reaches the old magic, his conversation is

Lilliam. Th , reach the city, and James alights on the *boulevard exterieur*, they are to go in different directions. James concludes. "I bade him goodbye at the carriage window, and never saw him again. There was a kind of fair going on, near b' , in the chill November air, beneath the denuded little trees of the Boulevard, and a Punch and Judy show, from which nasal sounds proceeded" (321 22). As Turgenev the person disappears into literary mythology, he is linked forever in James' mind with a piece of ribald folk art taking place on the *boulevard*. The Punch and Judy show becomes, in James' retelling, an allegory for the fate of human characters generally, their masks ironic and impenetrable, their significance obscure, the drama continuing as evening closes in. Both James and the dying Turgenev are implicated in this drama, it is the "infinite variety" out of which each has attempted to create a formal narrative coherence. If in his final remembrance of Turgenev, James has projected a figural space for his own will to narrative authority he has also reached a difficult identification with the tradition both men helped to shape.

James' 1884 eulogy to Turgenev reveals just how complex was his response, both psychically and figurally, to the Russian's imaginative world. Turgenev, the Russian provincial who conquered the European literary world, provided James with an aesthetic for the dramatic novel, a cultural perspective on his argument with American society, and a stance in relation to the feminine in his own nature. All of these things James internalized and transformed into a language new to American literature. The relationship which existed between this literary father and son is central to any understanding of an American literary identity as it has been shaped against the experience of Russian otherness. In a later chapter we will explore in depth two specific literary themes- the politics of feminine consciousness, and the novel as social critique- which link James so closely to Turgenev. For now, we turn to a slightly later period in the American literary response to Russia.

The Russian Craze 1885-1900

> I had reached the point through my acquaintance with Tolstoy where I was impatient even of the artifice that hid itself.
>
> W. D. Howells explaining why he now thought Tolstoy a greater writer than Turgenev (*My Literary Passions*, 172)

For about fifteen years, roughly 1885 to 1900, there was a remarkable discovery of Russian literature and culture in America. Turgenev had opened a cultural door through which a flood of Russian writers and artists were to follow. The first to come through that door, and in many ways the most important influence on American ideas, was Tolstoy.

Just as Americans were beginning to digest Tolstoy's portrayal of spiritual struggle and social philosophy they made the shocking discovery of Dostoevsky's inner psychic world. In 1881, the year of Dostoevsky's death, just one of his novels had been translated into English, the searing account of penal servitude, human degradation and transcendence sometimes translated as *Memoirs from the House of the Dead*. This kind of writing, moving as it did in the dream world of the human unconscious and between the poles of extreme spirituality and carnality, had no parallels in English fiction. Dostoevsky's reception in England and America was electric and controversial--he seemed to create a new human vocabulary, a new potential for feeling and thinking, frightening in its darkness as well as its spiritual excess.

At a slightly later date the English speaking world began to read translations from Chekhov and Gorky, there was a renewed interest in Pushkin, Russia's national poet, and for more specialized tastes even lesser known writers such as Saltykov-Schedrin, Ostrovsky, Goncharov, Lermontov, and Leskov were being discussed (Brewster 129). Overall, the period 1885-1890 marks a first flowering of wider American interest in and understanding of Russian literary culture. Royal Gettmann in his study of Turgenev's reception in America, remarks that "American interest in things Russian was so intense and widespread [during this

period] that it calls for the term *craze*" (110). There is much to support this point of view. A flood of translations began in the mid-1880s. Prior to 1885, for example, only one of Tolstoy's novels had been translated into English, once again it was Eugene Schuyler who led the way with his translation of Tolstoy's *The Cossacks* in 1878. By 1889, however, the tide had begun to turn. Sixteen different works by Tolstoy had been translated in America in a five year interval (Brewster 110). In 1886 alone there were translations from four works of Tolstoy, two of Gogol, and one of Dostoevsky (Gettmann 111). But American interest in Russian literature was not confined to translations of Slavic fiction. There was a significant and widening critical response to Russian history and culture during these years, a response which in many ways powered a wider public interest in the literature (Gettmann 113). Evidence of this wider interest is provided by the records of lending libraries across the country which were suddenly under much greater pressure to provide Russian titles (Brewster 110, Gettmann 111-13). Books such as D. Mackenzie Wallace's *Russia* (1878) and Alfred Rambaud's *History of Russia* (1886) went far beyond the boundless steppes and ravening wolves mentality, and gained a wide readership in the United States. In 1886 as well, the French critic Melchior de Vogüé, published his landmark critical analysis entitled *Le Roman Russe* which included essays on Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. This study, read widely in its original language by English and American writers, had a deep impact on Western views concerning Russian literature. Prince D. S. Mirsky whose later book, *The History of Russian Literature*, was to become as important a landmark, believed de Vogüé's book had been "the main landmark of the penetration of Russian literature into Western Europe" (Brewster 112-13). Books of literary criticism, and their power to affect ideas, may easily be overestimated by literary critics, but de Vogüé's work was a first serious attempt to deal extensively with living Russian writers of the nineteenth century. Its ideas had a long life and filtered through the literary circles of Western Europe and on to the most respected Eastern literary journals in the United States. De Vogüé's study was particularly illuminating in relation to Dostoevsky who was largely an unknown quantity in the West, and Tolstoy whose American reputation was just being established (Gettmann 114). It was de Vogüé's study which gave to the West a particular view of Dostoevsky which in some quarters is still

current Dostoevsky represented the true "soul" of Russia, was an expression of that mysterious spirituality and carnality, brutality and delicacy, which merged at their extreme points.

Isabel Hapgood, who later gained fame as a translator, especially of Turgenev, lived for two years in Russia just as the 1880s came to a close. She wrote a steady stream of articles on Russian culture for American journals and collected many of them in *Russian Rambles* (1895). Her comments in the introduction to that volume have held true through several decades of East/West relations. She writes, "I am told that I must abuse Russia if I wish to be popular in America" (Brewster 126) and goes on to state that travellers to Russia frequently go there expecting to see "queer things" (127), the Russia of Ivan the Terrible, rather than late nineteenth-century Russia, and because they wish to see a fantastic and brutal country they often see just what they imagine. She argues that Americans must study the Russian "people from their own point of view" rather than from the mindset of Western institutions and values. Hapgood understood early on, it seems, America's propensity to project its own cultural identity onto the "other" which was Russia.

By the 1890s, then, the American public could gain a picture of Russian culture and literature which had moved beyond the first fumbling attempts to envision this land of ice and wolves, anarchists and spiritual zealots. Russia and its culture had begun to move beyond the "dark continent" where explorers could return to Western civilization with fantastically imagined bestiaries. But why should this sweeping interest in things Russian have occurred at just this time in American history? There are a few obvious answers. Turgenev had earlier paved the way for Russians such as Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and others who wrote of a land and a people which was still foreign to Western perceptions. Then, too, there are the historical analyses which in many ways have become *clichés*, theories of manifest destiny, or of the chosen race--both nations inhabiting vast undeveloped territories and, as Walt Whitman argued, sensing great, undefinable destinies which might transform the world and mankind. Both were emerging provincial powers, beginning to test themselves against the economic and cultural authority of Western Europe. Both countries had abolished serfdom and slavery at about the same time, but America could look at Russia as

a political road not taken, a social arrangement which was "a danger after all escaped" (Matthiessen 26) In the U.S. the period immediately following the Civil War was one of rapid, often uncontrolled, social and economic development. The explosive nature of this development, and confusion over where it all might lead in the American destiny, caused its own pattern of self-doubts and visions within the culture of post-bellum America.[5] In Russia, however, an opposite social reality emerged. an autocratic regime still prevented the kind of social transformation which was radically altering American society As the nineteenth century moved into its last few decades, Americans increasingly became aware that the mass of Russian society was toiling under a political weight which was the antithesis of their own democratic vision. They knew, too, of the increasing dissatisfaction Russians felt with the conditions of their lives. Much of this social critique came from the novelists and poets themselves who traditionally filled a role which belonged to an intellectual intelligentsia in the West. Within the autocracy of nineteenth-century Russia, this intelligentsia had failed to coalesce in a significant way, and the responsibility for social critique fell to the imaginative artists who became spokespersons for their countrymen, who read them both as artists and as engaged social chroniclers. Pushkin and Lermontov had written of the superfluous man in their country, Turgenev had introduced Americans . the next generation of Russian nihilists who were committed to radical change in their political and social relations, Dostoevsky had portrayed the violence which was welling up inside his country, and Tolstoy explored the profound Russian desire for spiritual renewal and social justice. America itself had emerged out of the crucible of revolution, and Russia seemed to be playing out an inner destiny which would result in cataclysmic social change. Americans watched the first upheavals in Russia, the underground movements, the assassination attempts and the Russo-Turkish conflict, with the mixed emotions of those who have re-established a workable social order out of their own violent past.

[5] For a brief but fascinating analysis of the relationship between literature and social change in America at this time see F. D. Reeve, *The White Monk: An Essay On Melville and Dostoevsky*: 118-21.

There were also internal social conflicts within the United States at this time which may well have contributed to a sense of shared political interests between the radical elements of both countries and made the works of Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Tolstoy more relevant to an American audience. In 1884 a financial depression hit the United States. Within two years labour unrest had led to the brink of a general uprising of organized workers. Railroad strikes in the spring of 1886 were followed by May Day demonstrations which culminated in the Haymarket Riot (Gettmann 214-15). America had its own revolutionary currents to contend with as Marxist philosophy began to make itself felt. It is probably not a coincidence that a number of Tolstoy's social, ethical and religious texts were published in America during this period--books such as *What I Believe*, *A Confession*, *What Then Must We Do?*, and *Church and State*. Tolstoy had never accepted the dialectical materialism upon which Marxist philosophy is based. For Americans seeking to understand the radical currents within their own country, and on an international level, yet unable to accept Marxist theory in practice, Tolstoy's radical pacifism seemed to offer an alternative social philosophy to the rising tide of materialism and cultural chauvinism which characterized one important aspect of the American national psyche.

For about fifteen years beginning in 1885, there was as one critic put it, a "Tolstoyan episode" in American thought (Walsh 51). This episode marks a brief moment in American cultural history when the ideals of internationalism, pacifism and social justice were passionately debated as part of the official national agenda.

Tolstoy's relationship to, and influence on, American cultural history is a complicated story, one aspect of which is the impact on the writing and thought of William Dean Howells. Howells had begun by reading Turgenev in the 1870s, but by 1884 his friend T. S. Perry had introduced him to the Russian who would radically transform not only his view of the novel as a document of social realism but also his understanding of American democracy. Through the latter half of the 1880s, Howells wrote a series of politically engaged novels which depend directly on his understanding of Tolstoyan ethics, his espousal of a transformed human community where "men shall come into their own, into the right to labour and the

right to enjoy the fruits of their labour, each one master of himself and servant to every other" (*Literary Passions* 183-84). In *The Minister's Charge* (1887) Howells traces the life of one Lemuel Barker, a moral innocent who becomes easy prey for the cynicism and self-interest which powers the modern American city Only a sympathetic Minister, Reverend Sewell, saves Barker from destruction; and it is Sewell, reflecting on the ethical meaning of Lemuel's existence, who gives a final sermon on the Tolstoyan principle of "complicity . 'No man . . . sinned or suffered to himself alone, his error and his pain darkened and afflicted men who never heard of his name. If a community was corrupt, if an age was immoral, it was not because of the vicious, but the virtuous who fancied themselves indifferent spectators" (458) Howells' next novel, *Annie Kilburn* (1888), traces the rise into social consciousness of a young heiress who inherits her father's New England factory. Confronted with labour problems, human greed, and hypocrisy she attempts to further social justice and human rights. The evolution of Annie Kilburn's consciousness becomes an allegory for the potential evolution of an entire community toward ethical and political unity Her efforts finally are seen as a failure, but the novel as a whole explores what Howells took to be Tolstoy's central ethical teaching: "He taught me to see life not as a chase of a forever impossible human happiness, but as a field for endeavour towards the happiness of the whole human family" (*Literary Passions* 184).

There were many other prominent American thinkers who were influenced by Tolstoyan philosophy and ideals, their number includes William Jennings Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt, Clarence Darrow, Howard Crosby, and the prominent social reformer Jane Addams.[6] All of these Tolstoyans were drawn first to Tolstoy by a reading of his ethical and social works and only secondarily by his fiction. And it should be noted that they were not so much converted to Tolstoy's philosophy as confirmed in their own beliefs by it. There was, in fact, a distinguished intellectual tradition in America which had many profound links to Tolstoy's views. And the influence was not a one way street. Tolstoy was aware of and had read the works of the American transcendentalists and the abolitionists. He counted among his own intellectual mentors

[6] In my portrayal of the Tolstoyan episode in American thought, I am indebted to the prior research of Alexander Fodor "The Acceptance of Leo Tolstoy in the United States." *Research Studies* 45. 2 (June, 1977): 73-81, and Harry Walsh: "The Tolstoyan Episode in American Thought." *American Studies* 17. 1 (Spring, 1976): 49-67.

people such as Thoreau and Emerson, James Russell Lowell, William Ellery Channing and Walt Whitman. Tolstoy also paid close attention to religious groups such as the Unitarians and the Quakers. Many of his own ideas concerning a radical Christianity stemming from a divine element within men were reinforced by transcendentalist beliefs, and he deeply admired Thoreau's independence, his anarchic insistence on the rights and responsibilities of the individual, free man, as opposed to social, religious, or political, dogma. And Tolstoy was a serious and life long student of antinomian religious groups, and their attempts to renew Christian ideals in a practical community life.[*] So it can be said that Tolstoy himself was influenced by nineteenth-century American idealist currents. As we move into the late 1880s and 1890s and the emergence of a distinct period of Tolstoyism in American thought, we have a fascinating example of the circular process of cultural influence at work. Many of the first Americans who were attracted to Tolstoy's philosophy--Howells, and his friend the Unitarian minister Edward Everett Hale, who formed a Tolstoy Club at Harvard which later evolved into the Hale House for social settlement, Bryan, Darrow, and Jane Addams--were probably unaware of just how much Tolstoy's radical critique of society owed to their native tradition. In Tolstoy, they were reading, at one remove, and reflected back at them through a Russian perspective, the earlier idealist philosophy of the transcendental movement. This may in part explain why so many American idealists felt such immediate kinship with Tolstoyan principles as the nineteenth century neared its end. There were a small number of basic philosophical principles which held them all together, consciously or unconsciously. They were. 1. pacifism or non-resistance to aggression (and linked to this an evolutionary concept of world peace); 2. an international outlook rather than a narrow cultural nationalism (the majority of American Tolstoyans were Jeffersonian in orientation and viewed their own culture as part of a larger world community, they were open to continental thought and aware of international cultural links); 3. a Jeffersonian distrust of large government which was related to Tolstoy's own anarchism on the subject of powerful political structures (Tolstoy had written to Ernest Crosby in 1894

[*] As an example, Tolstoy used the proceeds from his novel *Resurrection* to finance the emigration of the Doukhobors, a pacifist and communitarian Christian sect, from Russia to North America at the turn of the present century.

saying that the Tsar should "divest himself of his power and give the people the freedom to rule themselves" (Walsh 65), and he admired the civil disobedience of Thoreau which led to his decision to reject citizenship in America), and finally, 4. a rejection of capitalism as a workable economic order (although there was considerable debate over what might replace it, ranging from Tolstoy's own prejudice in favour of a land based communism, to evolved forms of democratic socialism and anarchistic associations). All the Americans who followed Tolstoy's ideas showed little interest in Marxism as a viable alternative to capitalism, it is likely that Marx's dialectical materialism coupled with his rejection of spiritual idealism was as distasteful to them as it was to Tolstoy. In terms of social impact in America, Tolstoy's ideas found their most influential spokesperson in William Jennings Bryan. Bryan had travelled to Tolstoy's home, *Yasnaya Polyana*, in 1903, and there Tolstoy spoke of the necessity for manual labour in any truly healthy community and sought to move Bryan toward a philosophy of complete non-resistance. Over the next decade Bryan came to adopt Tolstoy's social philosophy almost completely. By 1909 he drew the following geo-political conclusion from his reading of Tolstoy. "I believe that this nation could stand before the world today and tell the world that it did not believe in war, that it did not believe that it was the right way to settle disputes, that it had no disputes that it was not willing to submit to the judgement of the world" (Walsh 53). In 1912, when the newly elected President Woodrow Wilson named Bryan his Secretary of State, America had as its chief of foreign policy what one biographer has called "a pacifist committed, with remarkably few reservations, to non-violence in dealings between nations" (Walsh 54). Bryan eventually resigned from office rather than support American aggression following the Lusitania incident, but Harry Walsh has written that Bryan's "strivings for peace seem to have been genuine and unprecedented in the history of American foreign policy" (54).

Tolstoy's impact, and influence, on American social thought was profound both in its positive and negative manifestations. Theodore Roosevelt, an early student of Tolstoy's novels, came to stand for everything in the national destiny which was opposed to Tolstoy's philosophy of non-resistant pacifism, anarchism and spiritual socialism. By 1885 Roosevelt had read *La Guerre et La Paix*, and he found the

criticisms of commanders, of Napoleon in particular, and war in general, "absurd" (*Letters* I 103). Through the late 1880's, Roosevelt argued against the decadent qualities of Tolstoy's writing, and this was based on his reading of works such as *The Kreutzer Sonata* (Tolstoy's indictment of marriage and sexuality generally), and *What I Believe* (Tolstoy's radical antinomian tract on the need for social and spiritual revolution) all of which went straight against Roosevelt's theories of American manifest destiny and racial vigour. By 1906 Roosevelt viewed Tolstoy as a man of "diseased moral nature" (*Letters* V 179) whose person was a degraded mixture of spiritual idealism and physical excess. Roosevelt saw that Tolstoy's philosophy of pacifism was a potentially powerful influence on American thought and constituted a critique of his vision of an Imperial America.

In reality, the debate over Tolstoyan ideas between men such as Roosevelt and Bryan was a debate over the vision of two Americas which goes right to the foundation of that country's social mythology. On the one hand there is the country of Jefferson, Emerson, and Thoreau, a country based on the individual conscience of free men debating the principles of an evolving contract of social conduct. This American tradition has from its beginnings been idealist, even anarchic in its philosophical principles, and highly critical of any form of large government or bureaucracy which might control and set a national agenda. On the other hand, to carry the analogy out, there is another potent American vision, that of the chosen race which justifies a highly structured nationalism, of expansionism both on the domestic and international levels. This belief in an American destiny as an imperial power, often associated with leaders such as Hamilton and Roosevelt, has powered national energies both in terms of internal capitalistic expansion and geo-politics on a world scale. The debate over these two versions of American destiny is not yet over, although the men of practical power seem to hold sway over the idealists.

None of the other major Russian writers of the late 19th century--Gogol, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Gorky--had the social impact that Tolstoy had in America, but they were being read and taken seriously as artists and spokespersons for the Russian mind, even if what they said, and how they said it, was often misunderstood. We will conclude this chapter with a brief look at just two of these other Russians.

Dostoevsky, whose underground men spoke to a repressed self in the American psyche, and Maxim Gorky whose social ideology questioned the very basis of a democratic American identity.

The Other Russians

> We must protest against the further introduction of Russian novels [to America].
>
> (Maurice Francis Egan
> *Modern Novels and Novelists*, 1888)

In general, through the period leading up to W.W. I, Americans were slower than the English in taking up the new Russians as they appeared in translation. Although Dostoevsky's *Memoirs from the House of the Dead* was translated in 1881 and *Crime and Punishment* found an English audience in 1886, *The Brothers Karamasov* was translated only in 1912, by Constance Garnett. Chekhov was not translated into English until 1902, although by the time of W.W. I there had developed a virtual cult of Chekhov in England, its members included Middleton Murry, Katherine Mansfield, and Virginia Woolf. Part of an extreme English fascination with both Dostoevsky and Chekhov in the years 1915-1920 may well be connected once again with political events Russia became Britain's ally in W.W. I and this created a renewed interest in things Russian. Earliest American and English responses to the Russians' work can be summed up in one word--incomprehension. Views of Dostoevsky oscillated between the moralists' disgust over the sordid treatment of violence, sexuality, even spirituality, and the few early commentators who saw through to the profound, and painfully won, spirituality, faith, and exploration of human dignity which was at the base of Dostoevsky's descent into the depths (Wellek, *Dostoevsky* 308/312/321). Even in a rather lengthy tradition of Russian criticism stretching back to the mid 1840s, and the publication of Dostoevsky's first and second novels *Poor Folk* and *The Double* (1846), there is violent disagreement over the wellsprings of his art. As

René Wellek notes, Dostoevsky is seen variously as either the compassionate friend of the insulted and injured or the dreamer of weird dreams, the dissector of sick souls" (*Dostoevsky* 304). Radical critics as influential as Belinsky and Pisarev, themselves arguing out of a Russian tradition which upholds art as social critique, as engagement with history, rejected Dostoevsky's development towards mysticism and faith beyond *Crime and Punishment* (305). In his turn toward religious meditation and Slavophilism politically, Dostoevsky was seen to run counter to the social revolutionary tide in Russia. By 1905, and the first Russian revolt, Marxist critiques from Gorky onward attacked Dostoevsky as "Russia's evil genius" (308), a reactionary in questions both religious and political.

Wellek has written that American critical response to Dostoevsky was hardly existent before W.W. II, but this statement is not entirely true. In America, Dostoevsky did not develop into a cult object, nor did his novels excite the same kind of fevered debate as they did in England, but they were being read and discussed from the 1880's on, and in at least one writer, Sherwood Anderson, the influence of Dostoevsky was decisive in the cycle of stories he was writing during the last years of W.W. I. *Winesburg, Ohio* is a gallery of American "grotesques" which in many ways are Anderson's response to the Russian underground men of Dostoevsky, those people who live in dark mines, their lives unexamined or repressed.

T. S Perry was characteristically one of the first American readers to look at Dostoevsky seriously, devoting a section of a long essay on "Russian Novels" in *Scribner's Magazine* (1887) to Dostoevsky. Always working to elevate the literary taste of his countrymen, Perry argues that Russian fiction is more serious, more honest and independent, less superficial and conventional, than current English fiction. The English novel, Perry writes, is conceived as if one were looking "through the windows of a comfortably warmed and charmingly furnished room," and readers had become "perfectly familiar with the working of the machinery" (Muchnic 23). The Russian novel, however, was a different matter, and here Perry instances the theme of murder in Dostoevsky. *Crime and Punishment* is no whodunit, with the discovery of guilt delayed to the end, rather Dostoevsky takes the reader inside the murderer's mind from the beginning. One is forced to occupy Raskolnikov's point of view from the instant he conceives of his crime. Perry recounts

that in this exploration of inner consciousness, rage and guilt, Raskolnikov's "agony and fear of detection" makes "one's mouth grow dry with terror." And this is the new realism which the Russians are masters of. not a description from the outside, but a direct portrayal of an inner, lived experience. Writers such as Dostoevsky had "set their foot on earth, not in an imaginary region" (23). Always sensitive to the Russian mind, Perry here identifies with an *otherness* which forms a part of his own psychic consciousness. Raskolnikov's rage and guilt are owned as potentials within underground men, whether they be Russian or American.

An indication of the negative impact Dostoevsky was having on an American reading public in the 1880's is given in Maurice Francis Egan's book *Modern Novels and Novelists* (1888), the section on Dostoevsky is written as a primer for those who read for moral edification and personal betterment. Offering himself as a guide "to his young friends–wandering in gardens of romance" Egan warns of certain "weeds growing among the flowers. . ." (120). Dostoevsky's gloomy masterpiece *Crime and Punishment* "is a book no careful mother could give to her daughters, no prudent father advise his son to read." Foreshadowing a later political xenophobia and cultural chauvinism in relation to the Russian *other*, Egan writes that the Russian is "a godless being", if he once throws off the forms and ceremonies of his "enslaved religion," he becomes "materialistic and superstitiously atheistical." In his role as protector of America's moral fibre, Egan concludes with the ringing peal of the censor. "We must protest against the further introduction of Russian novels." On one level alone Egan understood a great truth about Russian literature. once introduced, it would profoundly influence the way American readers could conceive of themselves in relation to a Russian mindscape. It was a literature which had the power to infect the self with images of otherness, revealing the repressed contents of one's own cultural identity. Contrary to Egan's wishes, the "further introduction" of Russian literature has continued to infect, and shape, the American mind up to the present time.

The writings of critics such as T. S. Perry and Maurice Egan give some insight into the ferment Dostoevsky's work was causing amongst American readers during the mid-to-late 1880s. The initial impact

of Dostoevsky in America soon lost its original force, however, and after the last translation by Frederic Whishaw in 1888 of a series of Dostoevsky's works (including *Crime and Punishment* and *The Idiot*) it was over twenty years before any new works were translated. And then Constance Garnett began her translations of Dostoevsky's corpus, a labour which extended from 1912 to 1921.

Up to the period of W.W. I, critics and readers of Dostoevsky on both sides of the Atlantic most often came to his novels with an initial incomprehension, which they attempted to rectify with a too hasty resort to known critical formulas As with many other important artists, the world Dostoevsky created was a profoundly disquieting one, a world which people were dimly aware of already inside themselves, but had no vocabulary to describe This reality is described convincingly by Angus Burrell and Dorothy Brewster in their book *Dead Reckonings in Fiction* (1924), especially in the chapter "The Myth of Abnormality". There the authors argue that with the advent of psychoanalytic theory, characters in *The Brothers Karamazov* become more understandable as men than as symbols, they are neither foreign nor strange. The authors recognize that there are families in New England who lead analogous lives to the Karamazovs. The only real difference is that Dostoevsky compressed and speeded up the events of ten years into a much shorter time frame. When the pressure of life is turned up to this intensity, aren't these "abnormal people," the authors ask, "potentially ourselves?" (175). The answer to that rhetorical question is, yes, the "abnormal is often a projection from the underground self of an identity which cannot be psychically owned. Dostoevsky was one of the first Western writers to recognize that the double, or "other," was a necessary figure which contained traces of the repressed self. In the argument of this study, Russia itself has become a necessary "other"—an abnormality which is also a potential self—in the formation of American cultural identity.

This historical chapter will close by looking at a Russian writer who actually came to the United States just after the turn of the century and formed his own views about American cultural identity as it collided with Russian otherness. Maxim Gorky's visit to America in 1906 to raise capital for the fledgling Bolshevik revolution is a now famous chapter in Russian/American literary and political relations. But he

was known and read prior to this visit. By 1905, the period of the first general s. .. St. Petersburg and the abortive beginnings of revolution, Americans were able to read not only Gorky's *Foma Gordeyev* (translated by Isabel Hapgood and published by the Chautauqua Press in 1902), but also *Three of Ther* a collection of stories which portrayed the rootless young men wh· were traversing Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. American critics compared these destitute wanderers to the hobos and tramps of their own country (Brewster 157-58). Gorky was perceived as a realist in the Russian tradition, a painter of life as it is without extraneous romanticizing, a writer who portrayed both the ugliness and degradation of modern Russian life without exaggeration or comment. Gorky's portraya' of social outcasts touched a chord in American consciousness, particularly as there was a great sympathy not only for the general strike of 1905, but for the revolutionary movement in general within Russia. The United States itself had been forged in revolution, and the Tsarist autocracy was increasingly seen as an institution which no longer had a legitimate claim to govern. It was easy enough to project violence and revolution as concepts as long as they remained a reality in the national past, or a possibility on Russian soil. This point of view is expressed by Mark Twain in his essay "The Tsar's Soliloquy" (*North American Review*, 1905) in which he has the Tsar reflect. "We do as we please, we have done as we please for centuries. Our common trade has been crime, our common pastime murder, our common beverage blood, the blood of ... nation. Upon our heads lie millions of murders. Yet the pious moralist says it is a crime to assassinate us" (Brewster 132). The abortive revolution of March, 1905, did not end in the Tsar's death, but in the blood of demonstrators on the cobblestones of the Winter Palace Square in St. Petersburg Nicholas had ordered peaceful strikers shot at without provocation, for a time it seemed as if the autocracy of Russia had effectively suppressed its people once again. But world and American opinion went against this show of calculated force, and there was a strong feeling in support of those who worked for revolution in Russia. This set the scene for Gorky's arrival in America in early April, 1906, at first he was full of high hopes and

great praise, even wonder, over American achievements, but a series of events soon led to disenchantment.[8] Through Gorky, and his disappointment in America, we are given a rare insight into a Russian perspective which sees the United States as the dark "other" of its own national identity. What we see is a mirror image of the transfigurations and projections which Americans have so often performed on the enigma of Russia. In the beginning Gorky's arrival was heralded. He was to attend banquets, meet important literary artists, political leaders, and possibly even gain an audience with then-president Roosevelt (a meeting one wishes could have taken place, if only for aesthetic reasons). He had hoped to raise large sums of money from Americans sympathetic to the Bolshevik cause, but his public reputation in America was destroyed almost overnight by the one subject about which Americans are still squeamish--sex. Gorky was travelling with a woman, Maria Andreeva, a successful artist with the Moscow Art Theatre, who was not his wife. Competing New York papers pounced on the "scandal," even though Gorky had lived with Andreeva for years, and the couple were accepted as common-law man and wife in Europe and Russia. On this pretext, the Gorkys were asked to leave their New York hotel room and were refused entry to other rooms. But there was a political subtext to this American fascination with bedroom farce. First there were the counter-revolutionary efforts of the Imperial Russian Embassy in America, which did what it could to discredit Gorky's cause. Then, too, there was Gorky's own political radicalism which led him, under the advice of sympathetic American communists, to sign a telegram of support for striking Idaho miners who were under legal indictment, and to openly support radical labor leaders, Moyer and Haywood, who were then on trial for murder.

The great banquets planned in Gorky's honour evaporated into air as Gorky overnight became a scapegoat sacrificed to American hysteria concerning revolution on *its* own soil. Gorky's bitterness over his treatment, coupled with his social ideology, soon bubbled up into some of the most searing propaganda against America which has ever been written. Upon his arrival in New York, Gorky could still project his

[8] The story of Gorky in America has been told in many places, but perhaps the most complete account is found in Alayne P. O'Reilly, *America in Contemporary Soviet Literature* (New York UP, 1971): 3-12.

own dreams for an ideal society onto American culture He wrote. "It is not the great things of your city that appeal so much as your people. . . . In their attitude is something of the spirit of America. They stand erect, their faces are bright and clear and free from the cringing, cowering looks of people who have bowed beneath the lash through many generations" (*New York American* 1), "Look what a country this is! Free, beautiful and happy! Someday, perhaps, Russia will be blessed by the same happiness" (*The World* 6). But then the scandal broke and soon, for Gorky, New York began to seem like the title of his essay "The City of the Yellow Devil" in which he portrays the city as a ravenous beast which swallows up the human potential of its inhabitants, all for the sake of Mammon. A few of the more graphic passages follow.

> From afar the city resembles an enormous jaw with uneven black teeth. It breathes clouds of black smoke into the sky, wheezing like a glutton suffering from obesity. (Reilly 6)
>
> The children are like flowers thrown out of the windows of the houses into the filth of the streets by some coarse hand. Nourishing their bodies on the greasy fumes of the city, they are pale and yellow, their blood is poisoned, their nerves are irritated by the ominous shriek of rusty metal, by the gloomy wail of enslaved lightning.
>
> Can these children possibly grow up into healthy, courageous and proud people? (9)
>
> Lonely little people disappear like flies, falling into the darkness. (10)

It is difficult to separate personal disappointment from ideology and propaganda in this writing. In private correspondence at the time he was writing "Yellow Devil" Gorky still speaks of an America of "overwhelming beauty"--"a fantastic country for a man who is able and willing to work!" (Reilly 11). What Gorky's writing does reveal is how far an artist's sensibilities may lapse when he descends into a political propaganda which is a projection of his own national doubts.

Alayne Reilly in his fascinating study of *The Image of America in Contemporary Soviet Literature* has written that Gorky's "The City of the Yellow Devil," though "written more than a decade before the October Revolution that brought the Soviets to power, has become to a large extent a prototype, in style and content, of the Soviet literary image of America" (4). But Reilly goes on to look at the period of the "thaw" in Soviet cultural reality in the 1960s when artists gained a limited freedom to critique their own society and history. The major portion of Reilly's study is devoted to Soviet artists of the 1960s who began to

establish a new view of the "otherness" of America--writers such as Andrei Voznesensky, Valentin Kataev, Victor Nekrasov, and Yevgeny Yevtushenko. Reilly's contention is that these writers began to influence the Soviet vision of America in more complex and positive directions, reading an image of their culture against the American model Often, Reilly says, these authors of the 1960s have used their meditations on America as a mask to both conceal and then reveal social criticism and philosophy which relates directly to Soviet experience. What is achieved, according to Reilly, is a "double exposure," a reflection on the other which necessarily exposes the self (xii). Reilly's thesis concerning Soviet literary response to America is mentioned because it stands as a reversed "double exposure" to this study. American literary response to Russia is about Western writers looking at Russian literature and culture, being influenced by it, and inevitably establishing a clearer vision of their own potentials or identities as writers. And this process is always a "double exposure," the influence a two way street. Rather than project national fears onto the psychic map of Russia, American writers at the their best have used the Russian image in literature to push their own cultural images in more complex and fruitful directions. The Cold War mentality and cultural chauvinism, which has characterized so much of Russian/American cultural relations, is a simplified figural dialectic based on projected self-doubt and ignorance. The literary relations which are most interesting--James and Turgenev, Sherwood Anderson and Dostoevsky, Willa Cather and Tolstoy--widen the dialectic of influence rather than narrowing it to one response. In the second half of this study we turn to those American writers who looked most deeply into the mirror of Russian literature and saw figures in a projected narrative of self.

CHAPTER THREE

James and the Beautiful Genius

> Really, universally, relations stop nowhere, and the exquisite problem of the artist is eternally but to draw, by a geometry of his own, the circle within which they shall happily *appear* to do so.
>
> (James, Preface to *Roderick Hudson*)

More than any other writer of his age, perhaps, James knew that the connectedness or "relations" between things and people, ideas and emotions, were properly speaking endless, that his "problem" as an artist was to devise a formal geometry which gave the illusion of completeness and boundaries. In many respects James' recognition of the interrelatedness or intertextuality of human consciousness sets the problem for the modern writer on literary and cultural influence. As with James, that writer must constantly ask himself where literary relations begin and end, or at least draw the circle around the points where these relations appear to end. In itself, this circling will depend on a myriad of prior influences which have forced the critical gaze in a certain direction.

The present chapter attempts to draw a line around the artistic practices of two writers, Henry James and Ivan Turgenev, to enclose their work within a circle which excludes other powerful voices. What we gain from this formal move, as James knew so well, is focus, coherence, a "made" thing; what we inevitably lose is what James lost: the larger scene, which drawn wide enough, includes all the influences that made up Henry James' artistic life. In tracing this particular line of influence on the work of Henry James, we are not attempting to deny the importance of many other voices from the past: of George Eliot's novels of character and ethical decision, of the French *cénacle* with its formal brilliance, of American forebears as unavoidable as Hawthorne. For now, though, the drawn circle of literary influence encloses the Russian

writer who James always thought of as the "beautiful genius" ("Preface," *The Portrait of A Lady* 6).[1]

James, himself, points us along the path we might take: in the preface to *The Portrait of A Lady* he sets out to recover an image of conversations held long ago with Turgenev concerning the nature of fictional art. It is no accident that these conversations occur where they do; James is attempting to explain the impossibly complex "origin" of the fictional "germ" which was to become his own portrait of a lady. James remembers that for Turgenev the "fictive picture . . . . began . . . almost always with the vision of some person or persons, who hovered before him, soliciting him, as the active or passive figure, interesting him and appealing to him just as they were and by what they were" (5). From there James recalls Turgenev telling him that one only "had to imagine, to invent and select and piece together the situations most useful and favourable to the sense of the creatures themselves. . . ." "As for the origins of one's windblown germs," Turgenev concludes, attempting to understand the mystery of the creative imagination, "who shall say . . . where *they* come from. Isn't all we can say that they come from every quarter of heaven, that they are *there* at almost any turn of the road. . . . They are the breath of life--by which I mean that life, in its own way, breathes them upon us." James' identification with this poetic evocation of origins, and influence in its widest sense, is very nearly complete. He writes: "So this beautiful genius. . . . gave me higher warrant than I then seemed to have met for just that blest habit of one's own imagination, the trick of investing some conceived or encountered individual . . . with the germinal property and authority" ("Preface" 6). The foregoing admission of literary influence could not be much clearer, especially as James tells us a few sentences further on that the germinal force in his novel is "a certain young woman affronting her destiny" (8). James here is describing his own reading and transformation of earlier work by Turgenev, especially I will argue, the 1859 novel *On the Eve*, which James always thought of as the Russian's "greatest triumph" (*French Poets* 286). This was the narrative of Elena, a story which "is all in the portrait

[1] The James, Turgenev connection has entered into the critical tradition. Among the most important studies which link the artistic practices of the two writers are: Cornelia Kelley's *The Early Development of Henry James* (Urbana: U of Illinois Press, 1930); Dale Peterson's *The Clement Vision. Poetic Realism in Turgenev and James* (Port Washington, Kennikat Press, 1975); and Daniel Lerner's "The Influence of Turgenev on Henry James," *Slavonic Yearbook* 20 (1941): 28-54.

of the heroine — a young girl of a will so calmly ardent and intense that she needs nothing but opportunity to become one of the figures about whom admiring legend clusters" (286). James' description of the Russian Elena is a direct projection of his own portrait of Isabel Archer, which would be written seven years later.

In a complex way James' preface to *The Portrait of A Lady* is an attempt to recover the actual processes of one mind's growth under the influence of its own discoveries, to do what James thought of as an ultimately impossible, and even "monstrous," thing. "write the history of the growth of one's imagination" ("Preface" 8). In his remembrance of Turgenev, James is writing a significant chapter in the "growth" of his own imagination--offering a potential portrait of self in the figure of the Russian other. And it is in the creation of a "certain young woman" about whom admiring legend might cluster that James most clearly identifies with Turgenev. The feminine represented many things to a writer such as James, an emerging voice relatively free of the power relations and material determinacies of a male-dominated marketplace, a personality which attempted to define itself within human relationships as an end in itself rather than as a means to industrial, economic and psychological conquest, certainly as the missing or repressed half of a patriarchal official culture which was rapidly disintegrating in front of James' imaginative eyes[2] James invested "certain young women" with the potential for an "otherness" which might stand in stark contrast to all he rejected in a debased materialistic society controlled by the principle of patriarchy. As Leon Edel has written, all his life, James harboured within "the house of the novelist's inner world, the spirit of a young adult female, worldly wise and curious, possessing a treasure of unassailable virginity and

[2] James' *The Portrait of A Lady* has become an almost archetypal novel in the exploration of female personality as it grows into self awareness. In some ways, its fame has blinded readers to James' linked achievement in novels such as *What Maisie Knew* and *The Awkward Age*, both of which might be seen as part of a trilogy which creates a feminine portrait at three stages of development: Maisie, the child, is confronted with the sordid lives and aimless passions which mark the breakdown of the Victorian age in the last decade of the nineteenth century. We leave her just as she is entering into a dim awareness of her own sexuality and its value as currency in the adult world; that is, we leave her at the moment when she leaves her own childhood behind. If possible, James portrays an even darker spectacle in *The Awkward Age*. Nanda Brookenham is nineteen years old, self aware and self-possessed, and already seen as spoiled goods in the rootless upper class London society which includes her own parents. Only absolute intellectual and moral virginity is marketable in a social circle which knows itself as hypocritical as well as debased. Isabel Archer follows her two younger sisters and unknowingly takes the next logical step into the calculated marketplace which is marriage between Amer. in wealth and European tradition.

innocence and able to yield to the masculine active world-searching side of James an ever-fresh and exquisite vision of feminine youth and innocence" (*Treacherous Years* 259). In the exploration of a female otherness within himself, James found "warrant" for the "habit of [his] . . . own imagination" in the novels of Ivan Turgenev Natalie in *Rudin*, Lisa in *A Home of the Gentry*, Elena in *On the Eve*, Marianne in *Virgin Soil* Each of these "young adult" females was characterized by the feminine qualities James himself wanted to explore questing intellect, moral integrity, idealism, passion, and a desire to act in the world. But James' inner life is not as simple as the Edel quote seems to imply. The projection of feminine otherness as the sign of a potential counter-culture is never a principle which gains an easy fantasy victory. For James, and Turgenev, the feminine remains implicated in the masculine, both on a personal and political level The feminine potential for a life of "otherness" is textured through and through by gender and culture opposition. The tragedy, when it invariably comes in both writers, is always a tragedy of men and women together, each defining the other. My argument is that James perceived the beginnings of this dialectic of gender cultural identity and otherness in the novels of Turgenev, and that he transformed this narrative into a reading of the political unconscious of his own times. We turn now to the two young heroines--Isabel in *The Portrait of A Lady* and Elena in *On the Eve*--"about whom admiring legend clusters."

I

Figures About Whom Admiring Legend Clusters: Isabel and Elena

> "The ladies will save us," said the old man, "that is, the best of them will--for I make a difference between them."
>
> (Mr. Touchett, *The Portrait of A Lady*)

Near the beginning of *The Portrait of A Lady* a seemingly frivolous conversation concerning women and

culture takes place on the lawns of Gardencourt between old Mr. Touchett, Ralph Touchett and Lord Warburton. The young men are joking and Mr. Touchett observes that they "have too many jokes. When there are no jokes, you have nothing left" (11). Ralph answers his father with more humour, saying that "fortunately," there are always more jokes. The conversation begins to take a more serious tone, though, when Mr. Touchett argues that the endless jokes of his son's generation cover over a kind of emptiness, or social void, which may change violently and without warning. He observes that the jokes are not limitless, that "things are getting more serious. You young men will find that out. . . . I am convinced there will be great changes, and not all for the better." Mr. Touchett, speaking for Henry James, is describing a society in decline, its younger generation facing toward revolution and war, "changes" which are "not all for the better." And then the conversation takes a curious turn. the young men, Mr. Touchett implies, can no longer be trusted to define their, or their society's, own best interests, it is only the women, and certain ones, who may be counted on for inner integrity. "They [the women] will be firm," says Mr. Touchett, "they will not be affected by the social and political changes I just referred to." Under the guise of drawing room chatter, James has a more serious purpose. to reveal a patriarchal culture which is beginning to double back on its own social emptiness, a society of traditional forms which is historically near the point of bankruptcy The inheritors of this social hegemony, the young men of Britain's aristocracy, no longer have the will to hold these forms together As the old social codes begin to unravel, through inertia and apathy, an underclass begins to emerge whose ideals and energies have not yet been sapped because they have been repressed. These voices begin to speak with the vigour of new found liberation. It is "the ladies [who] will save us," says old Mr. Touchett, "that is, the best of them will--for I make a difference between them" (12). Isabel Archer, who appears on the terrace at Gardencourt a few minutes later, is apparently one of these young ladies, her voice, which becomes James' center of consciousness in the novel, heralds potentially profound changes between men and women in society. But her ideals are broken by a culture which is still under the public sign of male dominance. Her error is to misjudge, or miss altogether, the structural power and underlying form of gender relations in the old culture.

Fifteen years earlier, in his novel *On the Eve*, Turgenev had taken up similar problems concerning the relations between men and women in a patriarchal culture which was drifting toward revolution. In that novel Turgenev examines the role of the "superfluous man" in Russia. It was Turgenev who first coined this term in an attempt to understand an entire autocratic order in Russia which was beginning to disintegrate by the mid-nineteenth century.[3] Many sensitive members of the Russian aristocracy were deeply aware of the structural imbalance of their society and yet were unable to find any relevant roles for their social aspirations. Like the young aristocrats at the beginning of James' *Portrait*, whose irony hides a profound malaise, these Russians experienced, too, a lack of respect for institutions which were a direct function of their own class. For Turgenev a significant part of the literary equation which characterizes the superfluous man is that he is unable to sustain relationships with Russian women of integrity and passion. This failed relationship, in a series of Turgenev's novels, is a personal sign of a larger structural futility within patriarchal culture. In *On the Eve*, it is a *dilettante* artist named Shubin who most clearly articulates Turgenev's concept of the superfluous man in his failed relations with women:

> No one is worthy of her [Elena]. . . . There is no one, as yet, among us, there are no men, look where you will. All are either small fry, or squabblers, petty Hamlets, cannibals, either underground gloom and thicket, or bullies, empty triflers, and drumsticks! And there's still another sort of man for you. they have studied themselves with disgraceful minuteness, they are incessantly feeling the pulse of their every sensation, and reporting to themselves. . . . No, if we had any able men, that young girl, that sensitive soul, would not be leaving us, would not have slipped from us. . . . What does it mean Uvar Ivanovitch? When is our time coming? When shall we bring forth men in our land? (231/232-33)

Shubin's reflections on Russia's superfluous man also subtly reflect on the ways in which the ideal female role is created and finally controlled by male desire.

The perspective of the Russian superfluous man and his failed relations with women, standing as a sign of cultural imbalance in general, influenced James in his own creation of questing, sensitive women from Daisy Miller and Isabel Archer, to Nanda Brookenham and Milly Theale -all of whom are ultimately failed by their weaker male counterparts. But the clearest example of this crossing of feminine otherness

[3] For insight into the social and psychological origins of the superfluous man in Russia, see Alexander Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts* (vol. 4): 1750-60.

occurs between Turgenev's *On the Eve* and James' *The Portrait of A Lady*. In his portrait of Elena, a woman who seeks both the right to act in a social world and personal integrity within private relationships, Turgenev is a precursor for James' own meditations on gender, power, and culture.

At the beginnings of both novels we have portraits of young women who are remarkably similar. Elena is described in the following way:

> In the whole of her being, in the expression of her face, which was attentive and somewhat timid, in her mutable glance, in her smile, which seemed strained, in her soft and uneven voice, there was something nervous, electrical, something impulsive and precipitate,--in a word, something which could not please everyone, which even repelled some people. (45)

We are told that Elena "had grown up very strangely" (46) in her family, and that later a governess had "imbued Elena with a taste for reading, but reading alone did not satisfy the girl, from her childhood up, she had thirsted for activity, for active good. the poor, the hungry, the sick, interested her, disturbed, tortured her; she saw them in her dreams. . . (47).

Here is Elena's reflection in Isabel of *The Portrait of A Lady*: "She had a desire to leave the past behind her, and, as she said to herself, to begin afresh. This desire, indeed, was not a birth of the present occasion, it was as familiar as the sound of rain upon the window. . . . Her imagination was by habit ridiculously active. if the door were not opened to it, it jumped out of the window" (30). Isabel, too, has been raised "strangely," perhaps "not even brought up" (31) at all--"The depths of this young lady's nature were a very out-of-the-way place between which and the surface communication was interrupted by a dozen capricious forces" (32). And like Elena, Isabel is often thought bookish, difficult, unapproachable, even though her deepest desire is to enter into a life of action and accomplishment:

> Her reputation of reading a great deal hung about her . . ., it was supposed to engender difficult questions, and to keep the conversation at a low temperature. . . . She had a great desire for knowledge, but she really preferred almost any source of information to the printed page. . . . She carried within herself a great fund of life, and her deepest enjoyment was to feel the continuity between the movements of her own heart and the agitations of the world. (33)

These two high-spirited, nervous, intellectual girls are about to embark on journeys which will transform their lives, chasten their untutored imaginations, and reveal them as women of moral strength and emotional

depth. Early in each novel both women have intimations of a destiny which goes far beyond accepted female roles in their cultures. Isabel, reflecting on her relationship to men, thinks, "Deep in her soul--it was the deepest thing there--lay a belief that if a certain light should dawn, she could give herself completely " (50) But immediately afterwards she recognizes that such a reality is "too formidable to be attractive " Isabel chooses for freedom to act in the world rather than giving herself "completely" to a man in marriage; in choosing independence rather than subservience she appears to break with a dominant code of romantic female behaviour in her society. Her fatal error is to believe too easily that in Gilbert Osmond she has found a man whose cultured sophistication places him beyond the patriarchal power structures from which she is attempting to escape. She believes that both her personal integrity and her ability to act in a larger social world are secure with this man who has seemingly renounced the sordid hypocrisies of the marketplace. Isabel does not recognize until too late that she *is* the bargain in the marketplace, that Osmond as a male will control and limit her freedom as a woman in ways that Caspar Goodwood and Lord Warburton would never have dreamed of. These two, both rejected as lovers by Isabel, represent the masculine ideals of power coupled with an outright acceptance of the code of male protection and control of the female By novel's end they begin to look almost positive in comparison with Osmond's psychological parasitism. Isabel chooses Osmond because he speaks, falsely, to what James called in another context the "great thing" or "sacred terror" (*Awkward Age* 183), that "light" at the deepest level of her imagination which tells her that she might be received as an end in herself, that the marriage relationship might be a door opening into a larger existence rather than become a means to social control.

Isabel's "sacred terror," her belief in a unique destiny of knowledge and freedom--so cruelly dampened by experience--is shared by the experience of Elena Nikolaevna in *On the Eve.* She, too, at the beginning of her fictional existence experiences the stirrings of a sacred potential within herself, a potential which has no ground in which to fix itself. She is described in the following way:

> . she lived her own life, but a lonely life. Her soul burned and expired alone, she beat her wings like a bird in a cage. . . . Everything around her seemed to her either senseless or incomprehensible. 'How can one live without love? but there is no one to love!' she thought, and

> fear fell upon her at that thought, at those sensations. . . . Sometimes she took it into her head that she wanted something which no one, in the whole of Russia, wishes, thinks of. something powerful, nameless, which she was not able to control, fairly seethed up within her, and demanded to burst its way out. (50)

Like Isabel, Elena begins by asking a question about feminine identity which involves the giving of oneself "completely" to a man, but she wants something more which is not defined by unequal gender roles, no matter how romantic. What Elena seeks is what Isabel seeks: a relationship with a man which is defined by both personal intimacy and public freedom. That this human combination is an imaginative and practical impossibility in late nineteenth-century society is borne out by the tragedies of both heroines. Isabel gains neither love, nor freedom to act in the world, instead her marriage becomes a "house of darkness" (396), and her "unswerving action," finding no release in the world, becomes almost entirely internal, psychologized as a philosophy of renunciation. "All the first steps" of her relationship with Osmond had been taken "in the purest confidence, and then she had suddenly found the infinite vista of a multiplied life to be a dark, narrow alley with a dead wall at the end" (391), a descent from "the high places of happiness" into "realms of restriction and depression" in a "darkened" (392) world. Elena finds love for a brief time, but Insaroff is a man marked for death by consumption. At the end, without personal love and having given up her cultural home, Elena becomes a martyr to Insaroff's memory and to the Bulgarian insurrection. She says only, "why this beauty, this delightful feeling of hope[?] . . . Can it be that this is only in us, and outside of us is eternal cold and silence? . . . Can it be that it is impossible to implore, to bring back happiness?" (258). For both Isabel and Elena, the socially conditioned model of the selfless woman becomes a prison house of wisdom, and James and Turgenev show us just how difficult it is for these women to imagine themselves beyond the gender roles of a given historical moment.

But the darkened world which both heroines inhabit at novels' ends is not entirely a world of passive despair, both are characterized by what James, describing Elena's beauty, called "unswerving action" (*French Poets* 287), even if it is an action of renunciation. For Isabel, too, "suffering was an active condition, it was not a chill, a stupor, a despair, it was a passion of thought, of speculation, of response to

every pressure" (*Portrait* 392) Elena's decision to act, and to renounce the possibilities of her former life, is given in a final letter to her parents in which she announces her intention to serve the revolution in Bulgaria:

> I do not know what will become of me, but even after Dmitry's [Insaroff's] death I shall remain faithful to his memory, to his life's work. . . . Probably I shall not survive all this--so much the better. I have been brought to the edge of the abyss and must fall in. Not in vain did Fate unite us. perhaps I killed him, who knows, now it is his turn to draw me after him. I sought happiness--perchance I shall find death. . . . Forgive me all the sorrow I have caused you. it was against my will. But why should I return to Russia? What is there to do in Russia? (273)

Elena renounces all claim to a personal life when she embraces Insaroff's ideal and disappears into Bulgaria. Her final question--"why should I return to Russia? What is there to do in Russia?"--is echoed by Isabel in her apparent decision to live in another country, populated by Osmond and her step-daughter Pansy, to reject the possibility of returning to America and her former life with Caspar Goodwood. Isabel, too, asks "what is there to do?" in a world which offers women the protection of Caspar Goodwoods and demands that they "do" nothing. Isabel's choice to return to Osmond and Rome is predicated on a promise she has made to Pansy ("I won't desert you," she tells Pansy when she learns of her fear of Osmond [513]) not to leave her alone and defenceless in the hands of her father. On however limited a scale, Isabel has a responsibility to act in the world, to count against the codes of a dying culture, a responsibility and freedom she would be denied in the world of Goodwoods and Warburtons.

And in one very important respect, Isabel goes beyond the self-abnegation which is the only fictional choice left to Elena. It is as if James had observed the trap into which Elena had fallen--a religion of suffering made complete by her inability to imagine any longer a personal life--and has swerved away from this solution in Isabel.[4] Driven to extremity in her relationship with Osmond, Isabel, like Elena, dreams a vision of oblivion. a sweet death which would be "to cease utterly, to give it all up and not know anything more. . ." (516). She almost succumbs to this vision, but James offers the slimmest, most

[4] Harold Bloom has characterized precisely this literary move as *clinamen*, a swerving away from prior meaning, a "corrective movement . . . which implies that the precursor poem went accurately up to a certain point, but then should have swerved, precisely in the direction the new poem takes" (*Anxiety* 14).

ambiguous escape. It is an escape, not yet realized, from patriarchal domination whether subtle and manipulative in the person of Osmond, or powerful and dominant in Caspar Goodwood This future exists only as a dimly perceived ideal(l) in a world whose social organization does not yet allow for its expression

> She saw herself, in the distant years, still in the attitude of a woman who had her life to live, and these intimations contradicted the spirit of the present hour. It might be desirable to die, but this privilege was evidently to be denied her. Deep in her soul--deeper than any appetite for renunciation--was the sense life would be her business for a long time to come. And at moments there was something inspiring, almost exhilarating, in the conviction. It was a proof of strength--it was a proof that she should some day be happy again. It couldn't be that she was to live only to suffer. (517)

Near the end of her fictional life, though her choices are sharply limited by the society in which she lives, Isabel dreams not of renunciation and suffering, her present conditions, but of future life in which she reaches toward personal happiness. Her own thoughts give the lie to these critical readings which argue "that behind the 'cage' of Isabel's marriage is the cage of her own mind, for she has unconsciously internalized those values of the male world which function to keep her an imprisoned and unquestioning victim" (Fowler 82). The foregoing is a far better reading of Elena than it is of Isabel, although both are subject to the extreme pressures of a patriarchal society which wants to make them conform to, and internalize, its values. Both Turgenev and James were acutely aware that in the personal, domestic dramas which were being played out in their times, there was also a larger social conflict, a conflict which reached to the very roots of their societies. Both writers shared "the imagination of disaster" (*Letters to A C Benson* 35), and in portraying the unequal struggles between individual men and women, were also portraying imbalanced societies which repressed the potential voices of women and in part because of this were drifting toward disaster. That is why James has one of his characters say at the beginning of *The Portrait of A Lady* that women, "the best of them. . . . will save us." He is implying that only a society which begins to listen to its "other" voices, begins to value what was mistaken for weakness, has any chance of survival. Isabel is James' portrait of one of those other voices, and if it is not clearly heard in the present it may be that we should pay greater attention to the coming changes which are implied by Henrietta Stackpole in the closing lines of the novel. "Look here . . ," she said, "just you wait!" (545).

While Turgenev could only imagine renunciation and oblivion for Elena in her struggle to find a voice, James swerved away from this "darkness ending in a blank wall" and created a character who, even in her bleakest hour, imagines "that life would be her business for a long time to come."

The relations between men and women as a sign of cultural health or sickness, was a theme which held the imaginations of Turgenev and James to the end. The political reality of unequal relations between the sexes only becomes more explicit in later novels.[5] Normally, though, it is Turgenev who is seen as the novelist of social commitment. Works such as *Fathers and Sons* and *Virgin Soil* lead us through the Russia of the 1860s and 70s, with its nihilism and philosophical anarchism, its scientific positivism, its radicalization of the peasants and workers, and its drift toward revolution. James wrote just one novel, *The Princess Casamassima*, in which the explicit intent was to portray the social/political conditions of his time. The novel when published was met with incomprehension, or was dismissed as that monstrosity, an aesthetic work masquerading as political critique, in short a failure. Several critics have noticed thematic parallels between *The Princess Casamassima* and *Virgin Soil* and have argued fairly convincingly that Turgenev's earlier political work is the major source for James' novel.[6] Quite frankly, these older studies, while good on source material, tell us very little about the ways in which an actual literary encounter sanctions a later writer's efforts to possess a similar literary/political terrain. The concluding portion of this chapter will examine the ways in which James confronted the political reality of Turgenev's novel, *Virgin Soil*, in imagining his own novel of the political unconscious--*The Princess Casamassima*. In these later works the relationship between gender, class, and power has moved from the level of the personal and domestic to the level of explicitly political relationships.

[5] James' *The Bostonians* is a particularly chilling meditation on this theme, as are the late novels *The Golden Bowl* and *The Wings of the Dove*. Turgenev in the novels *Smoke* and *Spring Torrents* traces cultural exhaustion in the perverse relations which exist between men and women.

[6] Critics who have made this connection include Daniel Lerner, "The Influence of Turgenev on Henry James", W. H. Tilley, *The Background of The Princess Casamassima*, and Anthony D. Briggs, "Someone Else's Sledge. Further Notes on Turgenev's *Virgin Soil* and Henry James's *The Princess Casamassima*."

II

The Princess Casamassima, Virgin Soil, and the Political Unconscious

> Believe me, no man of real talent ever serves aims other than his own and he finds satisfaction in himself alone. . . Only those who can do no better submit to a given theme or carry out a programme.
>
> (Turgenev, Preface to *Collected Works*, 1880)

> The condition of that body [the English upper class] seems to me to be in many ways very much the same rotten and *collapsible* one as that of the French aristocracy before the revolution--in its cleverness and conversation; or perhaps it's more like the heavy congested and depraved Roman world upon which the barbarians came down. In England the Huns and Vandals will have to come *up*--from the black depths of the (in the people) enormous misery, though I don't think the Attila is quite yet found. . . .
>
> (James to Charles Eliot Norton, Dec. 6, 1886)

Every serious reader must make a choice concerning Henry James and the novel of social commitment. There are two major readings of both the man and his later novels. the most common is of James the aesthete living in the rarefied air of subtle nuance and psychological gesture far removed from the realities of social praxis, choosing always for power and the sustaining illusions of the aristocracy This is the James of Hugh Kenner's *The Pound Era*, an artist who exists prior to modernity, an epigone who symbolizes, in that book's first sentence, the end of a literary epoch. "Toward the evening of a gone world, the light of its last summer pouring into a Chelsea street found and suffused the red waistcoat of Henry James, lord of decorum, *en promenade*, exposing his Boston niece to the tone of things" (3). But there is another reading, more difficult in the proof, which figures James as a solitary explorer of social realities and political praxis

inscribed in the gestures and attitudes of individual men and women existing at the end of a cultural epoch. Perhaps the first view is easiest to hold, the image of James in the imagined drawing rooms of the wealthy and powerful, of the endless conversations seemingly devoid of any physical or material effect, his apparent rejection of the physicality and dynamism of American democracy in favour of a hierarchal older culture based on form and tradition–all these things create a recognizable picture of Henry James, social reactionary. But the other view, first put forward so far as I am aware by Lionel Trilling in his groundbreaking essays "Reality in America" (1941/46) and "*The Princess Casamassima*" (1948), ranges James against the forces of a material and social dynamism which only masks a cultural, intellectual and emotional void.

In that first essay Trilling argues that a writer such as James exists at the "bloody crossroads where politics and literature meet" but that liberal critics have traditionally asked "of what use, of what actual political use, are his gifts and their intention" (11). Even given James "extraordinary moral perceptiveness," and the fact that this perception is related to politics and social life, "of what possible practical value in our world of impending disaster can James's work be?" This question, Trilling believes, stems from a cultural prejudice "that there exists an opposition between reality and mind and that one must enlist oneself in the party of reality" (10)–the typical intellectual malaise of desiring to be in direct contact with the objects of contemplation and social praxis because one feels oneself to be so far removed from that reality. James suffers, and I believe suffers up to the present, under this implicit often repressed materialist ideology, a perception which Trilling defines in the following way. "an art which is marked by perception and knowledge, although all very well in its way, can never get us through gross dangers and difficulties" (12). But for Trilling, James' "electrical qualities of mind," lead him to an "authoritative immediacy" (14) in artistic presentation of reality, which goes far beyond the perspective of any single ideology no matter how elegant or pragmatic. As with Turgenev in the epigraph to this chapter, James' portrayal of the individual in history, bound as he is by political/economic reality, becomes an unconscious bearer of ideological truth. Both James and Turgenev lived by the aesthetic/moral truth that "only those who can do no better submit

to a given theme or carry out a programme" (Turgenev, *Literary Reminiscences* 91). And both, in their political novels, came under heavy criticism for their refusal to be defined by any one practical ideology.

What James offers in a novel such as *The Princess Casamassima* is the immediacy of political, aesthetic, and emotional perception in individual men and women at the end of a cultural epoch, a portrait of what the Marxist critic Fredric Jameson has called the "political unconscious" of a moment in history. An odd pairing, Jameson and James (in this case the relationship between names surely can have no symbolic resonance), and certainly James is the last author Jameson might think of to exemplify an exploration of the "political unconscious." Jameson's concept, though, clarifies just what Trilling is searching toward when he speaks of James' "electrical quality of mind." In his essay "Marxism and Historicism" Jameson attempts to understand the movement of history as a dialectic between what he terms "Identity" and "Difference."[7] Identity is linked to the prevailing social forms and ideas of an epoch which are fully accepted without question, reality which seems to be beneath the level of ideological critique. Difference is the historical force which at all times disrupts the supposed solidity of social identity, a "powerful counter image" (44) which in many forms interrogates prevailing social forms. Jameson argues that in any epoch there will be "alternative worlds which can never intersect" (45) and gives as example the ideological opposition of a bourgeoisie (Identity) and a revolutionary principle (Difference). Because of this "binary opposition" of ideological perceptions the writing of "objective" history becomes an impossibility, no point of view contains, or attempts to contain, points of view which are not proper to its ideology. But Jameson offers a path out of ideological isolation, and here he comes very close to the world of Henry James. A truly questing mind, he says, as it attempts to come into a lived "contact with the past" will necessarily journey "through the imaginary and through its ideology," a journey which takes that mind through the otherness of "some properly political unconscious" (45). This last I take to be a fair critical analysis of the imagined world of James' *Princess Casamassima*. What James himself referred to as the

[7] In my reading of James, Jameson, and the political unconscious, I have been influenced by Martha Banta's essay, "Beyond Post Modernism. The Sense of History in *The Princess Casamassima*." *The Henry James Review* (Winter 1982): 96-107.

"grasping imagination" creates a reality in which alternative worlds and ideologies begin to interact with equal rights revealing some properly political unconscious.

Although Trilling could never have used Jameson's terminology, he really is very good on the "political unconscious" which James passes through in *Princess Casamassima*. In his classic essay "*The Princess Casamassima*," Trilling focuses on James' "imagination of disaster," portraying a mind which is "startlingly prescient" in its understanding of "society as crowds and police, as a field of justice and injustice, reform and revolution," a mind which continues to reveal 'much about misery and downtroddenness and of what happens when strong and gifted personalities are put at a hopeless disadvantage, and about the possibilities of extreme violence, and about the sense of guilt and unreality which may come to members of the upper classes and the strange complex efforts they make to find innocence and reality, and about the conflict between the claims of art and of social duty"–in short the intersecting worlds which form the political unconscious of a "Europe [which] has reached the full of its ripeness and is passing over into rottenness"(60-61).

Trilling is brilliant too on the "alternative worlds" of class and ideology which James passes through in his effort to grasp imaginatively the repressed human/political reality of his time. "James represents the poor," Trilling tells us, "as if they had dignity and intelligence in the same degree as people of the reading class. More, he assumes this and feels no need to insist that it is so. This is a grace of spirit that we are so little likely to understand that we may resent it. . . . That James should create poor people so proud and intelligent as to make it impossible for anyone, even the reader who has paid for the privilege, to condescend to them . . . is, one ventures to guess, an unexpressed and never-to-be-expressed reason for finding him 'impotent in matters sociological.' We who are liberal and progressive know that the poor are our equals in every sense except that of being equal to us" (87-88).

I take the time to present at length this second view of James, because it is one I want to contrast with Ivan Turgenev's own "imagination of disaster" in his *Virgin Soil*, another novel of the political unconscious set at a time when Tsarist autocracy is beginning to crumble under the growing force of

revolution, the intersection of two opposing worlds. I mentioned earlier that critics have long seen *Virgin Soil* as a practical source for *Princess Casamassima*. There are an overabundance of thematic and character parallels, perhaps the most obvious being the relationship between the major protagonists of the two novels- Hyacinth Robinson and Nejdanov. Both are explicitly portrayed as divided natures belonging by birth to both the proletariat and the aristocracy. Hyacinth is the unacknowledged offspring of Lord Purvis and a French mistress, Florentine Vivier, who murders the Lord after he has rejected both her and his paternity. Reflecting on the necessity to choose between the "two mighty forces," the forces which he believes will soon come to a political "death grapple," (165) Hyacinth foreshadows his own fate, the warring forces within himself. "There were times when he said it might very well be his fate to be divided, to the point of torture, to be split open by sympathies that pulled him in different ways, for hadn't he an extraordinarily mingled current in his blood" (165). His is a personality of warring ideologies, intolerable oppositions between "identity" and "difference" which force him to live in "alternative worlds which can never intersect." Thus, effectively, is Hyacinth's fate leading to the blank wall which is his own suicide.

Nejdanov is the illegitimate son of Prince G. who has seduced his daughter's governess, a woman who dies on the day of Nejdanov's birth. Nejdanov, as well, feels two opposed currents flowing fatally in his blood, and like Hyacinth attempts to reject his aristocratic heritage in favour of a commitment to the people. And like Hyacinth, Nejdanov is literally torn in two by divided loyalties. love of an aristocratic woman and art on one side and on the other a failed desire to right by revolution the social imbalance he sees all around him. Nejdanov, too, takes his own life at the end of the novel after finding that he has a place neither in the world of the aristocracy nor amongst the people. Nejdanov's description is a direct model for Hyacinth. "Everything about him betokened his origin [of the aristocracy]. His tiny ears, hands, feet, his small but fine features, delicate skin, wavy hair, his very voice was pleasant. . . . The false position he had been placed in since childhood had made him sensitive and irritable, but his natural generosity had kept him from becoming suspicious and mistrustful. . . . He was passionate and pure-minded, bold and timid at the same time. . . . He had an affectionate heart, but held himself aloof from everybody . . . but

Nejdanov was not born under a lucky star, and did not find life an easy matter" (27-28) Nejdanov s secret and most profound life is that of the artist and man of imagination, and Hyacinth as well is drawn to the physical beauty of books and aspires secretly to contribute something of his own to literature. Both are irresistibly and totally drawn to the beauty of the great world in its architecture and its art, at the same time they recognize that this very world is built on the blood and suffering of the poor. The lived contradiction of this world is the "unlucky star" which hangs over both Nejdanov and Hyacinth. It becomes an internal condition whose truth destroys both.

We should not be surprised at these similarities. James himself had a complex reaction to *Virgin Soil* after it was published in 1877. Almost immediately, he wrote an extended review of the novel in the *Nation*. That review can be taken as a detailed outline for the political novel he would write nine years later. James writes:

> His [Turgenev's] central figure is usually a person in a false position, generally not of his own making. . . . Such eminently is the case with young Neshdanoff, who is the natural son of a nobleman, not recognized by his father's family, and who, drifting through irritation and smothered rage and vague aspiration into the stream of occult radicalism, finds himself fatally fastidious and sceptical and "aesthetic"--more essentially an aristocrat, in a word, than any of the aristocrats he has agreed to conspire against. (*Literary Reviews* 192-93)

And finally of course the "'aesthetic' young man, venturing to play with revolution, finds it a coarse, ugly, vulgar, and moreover very cruel thing; the reality makes him deadly sick" (195). This is Hyacinth Robinson's career and demise in miniature. Other of Turgenev's characters find themselves transformed into James' London revolutionaries as well. The fatally beautiful, complex, and finally corrupt Princess Casamassima seems to combine the qualities of the politically committed and lovely Marianne and the manipulative, self-involved nature of Mme. Sipiagin. Solomin, who James describes as "a radical of the sturdy and practical type, who can bide his time" has a complex moral rebirth in the figure of Paul Muniment, perhaps the most enigmatic of all James' creations in *Princess Casamassima*.

There is little doubt that James depended heavily on the plot and characters of *Virgin Soil* in formulating his own novel of identity, difference and the political unconscious, but it would be a

simplification to say that he wholly admired the Russian novel. In the dark mirror which was Turgenev's novel, James saw a distorted, half-realized image of a much more complex political unconscious operating between opposed ideological systems. In private correspondence he wrote to T. S Perry: "The book will disappoint you, as it did me, it has fine things in it, but I think it the weakest of his long stories . I should not find myself able conscientiously to recommend any American publisher to undertake *Tierres Vierges*. It would have no success" (Tilley 11-12). In an irony that James could not be aware of, he was describing his own novel in this final sentence, which itself achieved neither critical nor financial success

In February, 1884, with Turgenev dead just a few months, James began on *The Princess Casamassima*. The field was clear for James to begin where the Russian left off in the exploration of the political unconscious of his time, to rewrite Turgenev's "failed" book so that its unrealized potentials could be heard in James' proper voice. James' transfiguration of Turgenev's political vision closely resembles a pattern of influence which Bloom has called *apophrades*, or the return of the dead, in which the later poet allows the precursor's voice to speak openly in his own work "and the uncanny effect is that the new poem's achievement makes it seem to us, not as though the precursor were writing it, but as though the later poet himself had written the precursor's characteristic work" (*Anxiety* 16). In figural terms James had performed a vast metalepsis or transumption of Turgenev's novel. In order to show specifically how this transumption takes place, I want to examine two linked characters from the novels. Solomin and Paul Muniment. Both at first seem to represent a recognizable type. the new man of unshakeable faith and practical intelligence who comes from the people and embodies their legitimate revolutionary impulses Both are highly attractive figures, supremely self-confident and reserved, confident that they are borne forward inevitably by necessary historical forces. But while Solomin never becomes anything more than this type, exists as it were outside of a properly political unconscious, Muniment has depths of motivation which are as impressive and horrifying as the violence he promotes. Only gradually do we see Muniment not just as an opaque surface but as a human being who exists at the point where warring ideologies meet, a character in whom are inscribed the unconscious forces of his class. The picture of Solomin, while

impressive, is all of one piece a mechanic and factory manager to Muniment's chemist, both practical men, unafraid to dirty their hands, "he spoke little--so little that one might almost have said he was quite silent.

Solomin did not believe that the Russian revolution was so near at hand. . . . He looked on from a distance as it were, but was still a comrade by their side. . . . He himself belonged to the people, and fully realized that the great bulk of them, without whom one can do nothing, were still quite indifferent, that they first must be prepared, by quite different means and for entirely different ends than the upper classes" (114). Solomin in the novel stands out as a man of principle and practical vision in a vast sea of ideological fantasy and psychological posturing, but for all of this he possesses no depth, no political unconscious.

Muniment in the beginning occupies the same structural position. a face marked by "intelligence and resolution" and "a kind of joyous moral health, a rugged frame and hands stained by work, an inner self possession which gave the impression of 'extraordinary' things in his head, that he was thinking them out to the logical end, wherever it might land him" (206)--someone like Solomin who has no use for the "millennium" but "believe[s] in the democracy" (446). For Hyacinth, Paul Muniment becomes a touchstone for manly resolve and political vision, as does Solomin for Nejdanov. And it happens too that the women the two heroes love, Princess Casamassima and Marianne, both reject their affections and turn to Solomin and Muniment as men of action and unbreakable resolve. As far as this goes there is little difference between these two men of the people. But James goes beyond the political surface in Paul Muniment, and he does it through his relations with Hyacinth and Princess Casamassima. Solomin does nothing but support and care for Nejdanov in his ideological torture, and once Nejdanov has killed himself, Marianne and Solomin marry Paul Muniment's relationship to Hyacinth is much darker. Hyacinth conceives of Muniment as his greatest friend and is willing to follow him even against his own instincts (446), but Paul always holds something back. It is Muniment who puts Hyacinth forward as an assassin in their revolutionary plot, a role which will lead almost certainly to his death, and it is Muniment who faces the death of his friend with what seems a "cheerful stoicism," an almost brutal disregard which Hyacinth never quite realizes is egotistical indifference, though he does know that he "could not have detached himself from

personal prejudice so effectually as to put forward in that way, for the terrible 'job,' a little chap he liked" (390).

Gradually another dimension of Paul Muniment emerges, some properly political unconscious which reveals a potential for careerism and self-advancement under the guise of revolution, a person who might use anyone--a Princess, or a Lady, or a poor bookbinder--to advance his cause. Even Hyacinth comes to see the nihilistic gleam which reveals "that if he [Muniment] had no illusions about the people who had got everything into their hands he had as few about those who had egregiously failed to do so" (391).

It is Lionel Trilling again who most succinctly states the collision of two opposed ideological systems as they mark the career of a man of the people. "In Paul Muniment a genuine idealism coexists with a secret desire for personal power. It is one of the brilliances of the novel that his ambition is never made explicit. . . . His natural passion for power must never become explicit, for it is one of the beliefs of our culture that power invalidates moral purpose" ("*Casamas..ma*" 90). It is Rosy Muniment, herself a brilliant cripple, who gets closest to her brother's inner complexity when she says. "What my brother really

for--well, one of these days, when you know, you'll tell me" (149).

The political unconscious emerges through the relations of relatively minor characters as well. . erhaps the most chilling moment in the entire novel occurs just before Hyacinth's suicide when he seeks out his friend and admirer Millicent Henning. In the dress shop where she models he comes, unobserved, upon Millicent and Captain Sholto, while Sholto pretends to be considering a purchase but in reality is emotionally undressing her magnificent form. Millicent displays herself as "admirably still" (585), as a revealed odalisque. Hyacinth withdraws but not before his eyes meet Captain Sholto's. Hyacinth's last human connection is severed, and in this pathetic moment we see all at once how a corrupt aristocracy, now reduced to the impotence of sexual voyeurism and connoisseurism, uses the lower class as a willing, but unaware tool, in its collapse into onanism.

The same deepening of a re,..essed political consciousness occurs in James' brilliant depiction of psychological deception in Princess Casamassima, a deception which breaks Hyacinth's heart. Her portrait

comments directly on the unformed aristocratic idealism of Marianne and the cultural cynicism masquerading as liberalism in Mme. Sipiagin. The divisions within the Princess character encompass and extend the limits of both of her literary predecessors. In her youth (portrayed in *Roderick Hudson*) the Princess had sold herself for a "title and a fortune" and the remainder of her existence is spent futilely attempting to face up to this fact. In her own novel she seeks the reality of poverty and revolution as if it might bring her personal absolution, but she cannot throw off her title or fortune and her hypocrisy and self reflexive angst are palpable in the novel At first it is Hyacinth who she believes will lead her out of the trap of self into ideological reality, and when he becomes too human, too real, she projects her fantasy onto Paul Muniment who is only too happy to oblige. Trilling sums up this dark reality of the political unconscious:

> the great irony of her [Princess Casamassima's] fate is that the more passionately she seeks reality, and the happier she becomes in her belief that she is close to it, the further removed she is. . . . She cannot but mistake the reality, for she believes it is a thing, a position, a finality, a bedrock. She is, in short, the very embodiment of the modern will which masks itself in virtue, making itself appear harmless, the will that hates itself and finds its manifestations guilty and is able to exist only if it operates in the name of virtue, that despises the variety and modulations of the human story and longs for an absolute humanity, which is but another way of saying a nothingness. (91-92)

Trilling ends by saying that if "we comprehend . . . the totality" of James' vision, "we understand that the novel is an incomparable representation of the spiritual circumstances of our civilization", and this is true because his imagination of disaster, his vision of "ambiguity and error . . . pride and beauty" is tempered by a corresponding "imagination of love." In the last decade of the twentieth century one can only add that in *The Princess Casamassima* James charts the vast fugue of what ideologues once called "false consciousness" or lack of "good faith," in his time, and in ours, that his political vision is a still not fully understood exploration of the explosive, because repressed, political unconscious of a moment in history. Nine years earlier than James, another great novelist, Ivan Turgenev, had attempted to convey in appropriate types "the body and pressure of time" as it was in late nineteenth-century Russia. the guilty conscience of an aristocracy beginning to reach, for its own repressed reasons, toward the people. Nejdanov and his friends are part of that back-to-the-people movement, but Turgenev's novel, interesting as it is, seems flat

and schematic in comparison to the reflexive ambiguities of desire which stream through James' *Princess Casamassima.* His is a novel of ideology lived on the pulse of personality. Before his death, Nejdanov is painfully aware of Marianne's rejection of his false consciousness and her growing love for Solomin, but this was a love which could be understood as inevitable, if heartbreaking. Marianne's revolutionary idealism and Solomin's social pragmatism are simply meant for one another. This personal rejection and its political implications pale in significance beside the silent betrayal which Hyacinth suffers at the hands of Millicent, the Princess Casamassima, and finally his other love, Paul Muniment. All become unconscious manifestations of their class and their moments in history, vibrating to life in the moment when unadmitted personal desire collides with political reality. Hyacinth, unlike his literary cousin Nejdanov, dimly perceives this about them, and about himself. He is the least unconscious character in an entire fictional world and this is his tragedy. With Hyacinth's death at the blank wall of a "fatal inner division," James' transumption of Turgenev's story is complete.

CHAPTER FOUR

Willa Cather and the Russians:

"The earth speaks louder than the people"

> The great group of Russian novelists who flashed out in the north like a new constellation at about the middle of the last century did more for the future than they knew. They had no benumbing literary traditions behind them. They had a glorious language, new to literature, but old in human feeling and wisdom and suffering, and they were themselves men singularly direct and powerful, with sympathies as wide as humanity. They were all very big men, physically (of rugged health, with the exception of Dostoevsky,) and had no need to be continually defending their virility in print. Horse racing and dog racing and hunting are almost the best of Tolstoy. In Gogol, Turgenev, Lermontov, the earth speaks louder than the people.
>
> (Willa Cather, Radio Speech, 1933)

> We come and go, but the land is always here. And the people who love it and understand it are the people who own it--for a little while at least.
>
> (Willa Cather, *O Pioneers!*)

Willa Cather's growth as a writer has most often been linked to the influence of the French, her beloved Flaubert, Mérimée and Daudet, and latterly to Henry James (a pernicious influence?), and by certain feminist critics to Sarah Orne Jewett (*Kingdom of Art* 37, and O'Brien, *Emerging Voice*). There is a demonstrable truth to this line of descent; one only has to read Cather's comments on style in her *On Writing* or *The Kingdom of Art* to hear echoes of the French *cénacle*, or to look at stories such as "The Namesake," "The Willing Muse," "The Profile," or even *Alexander's Bridge* to hear the lingering voice of Henry James, and Jewett's limpid, seemingly unaffected prose in *The Country of the Pointed Firs* points the way to Cather's own explorations of the lives and tragedies of simple, country people. But with this admitted, there is one other national literature which arguably had an even more profound effect on Cather's ideas and style over

the course of her entire literary career. I am speaking of the Russians, and in particular Turgenev and Tolstoy, who act as the two poles of a literary sensibility which divides her career into a distinct early and late phase.

Just how deep the Russian connection goes is revealed in a remarkable letter Cather wrote to H. L. Mencken in 1922 concerning the genesis of her own identity as a writer.[1] The letter, now housed in the Enoch Pratt Library, Baltimore, begins with a reflection on literary influence. Cather wonders with some pain if she has subconsciously been modelling herself on foreign writers. She had felt terribly alone in writing her first novel, *O Pioneers!*, it seemed so different than the formula fiction produced by her American contemporaries. And then she tells an odd story. she was fourteen years old, living in Red Cloud, Nebraska, when by some chance four of Tolstoy's novels came into her possession. *Anna Karenina*, *The Cossacks*, "Ivan Ilych" and "The Kreutzer Sonata." She read and reread these works constantly over the next three years and was indelibly marked by them (she is still not sure that these books have not defined the way she looks at literature). But this inheritance was not without its psychic costs--it seemed to have cut her off from an American tradition, viewed by American artists. She attempted to throw off the force of Tolstoy by turning to a long apprenticeship with Henry James and Edith Wharton. One of the results was *Alexander's Bridge*. But, Cather tells Mencken, before this novel was written, she had already composed a draft of *O Pioneers!*, a draft which she showed to no one because she felt the strangeness of its perspective made it unacceptable. This was a novel written first and foremost out of a deep imaginative response to the landscape and country of youth, Cather remembers, and she had no American models for this imaginative journey.

Clearly in this letter Cather is awkwardly trying to describe her own genesis as a writer. The point of origin is Tolstoy and a fourteen year old girl who read in the great Russian's works about a land which spoke louder than the people. There were many detours, false starts, in casting about for an acceptable

[1] Cather's will stipulates that direct quotations may not be taken from her letters. The Mencken letter, dated 6 Feb. 1922, is housed in the Enoch Pratt Library, Baltimore.

stance, for a tradition which was understandably American, Cather turned to James and Jewett. But this experiment was a false one finally--Cather came back again to the strangeness of the notes she had made for an earlier novel, *O Pioneers!*, and in that novel she began to work through the "foreign" lessons of Tolstoy and Turgenev.

Cather's earliest journalistic writings in the 1890s confirm the trajectory implied by her letter to Mencken. In a *Journal* article dated May 17, 1896, Cather describes a Tolstoy who "possessed all the great secrets of art at once, an immutable craft and power unlimited" and it was only when he turned to asceticism and began to write for a "moral purpose" that his brilliance was diminished (*Kingdom* 378). Turgenev, Cather discovered during her university days in Lincoln and ranked him with the "greatest artists." Cather's friend, Elizabeth Moorhead, remembered that in 1905 Cather and Isabelle McClung together "devoured the novels of Tolstoy, Turgenev, Balzac and Flaubert," that in the first years of her own literary apprenticeship Cather was "deeply impressed by the great Russian realists" (50). That view is sharpened even more years later by Louise Bogan's recollection that Cather was affected by "the power and breadth of the Russians even more than the delicacy and form of the French" (132).

And it was Cather herself in a letter written in 1924, to a Mr. Miller, who admitted that for her the twin giants of literature in the modern period were Tolstoy and Turgenev--their artistic visions antithetical to one another, the power of one balanced by the stylistic grace of the other but both supreme within the scope of their own strengths.[2] As one begins to look through the bulk of Cather's critical comments early and late in her career, it becomes clear that she was strongly attracted to the strangeness of the Russian vision, so fresh and powerful an alternative to potential American models. The Russians, particularly Tolstoy and Turgenev, are amongst the things not named at the base of her literary inheritance, but the dynamics of these influence relations remain very complex for at least two reasons. First, in Cather we must begin to take account of the entire question of influence as shaped by gender. We are no longer in the entirely male universe which rules Bloom's theories of literary influence. A man-to-man relationship

[2] The letter to Mr. Miller is housed in the Newberry Library, Chicago.

becomes a woman to-man relationship, and second, this crossed gender dynamic becomes especially difficult to understand when the sexual identity of the writer is as complex as was Cather's. Images of an adolescent "Willy" Cather, her hair cut short, and dressed as a young man or soldier, come immediately to mind, as do later intense female relationships with Louise Pound and Isabelle McClung. In recent years, feminist critics and traditional Cather scholars have debated at length the question of lesbian identity and literary imagination. This kind of debate always risks a kind of overdetermination of sexual inclination, as if even if we could understand it as a simple psychic given, we could read texts as a function of sexual preference. Beyond this reduction, it really seems more interesting to me to ask questions of the dynamics of human relations male and female which lead to identifiable patterns of expression and influence. A truly rich vein of theoretical insight on the issue of female influence has arisen over the past 15 years, almost all of it in opposition to Bloom's patriarchal, Freudian theories of oedipal struggle between literary generations. These writers have in many ways revolutionized the ways we can look at tradition, canon formation and influence relations. And a female writer such as Cather, whose sensibility was formed in the last years of the nineteenth century, stands in the very middle of this fierce debate. Most often these feminist theorists speak directly to a female-to-female influence dynamic. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, in their *Madwoman in the Attic* (1979) speak of the woman writer's "feelings of alienation from male precursors coupled with her need for sisterly precursors and successors, her urgent sense of her need for a female audience together with her fear of the antagonism of male readers" which separates her from male writers and creates an "anxiety" of authorship (50). Annette Kolodny argues that the "psychodynamics of Bloom's paradigm renders women invisible except as whore/mother Muses to male poets.... Both the theory and its result excise women from literary history" (590). Elizabeth Abel, beginning from the object relations theories of Nancy Chodorow which examine the critical nature of the mother/daughter bond established at a pre-oedipal stage, suggests that women writers exist in a "triadic female pattern" in which an agonistic (oedipal) relation to a male tradition is balanced by a nurturing pre-oedipal relationship to a primal female line (434). Following a similar line of inquiry, Elaine Showalter observes that because women writers live in a culture still

dominated by male perspectives they really must confront two traditions. "If a man's text . . . is fathered, then a woman's text is not only mothered but parented, it confronts both paternal and maternal precursors and must deal with the problems and advantages of both lines of inheritance" (203). Betsy Erkkila, in her important essay "Dickinson and Rich. Toward a Theory of Female Poetic Influence," argues that many of the critics mentioned above remain trapped within a Freudian mind-set, within paradigms or cultural myths which exclude women's voices (543). In her view the Demeter-Korê myth, one of "female union, separation, return, and renewal" more adequately explains the mother-daughter creative relationship (544). Erkkila believes that female literary influence is characterized by neither an anxiety of influence nor an anxiety of authorship but "a release from anxiety." She writes. "While the family romance has some of the same ambivalence as the relationship between mothers and daughters, there is a primary sense of identification and mutuality between women poets that sets them apart from the more agonistic relationship between precursor and ephebe in the Bloomian model" (545).

As one observes the young Willa Cather searching for a usable literary past, one senses that she is struggling through a female artist's reality described by these later theorists. How else can her long detour into a Jamesian world, against her own instincts and talents, be explained except as an assault on one of the two traditions, and the dominant one, which female writers inherit only later in her career was Cather able to find a living female tradition which enabled without threatening. In Sharon O'Brien's recent biography of Cather, she brilliantly argues for the central place of Sarah Orne Jewett as precursor and literary mother whose achievements Cather did not greet with ambivalence or anxiety but accepted as a gift and a support for her own literary ambitions. O'Brien writes that Jewett "became, for a time, both the mirror of Cather's artistic self and the maternal friend who helped her construct that self" (344).

But finally one cannot escape the fact that Cather's literary sensibility was formed within a tradition shaped largely by men. This is a reality and an ambivalence which no woman writer no matter how self-aware could have entirely escaped at Cather's moment in history. However one may deplore its historical and personal limitations, Cather's literary descent, her usable past was dominated by male writers, not

female; and one should not underestimate Cather's own deeply ingrained will to literary pre-eminence whatever path was necessary to arrive at it. As one might expect from a woman so sensitive to gender, the dominance of a male canon, and male interpretation, at a time when these issues had not yet risen to the horizon of cultural awareness, Cather's struggle to find her proper voice was fraught with repression and anxiety.

But Cather's inheritance from the Russians had one great advantage over a male literary inheritance from America or Europe. For Cather, the Russians were equated with a mysterious otherness, they were not part of an immediate American literary tradition with all its power to provoke anxiety. This was a new literature with "no benumbing literary traditions" (Bohlke 170) behind it, new in a way perhaps similar to Cather's own emerging female voice, a foreign tradition shaped on the Russian steppes which justified her own road back to a vast western landscape which was her true literary home even as it remained foreign to any dominant or acceptable American tradition. Cather's imaginative journey through the "otherness" of Russian literature bears witness to the psychic projections and figural transumptions out of which are formed both literary and cultural identities. For Cather, the East represented by Russian literature, a country of the mind after all, was to use Edward Said's words, "one of [her] . . . deepest and most recurring images of the Other," (*Orientalism* 1), a contrasting image of a potential self "governed" by "desires, repressions, investments, and projections" (8) in which there is "a certain *will* or *intention* to understand . . . even to incorporate, what is a manifestly different (or alternative and novel) world . . ." (12). Said's construction of a textualized East in relation to a Western will to identity is governed by "ideology, politics, and the logic of power" (24), and Cather's own efforts as a woman to overcome, or find a place within, an American literary tradition are governed by a "logic of power" and a lived experience of cultural otherness. We remember that in her letter to Mencken, Cather felt even as an adolescent she was indelibly marked by Russian literature, but that these foreign dramas were somehow unacceptable for translation into her own American experience. She wondered in that letter if the experience of Russian otherness, of a foreign landscape, had prevented her from really seeing the American landscape that other writers in the tradition

were experiencing. Her early and very fine novel, *O Pioneers!*, she hid away feeling that it was somehow different, not acceptable within a dominant American tradition, a "logic of power" she associated with Henry James. Only as she began to accept what was "manifestly different" in her own literary vision, a vision already reflected in the Russians, could Cather reveal her first novel to the world. Edward Said has written that the East always exists as a projection of Western desire, as other to prevailing systems of power and hegemony which make possible both what, and how, an artist can write in a given historical moment. Those very cultural patterns of control, both literary and gender-based, were what Cather was attempting to go beyond as she gazed into the dark mirror of Russian literature, and found an image of herself. A landscape which had been foreign and unacceptable, a projection of desire located on the Russian steppes, became in her novels of the American West a part of Cather's own literary "identity." The path was complex and led through the French--Flaubert, Mérimée, Daudet, and on to James and eventually Sarah Orne Jewett--but in coming home to an original country of the mind, Cather began with the Russian novelists--Tolstoy and Turgenev in particular--who flashed out of the north revealing a human landscape which was both strange and familiar at the same time. This was a landscape which existed at the "quiet center" of Cather's own imaginative life (O'Brien 346). The sections which follow will be an examination of Cather's novels as they relate to the fictional worlds created by Turgenev and Tolstoy.[3]

[3] My study of Cather and the Russians is limited to her novels, the first of which was published in 1913, but the influence extends all the way back to her early stories of the American prairie in the 1890s. Professor David Stouck, in his article "Willa Cather and the Russians," has done much of the hard scholarly work of tracing those early connections, finding many specific examples of influence on the levels of characterization and theme. My own study of Cather and the Russians is indebted to the questions raised in Professor Stouck's article.

I

"The Thing Not Named"--Cather and Turgenev

> Whatever is felt upon the page without being specifically named there--that, one might say, is created. It is the inexplicable presence of the thing not named, of the overtone divined by the ear but not heard by it, the verbal mood, the emotional aura of the fact or the thing or the deed, that gives high quality to the novel or the drama, as well as to poetry itself.
>
> (Willa Cather, "The Novel Démeublé")

Over the past several decades, critics have taken this famous passage to mean many things, most recently feminist critics such as Sharon O'Brien have argued that Cather's sexual orientation and its sublimation in art is the thing which remains unnamed (126-27 and 196-98). Most often Cather's ideas have been taken at what appears to be their face value: this is, after all, a statement about style and the ways in which nuance and indirection may create a reality which is unspoken, what Cather called a presentation of "scene by suggestion rather than by enumeration" (*On Writing* 40). Cather's goal was to "leave the room as bare as the stage of a Greek theatre" (42-43), to pare the scene to its barest essentials and to avoid what she thought of as the "tasteless amplitude" (43) which kills art.

Who were her models or precursors in this deeply internalized literary choice? Her essay, "The Novel Démeublé," gives some indication. certainly the French--Flaubert and Daudet--and Tolstoy's name is prominent, his attention to the physicality of existence is "so much a part of the emotions of the people that they are perfectly synthesized," and "when it is fused like this literalness ceases to be literalness--it is merely part of experience" (*On Writing* 39-40). From her extreme youth Cather admired Tolstoy as one of the great writers, this admiration never really flagged, but Cather's minimalist aesthetic was constitutionally different than the richness and inclusiveness of Tolstoy's huge social dramas. A more significant insight into Cather's literary inheritance comes in a quotation she takes from Mérimée's "remarkable" essay on Nikolai Gogol:

> L'art de choisir parmi les inombrables traits que nous offre la nature est, apres tout, bien plus difficile que celui de les observer avec attention et de les rendre avec exactitude. (37)

This leads us directly into the aesthetic world of Turgenev, where every word and descriptive phrase is chosen to reveal the emotional aura of the inner life of character. Turgenev's novel of dramatic silence became a model for Cather's own literary exploration of "the thing not named" but felt on the page as emotional aura. In this inter-chapter we will attempt to look beneath the aesthetic surface of both writers' styles to a shared emotional universe which is unnamed but omnipresent. How can one characterize this universe, what elements or identity patterns does it contain? There is something in Cather's response that "the land speaks louder than the people," that it endures when individual lives have passed. In both Cather and Turgenev the landscape becomes an emblem of natural order, an extended metaphor for man's possible self, both psychic and physical. The vision is pastoral, the desired recovery of a lost home of original unity associated in both writers with the natural cycles of the land. One only has to look at any one of a number of Turgenev's works from *On the Eve* to *A Home of the Gentry* and even *Fathers and Sons* in order to hear the echo of an unnamed but determining natural order which structures Cather's own work from *O Pioneers!* and *A Lost Lady* to later novels such as *The Professor's House* and *Death Comes for the Archbishop*. But perhaps the single work by Turgenev which most powerfully evokes the relationship between nature and human consciousness is his early cycle of stories collected as *A Sportsman's Notebook*. The search for a golden past, an original relationship between human psyche and nature, is only dimly articulated in the stories themselves, but it is there on every page, an emotional resonance which is unmistakable. In "The Rattle of Wheels" the narrator, newly awoken from sleep, describes a summer dawn:

> . . . we were passing through a landscape of great beauty. There were vast, spreading, grassy water-meadows, with countless smaller meadows, lakelets, brooks, creeks with banks overgrown with sallow and osier, real Russian countryside such as the Russian people love the sort of country into which the heroes of our ancient folk-lore rode out to shoot white swans and grey duck. . . . I was lost in admiration. (*Notebook* 381-82)

This is the landscape of human felicity, a landscape which Cather draws on when she attempts to define her own imaginative homeland. On another summer dawn in the American heartland, the young

narrator of *A Lost Lady* feels the same intense beauty of a landscape which is also an image of man's best and most natural self. Niel Herbert, too, is "lost in admiration" as he moves into the landscape.

> The sky was burning with the soft pink and silver of a cloudless summer dawn. The heavy, bowed grasses splashed him to the knees. All over the marsh, snow-on-the-mountain, globed with dew, made cool sheets of silver, and the swamp milk-weed spread its flat, raspberry-coloured clusters. . . . There was in all living things something limpid and joyous--like the wet, morning call of the birds, flying up through the unstained atmosphere. Out of the saffron east a thin, yellow, wine-like sunshine began to gild the fragrant meadows and the glistening tops of the grove. Niel wondered why he did not often come over like this, to see the day . . . while the morning was still unsullied, like a gift handed down from the heroic ages. (84-85)

Both Cather and Turgenev associate these moments of awareness in nature with the memory of an "heroic age" when the connection between human consciousness and the rhythms of nature was not yet broken. In Turgenev's "Kasyan from Fair Springs," the narrator throws himself down under "a lofty hazel bush".

> High above us, leaves were faintly trembling, and their liquid green shadows slipped gently backwards and forwards. . . . I lay on my back and began to admire the peaceful play of the intricate leafage against the bright, distant sky. It is a strangely enjoyable occupation to lie on one's back in the forest and look upwards. . . . You gaze without stirring, and no words can express the gladness and peace and sweetness that catch at your heart. You look--and that deep, clear azure calls to your lips a smile as innocent as itself, like the clouds in the sky . . . happy memories pass before you in happy procession, and you feel your gaze passing further and further into the distance . . . and you have no power to tear yourself away from its height, from its depth. . . . (126-27)

Images of a pristine new world at dawn and visions of perfection seen through the shifting patterns of leaves against a limitless sky in Turgenev are matched in Cather's *O Pioneers!* by the image of Alexandra's radiant face as she turns to the light coming off the divide. "For the first time, perhaps, since that land emerged from the waters of geologic ages, a human face was set toward it with love and yearning. It seemed beautiful to her, rich and strong and glorious. Her eyes drank in the breadth of it, until her tears blinded her. Then the Genius of the Divide, the great, free spirit which breathes across it, must have bent lower than it ever bent to a human will before" (65). And later in the novel Alexandra is identified, in Carl Linstrum's memory, with the dawn of the first day on the prairie:

> The dawn in the east looked like the light from some great fire that was burning under the edge of the world. The colour was reflected in the globules of dew that sheathed the short gray pasture grass. . . . He could remember exactly how she looked when she came over the close-cropped grass, her skirts pinned up, her head bare, a bright tin pail in either hand, and the milky light of the early morning all about her. Even as a boy he used to feel, when he saw her coming

> with her free step, her upright head and calm shoulders, that she looked as if she had walked straight out of the morning itself. (125-26)

But the purity of the dawn, and of the landscape, while it evokes a human potential to recapture or create anew a half-remembered paradise, exists within the shadow of human corruption. Niel Herbert wanted to see the dawn "before men and their activities had spoiled it" (85). The retreat from a corrupted social world into a pastoral landscape is played out in many forms in the writing of both Cather and Turgenev. One thinks immediately of Lavretsky in *A Home of the Gentry*, his marriage failed and in deep disgust over the hollow pretensions of decadent society, returning to his ancestral home in the country in an effort to recapture a sense of youthful purpose, or of the narrator in Turgenev's classic story "The Singers" who tells a story of human degradation and artistic genius and ends by listening to a disembodied voice, as it stretches out over the Russian plain, calling a young boy home to be beaten by his father. The boy is safe within a sheltering green world, but he cannot remain there forever. As the narrator himself disappears into the landscape, we know that the young boy is just one of an entire people who have been made grotesque by the violence of cultural "fathers." Turgenev's dark pastoral echoes Cather's portrayal of physical terrain and human potential in her novel *A Lost Lady*. There she creates the figure of Captain Forrester who, in his being and vast bulk, seems to shadow forth an heroic age, a man who possesses a vision of the landscape he inhabits and transforms. Several times he is referred to as a "mountain" (48/54). With the fall and illness that debilitates him, his wife Marian Forrester thinks that "it was as if one of the mountains had fallen down" (41). Captain Forrester is the last of the men who has seen the American West in its original beauty of "boundless sunny sky, boundless plains of waving grass, long fresh-water lagoons yellow with lagoon flowers, where the bison in their periodic migrations stopped to drink and bathe and wallow" (52), and now all that is left of this "gift" (85) is a "kind of afterglow" in these men's faces, "the taste and smell and song of it" that they "had seen in the air and followed" (169).

In direct contrast to this heroic age of the pioneer, stands the diminished and grotesque form of men like Ivy Peters, bitter materialists who actively scorn, because they cannot understand, the vision of pioneers

such as Alexandra Bergson and Captain Forrester. It is Ivy who, at the beginning of *A Lost Lady*, captures a woodpecker and deliberately blinds it so that the desperate "creature beat its wings in the branches, whirling in the sunlight and never seeing it" (25), and thereby shows his contempt for natural order, and a bitter determination to shape the landscape in perverse ways. It is Ivy Peters who enslaves Marian Forrester morally and sexually over a money nexus, who drains the beautiful natural meadows on the Forrester's property. It is Ivy Peters who is described as one of the "generation of shrewd young men" (107) who will "drink up the mirage, dispel the morning freshness" and "root out the great brooding spirit of freedom" (106) which hangs over the land.

The basic literary pattern established in *A Lost Lady*, of social alienation and pastoral renewal, recurs in Cather's novels early and late: we have Lucy Gayheart's identification with the natural force of the prairie, her love of the old family orchard, gnarled and half-dead, which she passionately defends from the axe (an echo of a similar symbolic pattern in Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*), in *The Song of the Lark*, Thea Kronborg escapes to the Panther Canon where she internalizes a golden and timeless tradition from which she can begin to create as an artist; in *The Professor's House*, Tom Outland's fine and private place is the forgotten world of the Pueblo Indians on the Blue Mesa, and Professor St. Peter identifies with Tom as the ever young spirit of a pristine landscape which has passed. This original world has been replaced by a grasping, self-involved, materialist reality which St. Peter believes Tom is well out of. Almost always this drama of the pastoral world and its loss is identified with specific relations which exist between men and women. And most often in both Cather and Turgenev, the enduring green world is linked to a feminine principle, while the male principle is identified with the temporary manifestations of maternal culture, a consciousness which is removed from a landscape, human and physical, in which it can clearly recognize itself.

In Turgenev's work this disconnection from an internalized landscape leads to the superfluous man, in Cather to a series of male protagonists who are curiously passive and unable to establish themselves in the social landscapes they have chosen. One thinks of Carl Linstrum in *O Pioneers!*, and Jim Burden in

My Antonia, both of whom have made a choice to leave behind the prairie, their primary landscape, for the landscape of the city. Both eventually return to their original homes in a state of resigned sadness, and with a feeling of loss of purpose in their social/economic lives. For Jim and Carl it is Antonia and Alexandra who represent a consciousness which has kept faith with its roots, its landscape, and consequently itself. Both Antonia and Alexandra come to represent, for these wandering and disillusioned men, the potential for a legitimate human existence which is linked to the rhythms of the seasons, and an acceptance of human rhythms which are part of a richly internalized landscape. Carl Linstrum expresses this point of view most clearly in a conversation with Alexandra:

> 'I've been thinking how strangely things work out. I've been away engraving other men's pictures, and you've stayed home and made your own.' (116)

> 'Freedom so often means that one isn't needed anywhere. Here you are an individual, you have a background of your own, you would be missed. But off there in the cities there are thousands of rolling stones like me. We are all alike; we have no ties, we know nobody, we own nothing. . . . We have no house, no place, no people of our own. . . . We sit in restaurants and concert halls and look about at the hundreds of our own kind and shudder.' (122-23)

This is the emotional landscape of Turgenev's superfluous men. of Rudin, who cannot return the love of Natalie, of Lavretsky who returns alone and disillusioned to his family estate in the country after many years in the cities of Europe, and only there does he discover a young woman, Lisa, whose honesty he can begin to believe in, of Sanin in *Spring Torrents*, who forgets his love for Gemma for a momentary passion with Madame Polosov and years of servitude to their perverse master/slave relationship, of Litvinov in *Smoke* who becomes entrapped in the European *beau monde* and by his fatal attraction to Irina, and only years later is able to return to the home and woman he once loved in the Russian countryside, and finally of Nejdanov in *Virgin Soil*, who yearns for a political ideal which finally he cannot believe in or serve while his love, Marianne, does not waver for one moment in her commitment to the people. When one lists the major male/female relations in Turgenev's novels in this way, a pattern begins to emerge. social coherence and personal integrity, even if bought at a high price, is most often embodied in the lives and actions of women as bearers of knowledge--seasonal, rhythmic, relational--which predates material culture.

The search for a pastoral world of original unity in the writing of both Turgenev and Cather corresponds to a very deep human mythic desire, but there is a shadow cast on this landscape once one begins to interrogate its emotional basis. The pastoral dream can be read as a desire for escape from the responsibilities of history and the complexities of a social world which is always falling further into corruption. The word, history, here can be taken as a recurring figure for corruption. In the early 1970s Blanche Gelfant contributed a seminal essay on Cather entitled "The Forgotten Reaping Hook: Sex in My Antonia." The essay examines the emotional, gender-based realities beneath the surface of Cather's texts. And although Gelfant is concerned primarily with a psycho-sexual interpretation of fictional patterns in Cather's novels, her ideas reveal, at least implicitly, what I am calling here the shadow or repressed significance of the pastoral vision. Gelfant's argument is that Cather's imaginative myth of the "decline of an heroic period" (149) only served to ward off "broad historical insight." Like Jim Burden, Cather's "mythopoeic memory patterned the past into an affecting creation story, with Antonia a central fertility figure, 'a rich mine of life, like the founders of early races'" with nothing in the present which might compensate "for the loss of the past." For Gelfant, the desire to regress from adult awareness, particularly sexual awareness, is a sign in Cather of the desire to return to an innocent world whose one inviolate image was the child--the "authentic self" (160) which exists before history and social corruption. But this dream of return is an historical illusion "which reveals our common usage of the past as a romance and refuge from the present" (163). If, as Gelfant concludes, *My Antonia* in its romanticism is a representative American novel then its typicality consists of an evasion of history as human struggle and its idealization of a past which was never real. Gelfant's is a tough-minded historical reading of the eternal return of certain human myths of denial and evasion concerning their own temporality--a myth which Cather found powerfully expressed in Turgenev before her.[4] These insights lead us to a recognition of the place of refusal in

[4] In more recent theoretical discussion, Jacques Lacan (*Ecrits. A Selection*, 1977) and Julia Kristeva (*Revolution in Poetic Language*, 1974) have explored the linguistic basis of a desire for return to earlier states of human consciousness in terms of biological object-relations theory. Language grows out of the child's pre-conscious memory of unity with the mother, a time when communication experiences no boundary between self and other, and awareness is conveyed through the rhythms of the body and non-representational sounds. But this original green world is inevitably subject to time and change. The child

Cather's literary imagination, a refusal which read purely for its political intent is regressive as well. One consistent criticism of Cather has been her refusal to accept a changed world growing out of World War I, her increasing desire to live in the "precious, the incommunicable past" (*My Antonia* 372).[5] But even in this criticism one sees emotional ties, which become aesthetic choices, that reveal Cather's debt to Turgenev Because Turgenev, too, while attempting to portray the "body and pressure of time" (Lowe 82) in the political moment he inhabited, was ultimately drawn away from any particular solution to human problems and offered as a final philosophy two conflicting visions of the pastoral. the one, as expressed in his novel *On the Eve*, is a fatalistic acceptance of spiritual absence and is heard in Elena's anguished cry.

> Oh my God! . . . why does death exist, why is there parting, illness, tears? or why this beauty, this delightful feeling of hope, why the soothing consciousness of a sure refuge, of deathless protection? What means this smiling, benevolent heaven, this happy, resting earth? Can it be that this is only in us, and outside of us is eternal cold and silence? Can it be that we are alone . . . . alone . . . . while yonder, everywhere in all those impenetrable abysses and depths,--everything, everything is alien to us? . . . Can it be that it is impossible to implore, to bring back happiness? (258)

This is Turgenev's dark pastoral, a recognition of the void which exists at the end of history. But there is another story, told in the rhythms of nature itself, which speaks not of absence and historical alienation but of a "resting earth" which offers "refuge" and renewal. The story is told most explicitly at the conclusions of two novels by Turgenev and Cather. Brooding over the tomb of Bazarov, a young revolutionary who might have changed the face of Russia, the narrator of Turgenev's great novel *Fathers and Sons* offers the following consolation, perhaps redemption:

> However passionate, sinning, and rebellious the heart hidden in the tomb, the flowers growing over it peep serenely at us with their innocent eyes, they tell us not of eternal peace alone, of the great peace of "indifferent" nature, they tell us, too, of eternal reconciliation and of life without end. (190)

The echo of this vision, the myth of eternal return, is heard in the final pages of Cather's first novel *O*

begins to know itself as a separate ego, and language structures develop in an effort to imagine oneself back to an original understanding, to bridge the split between self and other. In this view language has its origins in difference and absence, the mother's lost body being resymbolized in the mythic imagination as a golden age of original unity, the dream of the pastoral. These insights speak directly to the extended pastoral portrayed in the works of Cather and Turgenev.

[5] For Cather's problematic relationship to historical change see Morton D. Zabel, "Willa Cather- The Tone of Time", 216-17, and Granville Hicks, "The Case Against Willa Cather", 139-47, both in *Willa Cather and Her Critics*. Ed. James Schroeter.

Pioneers! the deaths of the young lovers, Emil and Marie, told in the "stained slippery grass" is "only half the story" (270). Above their bodies two white butterflies flutter, "and in the long grass by the fence the last wild roses of the year opened their pink hearts to die." And in the final sentence of the novel, the return and renewal of life is made even more clear. Cather writes. "Fortunate country, that is one day to receive hearts like Alexandra's into its bosom, to give them out again in the yellow wheat, in the rustling corn, in the shining eyes of youth!" (309) These images have the implicit power of pastoral myth about them How we respond to them will depend on our own visions of the relationship between human purpose, historical reality and natural design. In Turgenev, as in Cather, "the earth speaks louder than the people," and those "who love it and understand it" are those "who own it--for a little while" (*Pioneers* 308).

II

Cather and Tolstoy: Beyond Art

> Art is too terribly human to be very "great," perhaps. Some very great artists have outgrown art, the men were bigger than the game. Tolstoi did, and Leonardo did. When I hear the last opuses, I think Beethoven did. Shakespeare died at fifty-three, but there is an awful veiled threat in *The Tempest* that he too felt he had outgrown his toys. . . .
>
> (Willa Cather, "Light on Adobe Walls")

The title of this fragment, "Light on Adobe Walls," may stand as another example of what Cather thought of as the thing not named In this case the light itself--ephemeral, non-material but all powerful--reaches out as a sign of a mysterious force which touches on and illuminates the physical earth. The artist, Cather argues, can never fully represent the light materially. "he can only paint the tricks that shadows play with it, or what it does to forms" (*On Writing* 123-24). Tolstoy is grouped with other "great artists" whom Cather sees as investigating the relationship between the universal and the particular, the spiritual and the

mundane, the light and the shadows it casts on Adobe walls.[6] Although throughout her younger years Cather disparaged Tolstoy's shift toward a tendentious and didactic rendition of a moral universe, it is also true that she was deeply attracted to an art, like Tolstoy's, which based itself in monumental forms--whether in recurring cycles of nature, or in principles of coherence at a universal spiritual level. In *The Professor's House*, St. Peter echoes this vision when he tells his students that art and religion are the same thing in the end, and they "have given man the only happiness he has ever had" (69). In terms of purely aesthetic choice Cather never wavered in her allegiance to the novel démeublé, a stylistic and emotional choice which aligned her with Turgenev as opposed to Tolstoy, but as we move into Cather's later career certain questions begin to come to the fore in her novels which link her more closely philosophically and perhaps even spiritually to Tolstoy. In novels such as *The Professor's House*, *Shadows on the Rock*, and *Death Comes for the Archbishop*, a potentially ideal human community of shared belief and spiritual value is contrasted with the daily experience of a human world which is naturally beautiful, fragmented, and corrupt at the same time--in short, the world human beings inhabit and have made. As Cather enters into this later phase, her novels become less novel-like and are structured by the aesthetic rules which govern parable and legend. verisimilitude of plot and realistic development of character give way to the monumental patterns of communal belief and faith. Cather, like Tolstoy, in her later novels became a writer of myth, and she may have been describing her own projected future as an imaginative being in the words she used to describe Tolstoy's journey beyond art.

Philosophically, the crucial place to begin in understanding Cather's response to Tolstoy is the Russian's meditation on art, humanity, and spirituality entitled *What Is Art?* Cather actually incorporated an important reference to this book in one of her early stories, "A Gold Slipper," published in *Youth and*

[6] This same extended metaphor is made explicit in the title of Cather's late novel *Shadows On the Rock*--an exploration of community values and shared belief amongst the old French Canadians of Quebec City. In attempting to get at the mysteries of social unity, both material and spiritual, Cather is forced to admit that the artist "cannot even paint those relations of light and shade he can only paint some emotions they gave him. . ." (*On Writing* 124). Cather's insistence on the formal necessity of shared "emotions" as the basis for all significant art is identical with the aesthetic developed in Tolstoy's *What Is Art?*

the Bright Medusa There she has the female protagonist, Kitty Ayrshire, argue for the creative and spiritual values given in *What Is Art?* as an antidote to a narrow materialistic understanding of human significance. Kitty gives Tolstoy's philosophy, and apparently Cather's as well, when she says that humankind in its beginnings was mired in a gratification of physical appetite, but that a divine ideal had entered into human consciousness transforming it forever. It is this ideal, Kitty argues following Tolstoy, which provides any hope for human happiness, and one is able to intuit or feel its energy in the experience of great art (142-43). This is a faithful translation of the general philosophy expressed in *What Is Art?* The argument developed in this treatise is essentially Platonic, for Tolstoy, the experience of art was an "infectious" transmission of "feelings" from one person to another, from one culture and age to another (51-52). But feelings come in many forms, a great deal of them perverse as is demonstrated by the fixation on sexuality, power, pride, and world weariness in modern art, with the myriad details of existence rather than the significance of a relatively few enduring feelings and beliefs (74-76/153-54). All of this, Tolstoy argues, arises from a human forgetfulness of common origins. For Tolstoy, legitimate art in any age is communal and spiritual at its base. It exists in just two forms. art which recreates the feelings and reality of religious perception and spiritual faith and art which gives the universal feelings of existence which are accessible to all human beings (151-52) This type of art creates "the mysterious gladness of a communion which, reaching beyond the grave, unites us with all men of the past who have been moved by the same feelings and with all men of the future who will yet be touched by them" (Brewster 294). In its effects universal art liberates the "personality from its separateness and isolation" (*What Is Art?* 140) and makes humanity aware of a shared destiny. Art is not a plaything, a mere object of "pleasure," but a "great matter" (189) whose destiny it is "to transmit from the realm of reason to the realm of feeling the truth that well-being for men consists in being united together" in bonds of love rather than force (191).

Tolstoy's philosophy of art has been more often denounced than embraced since its publication in 1896, but his ideas have affected many artists, among them Willa Cather.[7] For Cather, too, felt that the essential responsibility of the artist was to convey universal human feeling, that the superficial--whether descriptive detail, event, or popular ideas of an historical period--was far less important than an aesthetic based on the faithful transcription of experience and feeling tested by time.[8] We are told in "The Novel Démeublé" that Tolstoy was "almost as great a lover of material things as Balzac" but there is a "determining" difference. "the clothes, the dishes, the haunting interiors of the old Moscow houses, are always so much a part of the emotions of the people that they are perfectly synthesized, they seem to exist not so much in the author's mind, as in the emotional penumbra of the characters themselves. When it is fused like this, literalness ceases to be literalness--it is merely part of experience" (*On Writing* 39-40). In Tolstoy, Cather observed one of the goals of her own art. that literal description of detail should exist as part of the "emotional penumbra" or "experience" of the characters themselves. And Cather understood Tolstoy's call for a spiritual and communal art in specifically mythic terms when she wrote that the artist "should leave the scene bare for the play of emotions," creating a "room as bare as the stage of a Greek theatre, or as that house into which the glory of the Pentecost descended" (42-43). This is an art which, like Tolstoy's own later parables and legends, begins with the barest essentials of human experience transforming them into symbols of universal feeling. But how, in specifically literary terms, does Cather respond to Tolstoy's call for an art which is communal, monumental and timeless in its portrayal of "human

[7] The reasons for dissatisfaction with Tolstoy's views are not far to seek. In general he denies the life of human passions "in favour of an ideal moral universe. Because of this, I believe Tolstoy's moral philosophy regarding the nature of art must be read selectively His views concerning the transmission of "feeling" through an art form which appeals to "universal" human emotions are much more interesting than his arguments for a "religious" art which is narrowly Christian in its origins. At least in part, one must agree with James Billington's assessment that, "Tolstoy's morality is shallow because it seeks to repress rather than engage the passions of men, because it is general and abstract rather than concrete and specific" (*Icon and Axe* 466). The argument of this section of my study is that both Tolstoy and Cather gave "specific" form to "abstract" concepts in their fictional portrayal of myth and legend.

[8] Cather reflected her commitment to this Tolstoyan principle of art--essential human feeling transmitted through time--throughout her career. In an interview with the *New York World* in 1925, Cather explained that "when a young writer tells me he has an idea for a story, he means that he has an emotion which he wants to pass on. An artist has an emotion, and the first thing he wants to do with it is to find some form to put it in, a design. It reacts on him exactly as food makes a hungry person want to eat. It may tease him for years until he gets the right form for the emotion."

feeling"? We will begin to answer that question in turning first to her novel *The Professor s House* (1925) and then conclude with her later novel *Death Comes for the Archbishop* (1927).

III

"Man was lost and saved in a garden."

(Professor St. Peter, *The Professor's House*)

In the beginning we find Professor St. Peter in a walled garden. This self-created *locus amoenus*, hidden behind the Mid-Western facade of the Professor's house is, we are told, "the comfort of his life" (14), a flowered retreat which cuts off the discord of the st eet, his family, any hint of a grasping, material world beyond. Although he has a wide reputation as historian, scholar and teacher, St. Peter is increasingly disenchanted by the world which lies beyond his inner "house." In his classroom, responding to the questions of students, he gives an encapsulated philosophy of human enlightenment:

> . . . I don't myself think much of science as a phase of human development. It has given us a lot of ingenious toys; they take our attention away from the real problems. . . . I don't think you help people by making their conduct of no importance--you impoverish them. As long as every man and woman who crowded into the cathedrals on Easter Sunday was a principal in a gorgeous drama with God, glittering angels on one side and the shadows of evil coming and going on the other, life was a rich thing. . . . And that's what makes men happy, believing in the mystery and importance of their own little individual lives. . . . Art and religion (they are the same thing, in the end, of course) have given man the only happiness he has ever had. (67/68/69).

In the world of communal faith which St. Peter describes "every act had some imaginative end" (69). This is a direct, dramatized translation into literary "feeling" of Tolstoy's philosophical views of religious and universal art as the origin of human culture, "the only happiness" open to human beings in a fallen world. Unfortunately for St. Peter, the memory of a golden world now lies entirely in the past. The image of grace resides in the tragically departed youth of Tom Outland, a boy in years but old in wisdom, in his understanding of the landscape of the American West, in his identification with the ancient communal art

and spiritual unity of the Pueblo Indian culture. His personality touches briefly on the St. Peter family, and no one is unaffected. He is, among other things, the "one remarkable mind" that St. Peter has ever known as a teacher (62). Now, as St. Peter enters late middle age, the age of spiritual discovery, and his wife and children increasingly grow away from him into the details of a purely social existence, he ponders his own reflected youth in Tom Outland. "Fellows like Outland don't carry much baggage, yet one of the things you know them by is their sumptuous generosity--and when they are gone, all you can say of them is that they departed leaving princely gifts" (121). Tom, arrived as a "perspiring tramp boy," has left the gift of grace once he has gone, and one-third of Cather's novel is devoted to his spiritual story, the discovery of the ancient Indian civilization atop the Blue Mesa. What he discovers there is the remnants of a monumental culture, a people whose communal and religious art is perfectly synchronous with the practical affairs of daily life. Tom understands the spiritual coherence of this culture immediately, a coherence which only throws his own cultural alienation into deeper relief. We are given images of the type of spiritually realized existence which Tolstoy might have been describing in his own stories and in *What Is Art?* "Through a veil of lightly falling snow" (201), Tom is the first human being to see the hidden village in what must be hundreds of years. Its architectonic structure is a still monument to the unified vision of its creators:

> It was as still as sculpture--and something like that. It all hung together, seemed to have a kind of composition. . . . Such silence and stillness and repose--immortal repose. That village sat looking down into the canyon with the calmness of eternity. (201)

> A people who had the hardihood to build there, and who lived day after day looking down on such grandeur, who came and went by these hazardous trails, must have been . . . a fine people. (213)

The Mesa, this monumental rock, itself becomes in Cather's work a significant symbol of an origin or base of human tradition (we shall see shortly how this symbol is given specific religious significance in *Death Comes For the Archbishop*). But even Tom Outland, in his mystical connection to this Golden Age, is not immune to the greed, and ambition, and indifference of the world. He dies knowing that the spiritual story told by the lost civilization is almost completely misunderstood by his own culture. Most of the finest

artifacts are sold to a German collector and disappear from their original landscape entirely. The objects are fragile, not only in their physical existence, but also in the beliefs inscribed in them. Falling prey to a spiritual lethargy, the Professor begins to believe that Tom was lucky to have "escaped" (261), that he had never been forced to handle "things which were not the symbols of ideas" (260). Things which are the symbols of ideas and belief are what Tolstoy meant by a spiritual art form which objectified communal reality. Near the end of the novel, as St. Peter sits alone in his house--his family has travelled without him to Europe--he seems to wait for a sign which will make sense of his existence. He realizes that all the years of his adult life "had been accidental and ordered from the outside. His career, his wife, his family, were not his life at all, but a chain of events which had happened to him. All these things had nothing to do with the person he was in the beginning" (264). As the Professor ponders both his sadness and his destiny, someone enters "through the garden door" (263), but it is not Tom, rather, it is "another boy . . . the boy the Professor had long ago left behind him in Kansas . . . the original, unmodified Godfrey St. Peter." This boy seems "to be at the root of the matter, Desire under all desires, Truth under all truths" (265). As he drifts back to the bedrock of his own origins, St. Peter discovers a "Truth" which Cather had read many years earlier in Tolstoy's moral parables. "He could remember a time when the loneliness of death had terrified him, when the idea of it was insupportable. . . . But now he thought of eternal solitude with gratefulness; as a release from every obligation, from every form of effort. It was the Truth" (272). We remember that Tolstoy's great meditation on human temporality, "The Death of Ivan Ilych," was one of the stories which Cather discovered as an adolescent in Red Cloud, Nebraska, and in her writing of *The Professor's House* we begin to see how that early reading marked the trajectory of her later career.

Ivan Ilych, like Cather's Professor, has come to a crossroads in his existence. The material world, the world of sensation and physical appetite, no longer makes sense of the journey he is on. Soon after his injury while working in his house the powerful magistrate "saw that he was dying, and he was in continual

despair" (*Works* 280). Like Professor St. Peter who also awaits death[9], the magistrate's prior life, its commitments and diversions, now seems meaningless, the concerns of his wife and family appear both ludicrous and distasteful to a man who is facing his own mortality. "In them he saw himself--all that for which he had lived--and saw that it was not real at all, but a terrible and huge deception which had hidden both life and death" (299). And in his moment of extremity, where all of life seems to have fallen away from him, Ivan Ilych like the Professor, reaches back to recover an "original, unmodified" self in childhood, "but the child who had experienced that happiness existed no longer, it was like a reminiscence of somebody else" (295). The boy who walks through the Professor's door is also "like a reminiscence of somebody else," an alter-ego who is both a forgotten self (the "original" Godfrey St. Peter) and a remembered "other" (Tom Outland). In the last lines of the novel, after he has faced his own mortality, the Professor realizes that "he had let something go . . something very precious, that he could not consciously have relinquished" (282). That something is arguably the existence and memory of Tom Outland, and a sadness over the loss of the other which is also a loss of the "original" self. In the experience of "otherness," St. Peter repossesses an "identity" which allows him to go on living in the present. His time, although coming, has not yet arrived.

At first it seems that Ivan Ilych will die without the grace of personal recovery which is granted to the Professor; but in the final hours of his life, another boy, a boy much like the Professor's child, walks through the magistrate's door. It is Ivan Ilych's own son who appears from the shadows, catches his father's hand, presses it to his lips, and begins "to cry" (301). In his son's eyes, Ivan Ilych recognizes both himself, "the person he was in the beginning," and a universal human identity which is always forged in the experience of "otherness." Only then is his fragmented personality "liberated" from its "separation and isolation" (*What is Art?* 140), and he passes "through" into the "light" (301) which is the extinction of self.

[9] It is unclear how much St. Peter actually participates in his own drift toward death. He is overcome by a faulty gas heater in his study, but just before he loses consciousness, the Professor thinks: "But suppose he didn't get up--? . . . He hadn't lifted his hand against himself - was he required to lift it for himself?" (276). He is eventually discovered, and revived, by his housekeeper, Augusta.

In the calm acceptance of mortality--the ultimate loss of self and experience of "otherness"--both Ivan Ilych and Professor St Peter share an identity of literary purpose. Through these characters, Cather and Tolstoy attempt to move beneath the myriad "details" of existence toward a portrayal of enduring "feelings" and beliefs which might release the "personality from its separateness and isolation" (*What Is Art?* 153/154/140).

We turn now to Cather's *Death Comes For the Archbishop* in order to see how this properly "religious" novel draws both ethically and stylistically on Tolstoy's late moral parables, especially "What Men Live By" and "Master and Man."

IV

> During those last weeks of the Bishop's life he thought very little about death. . . . More and more life seemed to him an experience of the Ego, in no sense the Ego itself.
>
> (Willa Cather, *Death Comes For the Archbishop* 289-90)

In beginning *Death Comes For the Archbishop*, Cather wrote that for a long time she had "wanted to do something in the style of legend, which is absolutely the reverse of dramatic treatment" (*On Writing* 9). Ever since her student days, Cather had desired to write "something a little like" Puvis de Chavanne's *Life of St Geneviève*: "something without accent, with none of the artificial elements of composition. In the Golden Legend the martyrdoms of the saints are no more dwelt upon than are the trivial incidents of their lives; it is as though all human experiences, measured against the supreme spiritual experience, were of about the same importance." Cather realized that this aesthetic approach was the reverse of the modern trend where "'situation' is made to count for so much", rather it was mood or emotion which was all important in this type of "narrative."

These comments explain a great deal about Cather's own choices in her late novels generally, but particularly *Death Comes For the Archbishop*, that account of spirit made flesh in the desert composed of a series of monumental scenes of miracles, legends and spiritual discoveries, all of which have equal weight "measured against one supreme spiritual experience." In *What Is Art?* Tolstoy had written, "strip the best novels of our times of their details and what will remain?" (154), Cather had attempted to answer that question in writing a novel "without accent" where surface "situation" is secondary to an underlying architecture of spiritual archetypes. This is the type of universal art which Tolstoy spent his last three decades attempting to create--an art structurally simple and emotionally complex which would "infect" humanity with the desire to recognize the reality of the "other" and so overcome its solitude and alienation. Cather's late interest in communal and spiritual typology, the opposite of "dramatic" portrayal in its attempts to get close to fundamental human desires, owes a great deal to her reading of Tolstoy's moral parables, not only in terms of philosophical insight but also in direct translation of stylistic preference. Look, for example, at the beginning of Tolstoy's parable, "What Men Live By," and then see how Cather creates a similar mood in *Death Comes For the Archbishop* through syntactic reflection. Tolstoy's narrator begins:

> A shoemaker named Simon, who had neither house nor land of his own, lived with his wife and children in a peasant's hut and earned his living by his work. (*Legends* 19)

The shoemaker is presented without distinguishing context; he might be any man, or every man. He is marked by fate, however, to learn a "universal" truth: an angel descends on Simon's house and in paying for his own misdeeds teaches the shoemaker that men live "not by care for themselves, but by love" (43). Now look at the first description of Father Latour in *Death Comes For the Archbishop* and observe the same distance from surface "detail" and "dramatic" event, and the same authority of voice which arises from a monumental conception of human temporality:

> One afternoon in the autumn of 1851 a solitary horseman, followed by a pack-mule, was pushing through an arid stretch of country somewhere in central New Mexico. He had lost his way, and was trying to get back to the trail, with only his compass and his sense of direction for guides. (17)

Here, Father Latour is lost and naked in the desert in much the same way Michael, the angel, in Tolstoy's

"What Men Live By," is hurled naked and lost to the earth. Both characters fall immediately into the timeless realm of legend Tolstoy and Cather achieve this effect through a grammatical architecture which replicates the simplicity and mystery of essential human desires unchanged over time. As David Stouck and Janet Giltrow have argued. "Cather's narrators do not speak in a voice that is casually intimate or jocular, they speak with formality and reserve that sustain the authority of voice over time. It is almost a bardic voice in places, with the solemnity and sonority of the most ancient forms of story telling."[10]

The overall pattern of *Death Comes For the Archbishop* is, in fact, a stitching together of legend and myth which extends beyond individual ego or personality in an effort to achieve a universality of human experience. The central human figures in the novel approach the monumentality of *figura* or type. Father Vaillant becomes the type of audacious fisherman of souls and Father Latour the will and order of Faith incarnate. Latour becomes the Bishop of New Mexico because of a chance which may also be read as his fate. a Vatican Cardinal wants to relocate a lost family painting, an El Greco canvas of St. Francis in the desert, which was given to the church in New Mexico generations ago (11). In the chapter entitled "A Bell and A Miracle" we are told the legend of the great silver bell of Santa Fe dated 1356, which must have been brought up on cart from Mexico City, an act of heroic determination in the wilderness that can only explained through faith. Old Padre Herrera relates the miracle of Guadalupe, the one authenticated appearance of the Blessed Virgin in the New World, and how roses were gathered from the spot in winter and then miraculously tumbled from a poor priest's robe in front of the Bishop of Mexico (45). We have more prosaic miracles such as the white mules of Manuel Lujon, his pride and joy, which he gives to Father Vaillant and Father Latour to aide them in their Ministry (63). There is the legend of Fray Baltazar, and his church at Acoma atop a vast mesa, who is thrown over the edge of the mesa by his native flock and disappears into the abyss. We are given images of the mysterious cave of fire, site of Indian religious rites since time immemorial, the place where Father Latour hears "one of the oldest voices of the earth" (130),

[10] Stouck and Giltrow's fascinating article, "Willa Cather and A Grammar For Things 'Not Named'," attempts to account for the emotional aura of Cather's writing in terms of its characteristic grammatical and syntactic patterns. The article remains unpublished at the present time.

a great underground river which moves timeless beneath the land. In the procession of figures, too, are Padres Martinez and Lucero, the hedonist and the miser who break with the church and whose tale ends with Lucero's deathbed vision of Martinez, the devil, eating his own tale. At Lucero's deathbed there are people gathered who await a sign, or a word. For them death was "a moment when the soul made its entrance into the next world, passing in full consciousness through a lowly door to an unimaginable scene" (170). People's last words "were given oracular significance and pondered by those who must one day go the same road."

The "truth" of physical mortality and the passage into another "consciousness" was a truth against which Tolstoy measured his own characters in tales such as "Ivan Ilych," "Master and Man," and "What Men Live By." In each tale, how a man meets his death and prepares for the passage into another form of existence defines his human significance. In the parable "What Men Live By," we are introduced to a "master" who demands high boots be made from the finest leather. Michael, the angel who has descended into Simon's house, sets to work immediately, but instead of boots he fashions a pair of soft slippers. Only as Michael finishes the slippers do we learn that the master has died of a stroke. he needs not boots but slippers for his coffin. We learn that man is not given to know his own needs or his own fate, that death is a door which opens into a mystery, an otherness which cannot be penetrated. In "Master and Man," the peasant Nikita has been pushed out of his master's carriage during a fierce snowstorm to find shelter as best he can while the master remains safe and warm within. He reflects with stoicism on his probable fate. "The thought that he might, and very probably would, die that night occurred to him, but did not seem particularly unpleasant or dreadful. It did not seem particularly unpleasant, because his whole life had been not a continual holiday, but on the contrary an unceasing round of toil of which he was beginning to feel weary" (*Legends* 211). Nikita accepts both life and death as elements in a universal cycle, and he lives with a concept of self which is also part of other, and larger, cycles. In Tolstoy's Russian peasant we are given a "figure" which, in its acceptance of self and other, presence and absence, is both a linguistic and a very human reality at one and the same time. In writing parables such as these, Tolstoy was portraying a mythos

of the universal figure or man, a being which only reveals itself through the experience of otherness and absence.

If there is a similar mythos, a figuration of universal human experience, in *Death Comes For the Archbishop* then it emerges from the mythic journeys of the two priests over an uncharted Western landscape and their transforming vision of what this immense absence might be in imaginative/spiritual terms. The re' ruths of art, religion, and miracle to transform experience into shared emotion and overcome human alienation are expressed by Father Latour:

> 'One might almost say that an apparition is human vision corrected by divine love. . . . The Miracles of the Church seem to me to rest not so much upon faces or voices or healing power coming suddenly near to us from afar off. but upon our perceptions being made finer, so that for a moment our eyes can see and our ears can hear what is there about us always.' (50)

This again is a nearly direct imaginative transformation of Tolstoy's belief in a communal art which reveals the spirit acting in and through material reality. We think of Michael in What Men Live By," and the willing suspension of disbelief Tolstoy demands of his readers when he tells the story of an angel who "fell to earth by the roadside" (41) in order to know what men live by. Only when he has learned this lesson in the experience of human "otherness" can the angel leave the earth. He departs in "a column of fire" which "rose from earth to heaven" while Simon and his family fall to the ground in awe (44). When Simon looks up, the apparition has vanished and "the hut stood as before, and there was no one in it but his own family." The angelic "figure" is gone, but in its absence leaves behind the force of a symbolic narrative Simon and his family will not forget. In specific terms this is what Father Latour means when he argues that the "figure" of an apparition may make our perceptions finer, "so that for a moment our eyes can see and our ears can hear what is there about us always." And for both Cather and Tolstoy in their later works "what is there about us always" is a universality of human experience projected through the figures of individual lives.

As we come down to the final pages of *Death Comes For the Archbishop* Cather begins to focus almost entirely on the significance of Bishop Latour's life in America. Through the figure of the Bishop,

Cather presents a final Tolstoyan insight, that of the myth, or universal significance, of any individual existence no matter how great or small. Bishop Latour as a human being is, in one part of himself, a limited being, a separate ego driven by what seem private desires, but on the level of his faith and his ideas, he becomes an example of flesh made spirit, an energy which moves beyond its material form towards an eternity of human relations. The bishop himself wonders why a man of his abilities and limitations should have been chosen by fate for just this moment in history, and Cather answers. "Perhaps it pleased Him to grace the beginning of a new era and a vast new diocese by a fine personality. And perhaps, after all, something would remain through the years to come, some ideal, or memory, or legend" (254). Bishop Latour faces the last days of his life in the knowledge that his physical form, his experience of self, will be transformed into the larger figures of memory and legend. He thinks "very little about death. . . . More and more life seemed to him an experience of the Ego, in no sense the Ego itself," and "this conviction, he believed, was something apart from his religious life, it was an enlightenment that came to him as a man, a human creature" (289-90). His final thoughts are of the "others" who have been with him on his journey, of Kit Carson, of Eusabio the Navajo chief, and of Father Vaillant who goes furthest back, all the way to the green hills of Auvergne when two young novices were attempting to summon up the courage to make a life long commitment to the New World. In possessing these absent others in "memory and legend" Father Latour possesses himself in his final moments. This same act of self-possession through an experience of "otherness" is portrayed with great power in the final scenes of Tolstoy's "Master and Man." In this moral parable, the "Master" has been transformed by a voice he has heard in the snowstorm, he returns to the carriage to find his "Man," Nikita, freezing to death. Without thinking, he opens his great fur coat and lies down over the peasant covering him "with the whole of his body, which glowed with warmth" (*Legends* 218). The storm deepens, but the "Master" does "not think of his legs or of his hands but only of how to warm the peasant who [is] . . . lying under him" (219). Like Father Latour in his last moments, the "Master" reflects on his past life, on the people who have been significant in it, and he realizes he is dying while his "Man" might live:

> 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. . . . "Nikita is alive, so I too am alive!" he said to himself triumphantly. (221)

In the moment that the "Master" faces his personal death there is a miraculous reversal of master and servant, self and other, presence and absence. A mythos of the universal man is portrayed in the combined figures of self and other.

At the conclusion of *Death Comes For the Archbishop*, Willa Cather makes clear the mythic or legendary quality of human existence through reference to her favourite image of light on rock. In earlier novels the light had fallen on the natural symbol of the mesa, a home for unified cultures, but now the rock is not only a natural phenomenon but also the church through which man's visions of spiritual perfection, an achieved "otherness," may be shadowed forth. For many years Bishop Latour had dreamed of founding a physical and permanent church in Santa Fe, and one day while out in the desert he discovers a mountainside composed of a uniquely hard stone which glows golden in the sunlight (241-44). This is the rock which he knows has been given as a base upon which can be built a physical, as well as metaphysical, cathedral Once, Cather had written of the symbolic importance of "Light on Adobe Walls," and now we see a similar light the last rays of which reach down to touch a physical world and remind us of a world beyond. It was toward this other world, a figural reality which could not be fully explained in terms of science or materialism but only relation to emotion and belief, which both Cather and Tolstoy turned in their final novels and stories. The late works of both writers achieve a similar intensity of response to the still being formulated legend of human history.

In reading the Russians, Cather was able to transform the figures of a foreign landscape into a native speech which described her own experience and identification with the American West. For Cather, as for the other American writers who responded to Russian literature, the very language she used symbolized a larger cultural dialectic between East and West. As Edward Said has written, "In any instance of at least written language, there is no such thing as a delivered presence, but a *re-presence*, or a representation. . . . [T]he written statement is a presence to the reader by virtue of its having excluded,

displaced, made superogatory any such *real thing* as the 'Orient'" (21). A linguistic reality of presence and absence has, in Cather's response to the Russians, its analogue on the psychic and cultural levels of identity and otherness. In the "logic of power" which is always part of literary identity and "otherness," the Russians allowed Cather to move past the iron logic of a native tradition in order to re-possess her own voice. It was the Russians who provided a sustaining if "foreign" tradition for a voice from the vast American prairie, a landscape as vast as the steppes themselves, a voice which had not yet been heard in American fiction.

CHAPTER FIVE

Anderson and Dostoevsky: The Form of Things Concealed

> . . . until I found the Russian writers of prose . . . Tolstoy, Dostoevski, Turgenev, Chekhov, I had never found a prose that satisfied me. In America we have had a bad tradition, got from the English and the French. To our tales that are popular in our magazines one goes for very clever plots, all sorts of trickery and juggling. The natural result is that human life becomes secondary, of no importance. The plot does not grow out of the natural drama resulting from the tangle of human relations, whereas in your Russian writers one feels life everywhere, in every page.
>
> I remember how, as a boy, I heard of Russia as a strange, cruel land in which--one got the notion--well, you see, it was a land in which most of the people spent their lives down in dark mines. A few tall figures in beards and wearing expensive fur coats strode about. Everyone carried a whip with which to beat others.
>
> I had this picture, and then I came to your writers. A door opened. I saw at last that the art of prose writing might spring into life directly out of an impulse of sympathy and understanding with the man beside you.
>
> (Sherwood Anderson, letter to Peter Ochremenko, Translator
> All Russian State Publishing House, January, 1923)

Anderson's memory of his first awareness of Russia, followed later by his discovery of Russian writers, gives an encapsulated version of the major theme of this study. for Sherwood Anderson, as for many Americans, Russia begins as the "other," a kind of dark double which can safely contain the repressed contents of one's own cultural consciousness. We are given images of a cruel place where most men spend their lives in dark mines underground, dominated by "a few tall figures" carrying whips with which to "beat others." This is just the dark place, the same deep psychic mine of obsession, desire and control, which Anderson was compelled to explore in his own examination of American lives. But at first he could only envision these lives as a projected darkness, an otherness contained within a Russian national identity--in short he had not yet accepted the contents of his own unconscious, had not *owned* the contents of the underground and forged them into usable literary figures. This only began to change when he came to artists such as Dostoevsky, Turgenev and Chekhov, and discovered a writing, so unlike his own tradition,

which was aware of the dark mines of human motivation but sprang "into life directly out of an impulse of sympathy and understanding" (*Letters* 93). In himself then, Anderson moves from cultural mystification to a form of literary understanding. He makes the figures of another culture his own, and he does this precisely by moving beyond the projected image of Russia as the dark other of American consciousness, by accepting as his own what at first seems most fearful and strange in the other.

Acceptance of the other, what Anderson called an impulse toward "sympathy and understanding" in the best writing, is a defining characteristic of the literature examined in this study. James, Cather, Anderson, each in his or her own way displayed a remarkable openness to the other literary experience which was Russian. And this openness has more than just literary or aesthetic significance. the way we imagine another culture determines its reality, and that reality is always constructed out of a figural response. The literary influence which extends from nineteenth-century Russia to America may well be a struggle, a series of symbolic misappropriations and transfigurations as Bloom and others have argued all influence must be, but it has been at least a fertile misunderstanding or transformation. My argument has been that the passage from Russian to American literature generally, even though subject to the constant human pressures of figuration and misreading, has been tremendously productive both in raising the standards for American art and in portraying a more complex national reality. American writers such as James and Anderson found a potential image of their own experience which they could use and transform from the Russian model. What they shared at first with Russian writers was an imaginative, aesthetic (mis)understanding. Russian achievements justified American experiments in both the novel and the short-story form. And it is this type of influence, however hard won, which in the long run may have the greatest impact on cultural understanding, potentially this shared imaginative or aesthetic world is the bridge to increased understanding in the world of practical affairs.

Anderson walked through a door which a reading of Dostoevsky and Chekhov and Turgenev opened for him, into a re-discovery of the repressed, muddled life which he read as the Russians' subject and which became Anderson's too as he began to realize that the people who "spent their lives down in dark mines"

were the very Americans he wanted to write about–their lives were "strange," as were all lives closely examined, but they were no longer simply Russian lives, the projected "others" of a repressed American consciousness.

By his own account Anderson began reading Russian literature with Turgenev when he was about 35 years old in 1911. He remembered "how [his]. . . hands trembled" (*Letters* 118) as he read Turgenev's *A Sportsman's Notebook*. He "raced through the pages like a drunken man" (118), and thought of this book as "the sweetest thing in all literature" (Howe, 93). Later, in Tolstoy and Dostoevsky he had the same recognition of artistic kinship: "The truth is I found in them the love of human life, tenderness, a lack of eternal preaching and smart-aleckness so characteristic of much Western writing, nearly all of it, in fact" (118).

William Sutton, in his study of Anderson's early development, *The Road to Winesburg*, has traced the American writer's relation to the Russians. Sutton writes that Anderson, just prior to beginning *Winesburg, Ohio*, "developed an intense interest in the Russians, and a deep sense of vanity concerning them" (300). This interest was not limited to Dostoevsky and Turgenev, Chekhov and Tolstoy. Anderson remembered that he had first read the "tales of defeated people" by Gorky when he was "a young factory hand," and "he thought of himself as having hungered to have the lives of people told in the accurate, sympathetic way of Gorki." And then there was Chekhov. In the early 1920s Anderson reflected, in a letter to Roger Sergel, on the necessary education of any serious writer. "If I were a young writer," he says, "I would study not the work of the tricky, flashy magazine writers, but of the masters of the craft. I would read the stories of Chekhov, such books as [Turgenev's] *Annals of a Sportsman*, and books of that kind. If you are interested in my own work, read *Winesburg, Ohio, Triumph of the Egg*, etc." (*Letters* 448). Here Anderson directly links his own achievements in the short story form to the stylistic mastery of Chekhov and Turgenev. Then there was Van Wyck Brooks' comment that Anderson was "the phallic Chekhov," to which Anderson replied in Chekhovian fashion. "I really do not believe I have a sex obsession. . . . I do not want to have, surely. When I want to flatter myself, at least, I tell myself that I want only not to lose

the sense of life as it is, here, now, in the land and among the people among whom I live" (*Letters* 78). Anderson was one of the first American writers to show signs that he understood the atmospherics of the new open-ended story which writers such as Chekhov and Turgenev had developed--stories which did not develop toward any obvious *dénouement*, but developed character without commentary in the full complexity, and mystery, of relation with other character and landscape. He was not the last. Chekhov and Turgenev have had a huge influence on how the modern short story has been conceived, Joyce in his *Dubliners*, Hemingway in his early stories, Willa Cather in her stories of pioneer people shaped by a vast landscape--all in their own ways have taken much from the Russians.

Early critics, when they recognized Anderson's link to the Russians, most often ranged him with Chekhov and Turgenev. Malcolm Cowley, in his introduction to *Winesburg, Ohio*, mentions both Chekhov and Turgenev, and Howe in his biography gestures toward Turgenev as a source, particularly a story such as "Death in the Woods" in its mood, pacing and sense of "the ultimate unity of nature" held "in the hands of death" (Brewster 211); while Virginia Woolf, on reading Anderson, recalled a feeling similar to her first discovery of Chekhov. Anderson himself went through a period when he intensely admired Turgenev's composure, his ability to keep his own ego out of the story.

With this said, even with Anderson's obvious love of Chekhov and Turgenev, his debt to the form of the story cycle in *A Sportsman's Notebook*, and the atmospheric silences of Chekhov's finely wrought stories, the Russian who seems to have had the deepest effect on him was Dostoevsky, and that for both emotional and aesthetic reasons. In Anderson's approach to writing one cannot imagine a man more different than the cerebral Chekhov, or the cosmopolitan Turgenev. Dostoevsky on the other hand was a writer who lived inside the emotions and ideas of his characters, who "perceive[d] and represent[ed] every thought as the position of a personality" (Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky* 9), and this is the approach, an unfinished, open-ended, response to personality itself, that characterizes the best of Anderson's work as well. Dostoevsky had written that his literary goal was one of "deep penetration" or *proniknovenie*, an attempt to move through a realistic surface toward an equally real but unexplored underground of emotion, desire,

and belief--to move "from the real to the more real" (Billington 416). In his own exploration of the unexpressed psychic and spiritual lives of Americans, Sherwood Anderson was engaged in a similar descent toward the "real." To this literary relationship we now turn.[1]

I

> With these nervous and uncertain hands may I really feel for the form of things concealed in the darkness.
>
> (Anderson, "The Form of Things Concealed")

Anderson's friend, Ben Hecht, places Anderson's first reading of Dostoevsky just after September, 1914 (a significant date in that the first sketches from *Winesburg, Ohio* were published just over a year later). To Hecht, Anderson said, "if Dostoevsky came into my room I would kneel before him. No one else. . ." (*Road to Winesburg*, 300).[2] By March, 1921, Anderson is writing to Hart Crane and expressing similar views:

> I am glad you've found Dostoevski. Had I know[n] you had not read him, I should have been shouting at you long ago.
>
> It is delightful that you should also have picked the two books I care for most, *Karamazov* and *Possessed*. There is nothing like *Karamazov* anywhere else in literature--a bible. You will like *The Idiot* and the prison tales too. However, one doesn't like this man, one loves him. I have always felt him as the one writer I could go down on my knees to. (*Letters* 70-71)

What is it that Anderson would go down on his knees to in Dostoevsky? Howard Mumford Jones, in his

[1] Although several early commentators on Anderson's work saw his literary affinity to Dostoevsky (see reviews of *Winesburg, Ohio* by Burton Rascoe and J. V. A. Weaver reprinted in *The Road to Winesburg*, 599-604), these early impressions have never been taken up in a systematic way by scholars. So far as I am aware, no one has followed the lead Anderson himself has given in numerous letters, and in his memoirs, indicating his profound literary and personal debt to Dostoevsky's fictional world. The section which follows begins with Anderson's own comments concerning Dostoevsky and uses the seminal theoretical insights of Mikhail Bakhtin to explore the literary and philosophical dialogue which occurred between the Russian and the American writer. Although Bakhtin's ideas concerning the dialogic imagination have not been applied to Anderson's stories previously, in my view these insights open up the potential for further understanding both these complex fictions and also the actual process of literary influence as it crosses between cultures and individuals.

[2] Hecht reported this conversation in an article he wrote for *The Chicago Evening Post*, Sept. 8, 1916: 11.

introduction to Anderson's collected letters, has probably understood the emotional basis of Anderson's link to Dostoevsky better than anyone. There is, in Anderson, he says, a mysticism, a kind of spiritualized pantheism and forgetfulness of self, which puts him in the company of Whitman, Van Gogh, and Dostoevsky. And Jones quotes as evidence a letter of comfort Anderson wrote to Burton Emmett. We are all a part of some incomprehensible thing, Anderson writes, which is "the real inner glory of life. I believe . . . that it is this universal thing, scattered about in many people, a fragment of it here, a fragment there, this thing we call love that we have to keep on trying to tap. . . . As for the end, I have often thought that when it comes, there will be a kind of real comfort in the fact that the self will go then. There is some kind of universal thing we will pass into that will in any event give us escape from this disease of self" (*Letters* xii-xiii). The escape from the disease of self, this is just what the mystical side of Dostoevsky wanted to go beyond in his polyphonic novels. Anderson's best stories are about people caught and isolated in the self and their often desperate attempts to shoot the gap, to achieve some kind of communion with the "other," an otherness which is internal as well as external. Dostoevsky's "poor folk" are part of the same family which Anderson came to understand on the road to Winesburg.

Early on, Jones recognized what later critics increasingly have recognized as Anderson's exploration of the problematic nature of the self or ego as unified consciousness, his desire to extend the boundaries of individual personality to their limits in a world of constantly impinging relations, to its richer status as a perceived fragment within universal "otherness." As Frank Gado has written in his introduction to *The Teller's Tales*: "If any one coupling of theme and structure in Anderson's short fiction is paradigmatic, it is this progress to a . . . moment in which the reader empathetically perceives a character's utter vulnerability and confusion. Anderson employs various strategies toward this end, but behind each lies the universal nightmare of the self discovering its nakedness before the world" (7). Now, this is important, not only to understand Anderson the writer as individual, but also in his deeper connections to a precursor such as Dostoevsky. Dostoevsky is *the* nineteenth-century writer who begins to explore the problematic status of self, its "vulnerability" and "confusion" as it discovers its "nakedness before the world": a fragment

created and knowing itself only in relation to a larger cultural dialogue or polyphony. But Dostoevsky explores this problem of modernity, in some senses defines it, in a very special way which we must look at in its existential form. And I should add at the outset that in the dialogue which exists between Anderson and Dostoevsky, I am in no way making the claim that Anderson's achievements reach an equivalency with the Russian's. The remainder of this chapter should make it clear that a later writer can be profoundly influenced by a precursor, without ever fully understanding that writer's spiritual philosophy, or ever attaining anything like his impact as a world artist. To be absolutely clear, on whatever scale one wants to measure artistic achievement Anderson exists in the half-light of Dostoevsky's sun, dark though it may be.

In the introduction to this study, Mikhail Bakhtin's name emerged in the wider discussion of cultural influence as dialogic or polyphonic relations between nations. Although Bakhtin limited his theory to the study of relations between characters in Dostoevsky's novels, he does point the way at the conclusion of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* toward a larger social world. And Bakhtin's theories of dialogism and polyphony are critical not only to the wider cultural/influence implications of this study but also in understanding the specific link between writers such as Dostoevsky and Anderson in their common vision of the isolated self as grotesque. Bakhtin characterizes Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel as the creation of "*free* people, capable of standing *alongside* their creator, capable of not agreeing with him and even of rebelling against him. *A plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices is in fact the chief characteristic of Dostoevsky's novels*" (6). In Dostoevsky, Bakhtin argues, there is no "single objective world, illuminated by a single authorial consciousness, rather a plurality of consciousnesses, with equal rights and each with its own world, combine but are not merged in the unity of the event." The radical free play of consciousnesses, of embodied ideas, gives each character's "word" as much weight as the author's in an ongoing novelistic dialogue. In this new fictional world, characters are created as "autonomous subjects, not objects" (7).

This is Bakhtin's introduction to the essential features of Dostoevsky's radically decentered world

view as it creates itself in polyphony. From this we turn to the categories which link Anderson to Dostoevsky on an existential plane. There are two: the first has been named as polyphony, and the second is the grotesque. In its most simplified form, my argument is that the grotesque occurs for both Anderson and Dostoevsky when character cuts itself off from dialogue with the other, refuses, out of fear or incapacity, the radical indeterminacy and freedom of polyphony. The personality or ego which finds itself exposed to the nightmare of its own nakedness before the world turns in on itself, for self-protection, fixates on a single monologic point of view, and the monologic view or idea chosen is the specific form of the grotesque achieved. On this level of outwardly expressed grotesque forms, polyphony or dialogism does not simply disappear in either Anderson or Dostoevsky, it simply retreats from a social arena into the private world of the underground man whose very ego begins to split, or double into open forms of the other. We see this happening in Dostoevsky's second novel *The Double* (1846) where the repressed other of Golyadkin emerges as an embodied character whose projected reality destroys the sanity of our hero. One character carries on a tortured dialogue with his other self. In *Notes from the Underground* (1864), a physical double does not emerge, but the psyche of the underground man is decentered, split, and the intensity of his desire to contact a social world is matched only by his inability to know it as "real." In *Crime and Punishment*, Raskolnikov's attempt to cut himself off from social polyphony leads him only into the tortured labyrinth of self or selves.

In Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel of embodied ideas, no *one* dominates over the other; there is an ongoing play of unfinalized voices, which gives the peculiarly intense hallucinatory tone to his decentered, but open, world. Dostoevsky's "spirituality" as well as Anderson's can be explained in terms of a fallen human world which exists in limitless polyphony or grotesquery. The unfinished journey which both writers make is toward the "universal thing" which exists in this world only as fragments, a thing human beings sometimes call "love" and keep on trying to tap. For Dostoevsky and Anderson a fully realized world consciousness would be the only non-grotesque in their fictional universes, but this does not, and cannot, come to pass.

But how did Anderson respond in his own writing to the dialogic, existential world which Dostoevsky created? We begin by looking at the first story of *Winesburg, Ohio* entitled "The Book of the Grotesque," and we remember too that this was Anderson's first choice for the title of the entire volume. What a curious tale it is. We are presented with an old writer, who smokes cigars, who sometimes cries and, when his white mustache bobs up and down, looks "ludicrous" (22). He wants a carpenter to raise his bed to a level with his window so he can see out to a larger world instead of being enclosed, or limited, but the plan comes to nothing and instead the two discuss life and death and war. In bed at night the old writer dreams, and what passes before his eyes is a dancing procession of grotesques, "all of the men and women the writer had ever known. . . " (23). These were not "horrible" people; some were "almost beautiful." But as he watches this unending human dance, the grotesque equivalent of the tympanum carved in stone relief above the doors of medieval churches, the old writer feels compelled to tell the story of each, to characterize their desires, their individual realities. Each grotesque has perhaps just one idea, just one desire which rules and defines him, but they all exist in the human procession which is a vast social polyphony of unmerged voices. And because each character is dominated by a single idea, each becomes a grotesque, a fragment of a larger dialogue.

The old man in writing his parable of the grotesques has a vision, or creation myth, which explains the evolution of a grotesque world:

> . . in the beginning when the world was young there were a great many thoughts but no such thing as a truth. Man made the truths himself and each truth was a composite of a great many vague thoughts. All about in the world were the truths and they were all beautiful.
>
> The old man had listed hundreds of the truths in his book. . . . There was the truth of virginity and the truth of passion, the truth of wealth and of poverty, of thrift and of profligacy, of carelessness and abandon. . . .
>
> And then the people came along. Each as he appeared snatched up one of the truths and some who were quite strong snatched up a dozen of them.
>
> It was the truths that made the people grotesques. The old man had quite an elaborate theory concerning the matter. It was his notion that the moment one of the people took one of the truths to himself, called it his truth, and tried to live his life by it, he became a grotesque and the truth he embraced became a falsehood. (24-25)

This parable explains a great many things: from the structure and meaning of the book *Winesburg, Ohio*

itself, to the aesthetic philosophy of Sherwood Anderson, to the nature of the old writer, to the social pathology of human interaction. We learn that no one escapes from the condition of the grotesque in a polyphonic world, each person has taken only a limited number of truths and therefore is partial This is true even of the old writer, like Bakhtin's Dostoevsky, he does not escape implication in the grotesque world he recreates. "the author's discourse about a character is organized as discourse about *someone actually present*, someone who hears him (the author) and is *capable of answering him*" (Bakhtin 63). And if we take the old writer as a projection of Anderson's own future identity as a writer, we see that not even the artist escapes the divisions and doublings within consciousness which constitute many valid voices, many selves beneath the mask of unified ego. This lived reality of a potential infinity of other selves, what Bakhtin has called the openness to the other which is "dialogically oriented discourse"(63), is what characterizes most of Dostoevsky's work and the best of Anderson's short stories. We find Anderson himself reflecting on the difficulty, both as an artist and human being, in achieving openness to the other future

To his wife Eleanor he wrote, in 1929, that it was so easy to lose the artistic "point". "The reason, dear, that, when for example we go to the clay, what we want doesn't come forth is that there is something wrong with us. I for example am always superimposing myself on others. How would it be if I could always be really alive to what is before me instead. Let it exist. Let it exist" (*Love Letters* 9).

In another letter, reflecting on the aesthetic choices which an openness to the lived experience of the other implies, Anderson compares himself to the Russians. "Chekhov and Turgenev, to name two masters, managed to give free play to feeling but always, also, to let mind come in and more or less control. Dostoevsky perhaps went rather the other road I have been inclined to take" (*Letters* 188).

These comments, one professional and one very personal, but both very revealing of the dialogic aesthetic choices Anderson wished to make, deserve to be compared to a passage from Bakhtin in which he reflects on the first critic to understand Dostoevsky's experiential openness to the other, Vyacheslav Ivanov. "He defined Dostoevsky's realism as a realism based not on cognition (objectified cognition) but on 'penetration.' To affirm someone else's 'I'–'thou art'–is a task that, according to Ivanov, Dostoevsky's

characters must successfully accomplish if they are to overcome their ethical solipsism . . . and transform the other person from a shadow into an authentic reality. At the heart of the tragic catastrophe in Dostoevsky's work there always lies the solipsistic separation of a character's consciousness from the whole, his incarceration in his own private world" (*Dostoevsky* 10). This critique of Dostoevsky applies precisely to Anderson as well We remember his desire to remain open to the reality of the other, coupled with his aesthetic realization of just how difficult this openness was, his rejection of the rational mind as a controlling point of view in the monologic novel, and his desire to go beyond the "disease of self," of an egoistic private world, in order to recover the "fragments" of a more universal understanding. Those fragments of truth which Anderson recovered, although grotesque in themselves, incarcerations in private worlds, taken together reveal one complete world named *Winesburg, Ohio*. The first story, "The Book of the Grotesque," is a direct explanation of the structure and meaning of the stories which follow. The dance of grotesques which was only in the old man's dreams has now been set on paper, one after the other. These are not discrete stories but part of a community of desires and activity, conscious and unconscious, which forms an "unmerged" totality of purposes, each partial character with his/her own validity as a speaking fictional character, where no one voice predominates over another.

II

> There is no reason at all why Americanism should not be seen with the same intensity of feeling so characteristic of Russian Artists when they write of Russian life. Our life is as provincial. It is as full of strange and illuminating side lights. Because we have not written intensely is no reason why we should not begin.
>
> (Sherwood Anderson to Miss Marietta Finley, Dec. 21, 1916)

We will look at several of Anderson's stories now to see how their partial "truths" define specific aspects of the human grotesque. partial beings who embody precarious constructed identities, naked before the

world. The self as unified structure, the identifiable "I" of ego, no longer holds firm purchase in stories such as "Hands," "Loneliness," "The Strength of God," "Queer," or "Sophistication," where instead a polyphony of competing and equal voices is heard in the mind. In "Hands" we meet Wing Biddlebaum, "beset by a ghostly band of doubts" (27), who sees his own hands as grotesque appendages belonging to someone else. His character is split and driven into a dialogic underground because years ago as a gifted teacher of young boys he had been accused of perversion and then brutally driven from the town. In trying "to carry a dream into the young minds" (32), he had used his hands to guide and caress his students. The town responded to another self which Wing had not recognized in himself. This other self expressed in foreign hands is a double which forever after he fears in himself. His hands are likened to "the beating . . . wings of an imprisoned bird" (28), and Wing Biddlebaum is trapped in a world of "shadow," "incarcerated" in an internal and interminable dialogue with a repressed self.

In "Queer," Elmer Cowley is bound in the prison house of a single point of view--his own--and exists in a "solipsistic separation . . . from the whole." He has taken it into his mind that the townspeople think him a fool, "queer," and in his mania he fixates on George Willard as a representative of the town, a person who has not known "unhappiness" (194) and must be comfortable with the self he inhabits. "I will not be queer--one to be looked at and listened to," he declare[s] aloud. "I'll be like other people. I'll show that George Willard. He'll find out." This is reminiscent of the underground man's compulsion to push a certain self possessed officer off the sidewalk, for a slight the soldier could not even imagine (*Notes From the Underground* 52). In fact the insult, in both cases, seems to be that both Willard and the soldier unconsciously live within worlds which the underground man knows himself to be excluded from.[3]

[3] The literary descent of Dostoevsky's soldier is a fascinating one. There is a similar scene in Nikolai Chernyshevsky's *What Is To Be Done?* (1863), the most influential, and possibly worst written, Russian novel of the mid-nineteenth century. In that work, a character named Lopukhov, a member of the *raznochintsy* or displaced intellectual class, is also confronted by a citizen on the sidewalks of St. Petersburg. For Lopukhov, this upper-class gentleman is an intolerable reminder of the unconscious authority of the state. Rather than be pushed from the sidewalk (his rightful place in society), Lopukhov, like the underground man, vows never to give way. Elmer Cowley in Sherwood Anderson's story, too, is determined never to be pushed from the sidewalk by people who are "better" than he. The difference between an ideological writer such as Chernyshevsky, and writers such as Dostoevsky and Anderson, is shown in Lopukhov's physical triumph over the aristocracy (he throws the unyielding gentleman into the gutter, to the applause of onlookers). Chernyshevsky was writing a sociological and revolutionary novel, while Dostoevsky and Anderson were exploring the inner psychic and spiritual realities of victimization.

Dostoevsky's protagonist tortures himself on the razor of cynicism and idealism and Elmer Cowley explodes without warning, suddenly beating George Willard senseless. He leaves the town with "pride" surging up in him (201). "I showed him," he cried. "I guess I showed him. I ain't so queer. I guess I showed him I ain't so queer." And with these final words, he ironically reveals just how divorced he is from social dialogue, in short how really "queer" he is.

In stories such as "Hands" or "Queer," grotesque doubleness is limited to a fragment of the body or an internalized state of mind, while in Dostoevsky's *The Double* the splitting is physically completed in the character of Golyadkin. *The Double* exists at an early stage of Dostoevsky's exploration of the problematic status of the self--this is a novel which examines a projected grotesque of internal selves. We see what happens to a man whose desire to be understood, to explain his consciousness, is blocked from social dialogue and forced inward. In this case the explosion of neurotic will is so powerful that there is a manifestation of an actual physical double which can carry the contents of the repressed self. Golyadkin II, "the unworthy twin" (286) who has usurped his brother's life and identity, hangs on to the bitter end, dropping from the carriage only as Golyadkin I makes his final approach to the madhouse and complete mental obliteration. This early novel is a very literal expression of a grotesque inwardness projected into the world. As Dostoevsky develops the idea in later works the doubleness or polyphony no longer takes on separate physical shape but rests in the minds of various protagonists. The clearest example of this passage occurs in Dostoevsky's famous *Notes From the Underground.*

If one had to select one character from Anderson to put alongside Dostoevsky's underground man, it would have to be Enoch Robinson in "Loneliness." This talented, imaginative young man has gone to New York to take up art, but "nothing ever turned out for Enoch Robinson" (167). He wants to speak to the world, to begin a dialogue through his paintings, but he "couldn't understand people and he couldn't make people understand him" (167-68). At first he invites artistic people to his lodgings, but when they discuss a particular painting he wants to shout "you don't get the point . . . the picture you see doesn't consist of the things you see and say words about. There is something else, something you don't see at all"

(169). It is a dark spot, hidden in the corner which signifies a lovely woman who has been hurt and abandoned. He wants to scream, "[d]on't you see how it is?" (170), but the words echo only in his mind and die in his throat. He cannot explain himself and in egotistical torment he rejects the world, begins to think "he did not need people any more." To replace an outer-directed dialogue which he has rejected, Enoch begins to listen to an internal polyphony. "he began to invent his own people to whom he could really talk and to whom he explained the things he had been unable to explain to living people" (170). For a period Enoch attempts to inhabit the social role of marriage, but this too is like his relationships with former friends; all at once he simply walks out of it and is "happy" in his locked room "making comments on life," talking to phantoms. But something happens to disrupt his solitary dream/nightmare, and as with Dostoevsky's underground man, the "thing that happened was a woman" (173). The empty room, which is his mind, is profoundly disturbed by the potential dialogue the woman represents. Her presence is a magnet which wants to pull Enoch from his underground room: "I had a feeling about her. . . . Her hands were so strong and her face was so good and she looked at me all the time. . . . I was afraid . . . I was terribly afraid. I didn't want to let her come in when she knocked at the door but I couldn't sit still. . . . I wanted her and all the time I didn't want her. . . . Sometimes I ached to have her go away and never come back any more" (176). The final scenes of Enoch's struggle to go beyond an internalized grotesque are hauntingly similar to the underground man's last interview with Lisa, the prostitute. At first Enoch wa. s to make the woman understand, "to see how important I was," and then a look comes into her eyes which makes him see that perhaps she "had understood all the time" (176/177). And this makes him "furious" because he knows at the bottom of his being that he "couldn't let her understand. I felt that then she would know everything, that I would be submerged, drowned out, you see." In mortal fear of the radical openness of dialogue the woman demands, Enoch scurries back to the underground. He says "things" to her, "vile" things that "smash" the woman and make it clear that he "would never see her again" (177). Enoch's voice ends in a whimper of defeated truth. "I'm alone, all alone here . . . It was warm and friendly in my room but now I'm all alone" (178).

In his self-defeating, internalized grotesque, Enoch Robinson is a double for the underground man of Dostoevsky's tale: this man, too, lives alone in a narrow chamber, a room which is a physical manifestation of his solitary, involuted mind. He has lost contact with a world and has populated his internal landscape with imagined slights. Like Enoch, only more consciously, he realizes that man is not a rational animal, that often he will work toward his own deepest defeat. The narrator's tale begins where Enoch's ends: "I am a sick man. . . . I am an angry man. I am an unattractive man" (15), a man who knows that humankind is not guided by rational desire to improve or to advance, that his deepest hunger is to retain, at any cost, a sense of his own ego and will, the desire not to be, like Enoch, "submerged" or "drowned out" by any other will or truth or even objective analysis of self-interest. There is no room for dialogue, no matter how much desired, in a philosophy where "one's own free and unfettered volition, one's own caprice, however wild, one's own fancy, inflamed sometimes to the point of madness . . . is the one best and greatest good. . ." (33-34). This is the truth on which the underground man believes all philosophies of human happiness and progress founder. that knowing the good, humankind wilfully and obstinately "prefers to follow a perverse and difficult path," is "passionately disposed to destruction and chaos" (40) and wilfully seeks self-defeat as a sign of existent will.

The underground man's story in "Falling Sleet" is a dramatization of this dark internal monologue. Like the grotesque Enoch, he is misunderstood because he will not allow himself to be understood. In misunderstanding, in isolation, he at least retains the illusion of an identity and will, no matter how fragile. Like Enoch he seeks out friends so that he might open a dialogue, and like his counterpart his pride and self-involvement deliberately drive those people away. To his former classmates and friends, now seen as bitter enemies because they cannot recognize his superiority, the underground man directs these thoughts. "Oh, if only you knew what thoughts and emotions I am capable of, and how enlightened I am!" But he is incapable of expressing himself, his thoughts are driven inward as are Enoch's, and his "enemies (friends) acted as though . . . [he] wasn't even in the room" (79). After he has driven them away, Dostoevsky's protagonist decides to follow his enemies to a house of prostitution and there force them to recognize his

importance. "Either they shall all kneel before me, embracing my knees and begging for my friendship, or . . . or I'll give Zverkov a slap in the face!" (80).

It is this overweening desire to be recognized for "something" not "see[n] at all" (*Winesburg* 169) which leads him to the house of prostitution and Lisa. In the first moments of their relationship we are given the same antithesis of emotion which will characterize the man/woman relationship in Anderson's "Loneliness." Lisa, like the other woman, has "something kind and simple-hearted" (85) in her face, and the narrator's first emotional response to this open face of the other is. "Something foul seemed to sting me, I went straight to her. . ." In a long interview he attempts to reveal himself to her, he speaks of the potential for a higher existence. "when there is love, you can live even without happiness," he says (90), and the young prostitute is touched, seems to see that better existence reflected in his face. But even as he leaves her, the underground man is disgusted with himself, his false sentiments, and begins to feel that if Lisa comes to see him he will be "submerged, drowned out" by her understanding. ". . . if she had suddenly appeared by my side; I should have insulted her, abused her, driven her away, even struck her!" (106). But when Lisa does appear, he breaks down and sobs like a child on her breast (114). And like Enoch, while he yearns for understanding, dialogue with the other, he cannot accept it. On seeing that Lisa really can see into the depths of his loneliness and despair, he asks: "Do you understand how much I shall hate you for being here and hearing me tell you all this" (117).

And then another emotion takes over: the will to control and destroy, to make the world conform to his own chaotic and debased inner self. He knows he will take her as a sexual object, answer her openness with egotistical deceit, and in that moment thinks. "How I hated her and how strongly I was attracted to her at that moment! . It was almost like revenge. . .!" (118). Unlike Enoch Robinson who "curses" and says vile things in order to take revenge on a woman who sees into his crippled state, the underground man physically performs a vile act, afterward even attempting to pay for her services with a 5 ruble note. Like the unnamed woman of Anderson's tale, Lisa disappears into the falling sleet and out

of the protagonist's life forever. Both men just want "'to be left in peace', alone in [their] . . . underground" (119).

Alone, ashamed, and in anguish at the end of his story, the underground man is just slightly more aware, more intellectual about the form of his inner grotesque. Enoch Robinson rocks himself, whimpering "I'm alone, all alone here," a self naked before a nightmarish inner world, while the underground man diagnoses his dialogic illness, his "anguish" and "loneliness," in the following way. "we are all in a greater or less degree crippled. We are so unused to living that we often feel something like loathing for 'real life' and so cannot bear to be reminded of it" (122). He is truly a "sick man, an angry man." He is also a grotesque man who prefers isolation and loneliness to any potential dialogue with a larger world. He, like Enoch, seeks loneliness and defeat simply to prove to himself "that he was a man and not a piano-key" (38) to be played upon by fate and the will of others.

Dostoevsky's underground man and Anderson's grotesque Enoch Robinson in "Loneliness" are terminal characters--their type of internal dialogue cannot go any further underground and still exist as a functioning being. Both Dostoevsky and Anderson reveal the counter-image of their underground types in later characters. In the penultimate story of *Winesburg, Ohio*, "Sophistication," Anderson gives a kind of antidote to the alienated grotesques who are trapped within themselves and carry on insane dialogues with an internalized other. While this story cannot be compared in an overall sense with Dostoevsky's great early novel *Crime and Punishment*, I think it is correct to see that both writers offer similar escapes from the prison house of self in these works. In "Sophistication," after the reader has come to know a long line of underground men and women, we are introduced to George Willard, a boy who is "fast growing into manhood" (233). He has come to that point in his life when a "door" is opened and he sees the "countless figures" who "before his time have come out of nothingness into the world, lived their lives and again disappeared into nothingness", and "he knows that in spite of all the stout talk of his fellows he must live and die in uncertainty. . ." (234). But unlike almost all of the characters who have preceded him, unlike Dostoevsky's underground men, he does not turn away in fear or disgust from the naked self. At the

moment he hears death calling he desires to reach out to a larger world, "to come close to some other human, touch someone with his hands, be touched by the hand of another" (235). If he chooses a woman it will be because that woman will "understand" and what he needs most is "understanding" (235). This is the dialogic moment in all Anderson's tales, and the choice is to reveal oneself to the "other" or to hide oneself in a narrow chamber.

For George Willard a thing happens, and that "thing" is "a woman" named Helen White who, too, is on the edge of life. Together in the darkness they sit in the deserted grandstand of the town park and "in the mind of each was the same thought. 'I have come to this lonely place and here is this other'..." (241). A feeling of open reverence for life passes over them. They kiss briefly, the mood passes, and they begin to walk back to the town. They play for a moment and then silently agree to stop. Anderson ends the story: "she took his arm and walked beside him in dignified silence.... Man or boy, woman or girl, they had for a moment taken hold of the thing that makes the mature life of men and women in the modern world possible" (243). In a world of grotesque form and idea the thing that makes life possible and large is openness to the reality of the other. Men and women in the modern world have a memory of this verity in the emotion they call love. The world of partial truths, of ideas, and ideologies, that humans so eagerly cling to as immediate support for the ego and will, these are "the truths" that Anderson has already told us "made the people grotesques."

On a vastly larger canvas, Dostoevsky tells us the same story in *Crime and Punishment*. In the beginning, caught within the grotesque of internal polyphony, Raskolnikov "had become . . . completely absorbed in himself, and isolated from his fellows.... He was crushed by poverty, but the anxieties of his position had of late ceased to weigh upon him. He had given up attending to matters of practical importance; he had lost all desire to do so" (1). His fixation on destiny and free will as the sign of willed ego lead him to identify with historical figures such as Napoleon for "whom all is permitted" (238), "extraordinary men [who] have a right to commit any crime to transgress the law in any way, just because they are extraordinary" (225). And this grotesque internal fixation on a single idea or "truth" becomes the

"falsehood" which justifies his killing of the old woman, Alyona Ivanovna, for her money. Raskolnikov moves beyond an internorization of the grotesque only as his guilt leads him to recognize a world of "other" consciences, other voices, all of which have equal rights to be heard. Unlike Dostoevsky's underground man, or Anderson's Enoch Robinson, who never emerge from an internal self-absorption which precludes dialogue with an exteriorized other--the very definition of the grotesque--Raskolnikov reaches toward the recognition of "a plurality of unmerged consciousnesses" (Bakhtin 9), which is a dialogic social world.[4] And as with Anderson, this regeneration takes its form through relationship with a woman. For George Willard, it is a moment spent with Helen White in the darkness at the edge of town, a silent recognition of the reality of the other, "the thing that makes the mature life of men and women in the modern world possible" (243). In *Crime and Punishment* it is Sonia, a young girl who has turned to prostitution in order to save her family from starvation, whose acceptance of Raskolnikov withstands even the revelation of his act of murder. Both have come to a "lonely place" and found there "this other". "he had gone to her for human fellowship when he needed it, she would go with him wherever fate might send him" (449). Raskolnikov has seven more years to serve in a Siberian prison, but an understanding has been reached between he and Sonia, a recognition which is the same as that reached by George Willard and Helen White. "the heart of each held infinite sources of life for the heart of the other" (471). Raskolnikov's emergence from an internal underground, into a lived recognition of the reality of other voices, is the image on which the novel closes. "He did not know that the new life would not be given him for nothing, that he would have to pay dearly for it, that it would cost him great striving, great suffering. But that is . . . the story of the gradual renewal of a man, the story of his gradual regeneration, of his passing from one world into another, of his initiation into a new unknown life" (472). Both Anderson and Dostoevsky understood that the escape from an internal grotesque into a "new life" of dialogic openness could come only with "great striving, great suffering" but that it offered the potential for human "renewal."

Anderson's reading of Dostoevsky was a commentary on the soul, often crippled, of modern man,

[4] Raskolnikov's very name carries within it the Russian word for schism, or doubleness [Raskol], within it.

and its spiritual/social potential in a world more open to the reality of the other—whether an individual or a culture. Bakhtin used the concepts of dialogism and polyphony to describe the new human relations Dostoevsky was exploring in his art, and I have applied these concepts to Anderson's own artistic desires. Both writers, one greater and one lesser, related artistic vision to a diagnosis of illness and of social transformation. Because of this we will conclude this chapter with a reflection on the wider cultural potential of Bakhtin's concepts.

III

> We consider the creation of the polyphonic novel a huge step forward not only in the development of novelistic prose . . . but also in the development of the *artistic thinking* of humankind. It seems to us that one could speak directly of a special *polyphonic artistic thinking* extending beyond the bounds of the novel as genre.
>
> (Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 270)

What Bakhtin seems to be arguing for, at least implicitly, is a more artistic, truly dialogic relationship to the world. In Dostoevsky he found the seeds of that vision, and I have argued that Anderson debated a similar reading of reality in his stories. But beyond the hermetic world of purely aesthetic accomplishment, what links imagined human relations to a social world? I believe how one answers this question has profound meaning, not only for understanding what literatures can do, how they are created in cultural dialogue, but also for the ways in which individuals and cultures create intertextual realities based on a reading of otherness. Bakhtin states his view of the relationship quite clearly in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. He writes:

> Thus Dostoevsky portrayed not the life of an idea in an isolated consciousness, and not the interrelationship of ideas, but the interaction of consciousness in the sphere of ideas (but not of ideas only). And since a consciousness in Dostoevsky's world is presented not on the path of its own evolution and growth, that is, not historically, but rather *alongside* other consciousnesses, it

> cannot concentrate on itself and its own idea, on the immanent logical development of that idea, instead, it is pulled into interaction with other consciousnesses. In Dostoevsky, consciousness never gravitates toward itself but is always found in intense relationships with another consciousness. Every experience, every thought of a character is internally dialogic, adorned with polemic, filled with struggle, or is on the contrary open to inspiration from outside itself . . . it is accompanied by a continual sideways glance at another person. (32)

Thought itself is "a *rejoinder* in an unfinalized dialogue" and the characters are defined by "independence, internal freedom, unfinalizability, and indeterminacy of the hero" (32/63). Bakhtin's Dostoevsky then is an artist who exists in radical openness to the other—whether that be dialogue or argument with another character, or an internal polyphony of potential other selves. The key words which define a dialogically open path are "interaction" and "relationship." In Bakhtin's reading of Dostoevsky both thoughts and individuals are put at risk, interrogated, through an intertextual "struggle," an "intense" involvement with the dialogue of the other. Long before terms such as intertextuality or contextuality became popularized in critical circles, Bakhtin was exploring the interpenetration of consciousnesses which is both influence and tradition.

But what do Bakhtin's insights mean to the artists we are studying, to the ways in which we conceive of literary influence narrowly defined and to cultural consciousness generally? This chapter, I hope, has shown how a dialogic artistic position can be transmitted from one artist to another, and become a reality in the lives and thoughts of characters in that later writer's work. Once, Sherwood Anderson had written that Chekhov and Turgenev had "managed to give free play to feeling but always, also, to let mind come in and more or less control. Dostoevsky perhaps went rather the other road I have been inclined to take" (*Selected Letters* 188). For Anderson, as Dostoevsky, the single "isolated consciousness" was an aberration, a grotesque, identity was to be achieved only "alongside other consciousnesses." The goal was to portray not the "interrelationship of ideas" controlled by mind or intellect but to reveal the "interaction of consciousnesses" as expressed by internal "polemic, filled with struggle" and "open to inspiration from outside. . . ." In the best of his stories, Anderson transcribes an American literary experience which is consistent with the new "artistic thinking" which Bakhtin found in Dostoevsky's pages. Whether or not

writers as different as James and Cather can be said to have been directly influenced by Dostoevsky's polyphonic novels (and I don't think they were at any profound level), one can still argue that the relationship of these American writers to a Russian tradition has in fact been dialogic, that they did listen with an intense openness to the foreign voices which they could translate into their own tongues. That has been the point of the preceding three chapters of this study. The more intense the dialogue--in Bakhtin's terms the more intense the "sideways glance" directed toward the "other"--the more fraught this glance is with potential projections, re-figurations, misreadings, and political tensions, the more interesting and finally important that cultural dialogue will be. The intense debate which has gone on between Russian and American writers since at least the mid-point of the nineteenth century is one of those critical dialogues, an ongoing cultural argument, without a single dominant voice, which has moved in advance of, and often explained, the emerging political and social relations between Russia and America. Bakhtin, and writers such as Dostoevsky and Anderson tell us that *polyphonic artistic thinking* is not just limited to the artists mentioned, or restricted by "the bounds of the novel as genre," but is a way of perceiving the world, an ongoing condition of individuals and cultures, which signifies a healthy if difficult openness to reality itself. The other choice, they tell us, is retreat into a narrowed chamber, the place of the grotesque. Anderson, James and Cather, amongst many others, in their responses to the Russians, have helped to consciously unlock the doors of that room.

CONCLUSION

The Dark Mirror

Final Reflections on Russian and American Literary Culture

> . . . the barrier between ourselves and the Russia of the present day is not merely linguistic or literary. It is a matter of witness being borne about a culture . . . which is from our point of view almost unbelievably strange, a culture which we can only begin to understand by a constant effort of the imagination.
>
> (Robert Conquest, "Solzhenitsyn in the British Media")

In the autumn of 1917 the first events of the Russian Revolution began transforming the political and social relations of the largest country on earth, and within a few months there came an official end to W.W. I. For Western culture, at least, these events mark an historical watershed. From this time on, both the political and cultural relations between America and Russia take on new dimensions, become much more complex. Out of this historical moment, both countries emerge as world powers, by the 1940s at the latest, the era of the Cold War dominates the images one culture has of the other. In a realigned world where political dominance and cultural hegemony are key terms, Russia becomes even more than in previous times the dark "other" of America's own cultural self-definition--a vast and mysterious land into which can be projected America's deepest cultural fears about itself. A social mythology of opposition and ideological difference grows up and is supported by the respective political and economic structures of each country.

[1] For a Russia which becomes the dark "other" of American cultural self-definition see E. P. Thompson, *The Heavy Dancers*: "[American] anti-communism is necessary, less because Communism exists, than because there is an internal need within the ideology to define the approved national image against the boundary of an antagonist" (40), and also Robert Dallek, "How We See the Soviets" in *Shared Destiny Fifty Years of Soviet American Relations* (ed. Garrison and Gleason), who observes that "for most Americans the international scene has been a remote, ill-defined sphere onto which they projected foreign policies expressing unresolved internal tensions or relieving tormenting domestic concerns" (84), and quotes George F Kennan to prove his point. "The record of American foreign policy toward the Soviet Union over the six-and-a-half decades of the existence of that body politic gives the impression that it was not really the nature of any external problem that concerned us but rather something we were anxious to prove to ourselves, about ourselves" (84). Dallek concludes, "As

The writers we have studied in previous chapters--James, Cather, and Anderson--all grew into literary maturity prior to 1917, their sensibilities shaped by a world which had not yet experienced global revolution and world war, and an intensified cultural antithesis based on projected national destinies.

After these American writers, though, come many others as intensely fascinated by a Russian otherness as their literary forebears and living in a time when the dialogue, now consciously textured with political ideology, becomes if anything even more important. The final pages of this study will briefly examine those other American writers who came into maturity after 1917 and continued the dialogue with Russian literary culture. A brief conclusion will attempt to place this literary dialogue in its social and political context.

I

> . . . you could live in the other wonderful world the Russian writers were giving you. At first there were the Russians; then there were all the others. But for a long time there were the Russians.
>
> (Ernest Hemingway, *A Moveable Feast*)

During the early 1920s in Paris, when Ernest Hemingway was forging the remarkable prose style that would soon bring him to world prominence, no literature was more important to him than that created by the nineteenth-century Russian masters. His critical writings, his memoirs and letters, even his novels, are full of commentary on those writers--Chekhov, Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky--who created what he called a "new world of writing" which "was like having a great treasure given to you" (*Feast* 134). In *A Moveable Feast* Hemingway describes Chekhov as "an articulate and knowing physician" whose stories were like clear "water" (133), and in this brief analysis we are given the twin coordinates of Hemingway's own craft.

Kennan suggests, an impulse to project deep-seated feelings about ourselves has been in large part at the core of American dealings with Russia" (86).

absolute knowledge of the body of one's materials, literature as deeply internalized, transformed experience, and style which is fluid and slips through the trap of determinate meaning. In his best stories Chekhov presents emotional reality through indirection and silence–an approach which directly prefigures Hemingway's concept of the thing left out, the idea of the story as "ice-berg" (*Death in the Afternoon* 192) in which the majority of its significance lies beneath the level of consciousness. On a directly thematic level, the tensions which exist in Chekhov's art between the human ideal and the mundane, often disgusting realities of human mouvation are also echoed in Hemingway's stories. And Hemingway, like every other serious writer in the teens and twenties, could not have escaped the influence of Chekhov's atmospheric, or zero sum, endings in which the reader is taken beyond the final sentence on the last page into an area of blankness where he is forced to interpret character and dramatic significance for himself. Hemingway, in stories such as "A Clean, Well-Lighted Place" and "Big Two-Hearted River," learned from Chekhov about writing which moves beyond its own beginning and conclusion, stories which defer a final telling, creating an absence which is the content of another story yet to be told.

Hemingway felt the power of Dostoevsky, but could not easily explain its sources. He remembered the weight and excess of Dostoevsky's prose, its ability to recreate the "insanity of gambling," "wickedness," "frailty," "saintliness," and "madness" (*Feast* 133), and he asked Ezra Pound's "opinion on a man [Dostoevsky] who almost never used the *mot juste* and yet had made his people come alive at times, as almost no one else did" (134). But Hemingway's response to Dostoevsky was not primarily based on style but on the creation of character in relation to society. Dostoevsky pointed the way to the underground man of the twentieth century–the alienated man who could no longer locate any clear image of himself within the vortex of the crowd, he recorded that character's attempts to somehow remain a human being in the face of a world which would reduce him to the level of the machine. Hemingway's protagonists, too, struggle under the weight of a dying culture, he took from Dostoevsky a theme in modern society but there the similarity ends. Although both writers were painfully aware of the forms and codes which make it possible for a man to go on living in a decadent society, Dostoevsky's characters are always driven beyond social

codes consciously seeking humiliation, failure, redemption, while Hemingway's male protagonists defend against the underground of the self through adoption of codes of manliness. This may be one reason why Hemingway is so out of fashion in this time, while Dostoevsky's reputation continues to grow.

Hemingway, the existential pragmatist, was always suspicious of the vast philosophical underpinnings of Tolstoy's art, but in at least two respects he may have learned more from him than from any other Russian writer, with the exception of Ivan Turgenev. Those two things were: an awareness of how the Russian described and made real the subject of war, and a feeling for terrain and landscape which is in all Tolstoy's work. In his memoir *Green Hills of Africa*, Hemingway remembers "reading a story called 'The Cossacks' that was very good. In it were the summer heat, the mosquitoes, the feel of the forest in the different seasons, and that river that the Tartars crossed, raiding, and I was living in that Russia again" (108). Tolstoy's prose made Hemingway feel as if he were living inside Russia, and this ability to situate character in a landscape which comes alive, standing for itself and at the same time illuminating human consciousness, was the one ability by which he measured all writers.

In the same memoir Hemingway reflects on the "irreplaceable" importance of the experience of war to a writer. He describes himself reading from Tolstoy's *Sevastopol Sketches* as he rests beneath a tree during the heat of the day:

> a very young book and had one fine description of fighting in it, where the French take the redoubt and I thought about Tolstoi and about what a great advantage an experience of war was to a writer. It was one of the major subjects and certainly one of the hardest to write truly of and those writers who had not seen it were always very jealous and tried to make it seem unimportant, or abnormal, or a disease as a subject, while, really, it was just something quite irreplaceable that they had missed. (69-70)

War was also to be Hemingway's subject--the event against which a man could measure the full extent of himself, purchasing self-knowledge which could be gained in no other way.

But of all the nineteenth-century Russian writers, there was one who held Hemingway's critical attention first and longest. That writer was Ivan Turgenev, undoubtedly the single most important figure in the introduction of Russian literature to the Western world generally, and America specifically. If

Chekhov was a craftsman and an "amateur writer," and Tolstoi was a "prophet" then Turgenev was, in Hemingway's opinion, "the artist," the "greatest writer there ever was" (*Selected Letters* 179). Hemingway took from Turgenev a very different education than had Henry James a generation earlier, but the effects on his writing were no less pronounced. And like James, Hemingway's first real introduction to Turgenev came in the moveable feast which was Paris. The young Hemingway had left the United States in 1921 in search of a European education--literary and cultural--and he remembered that from the day he had discovered Sylvia Beach's Paris bookstore in December, 1921, he "had read all of Turgenev" (*Feast* 133), and the first book he borrowed from *Shakespeare and Co.* was *A Sportsman's Notebook*, taking the two volume translation by Constance Garnett.

Thus began a remarkable literary apprenticeship. between 1925-29, Hemingway checked out the *Notebook* on four separate occasions, often keeping the story collection for months at a time. No single author turns up more often on Hemingway's library cards than Turgenev, nearly a fifth of all the books he borrowed from *Shakespeare and Co.* are Turgenev titles. Reflecting back on that early time, a period when Hemingway was just beginning to measure himself against world standards in literature, he remembers in *Green Hills of Africa* "thinking how real that Russia of the time of our Civil War was . . . of how, through Turgenieff, I knew that I had lived there. . ." (108). Much later in *A Moveable Feast* he speaks of how in Turgenev "you knew the landscape and the roads" (133)--a significant comment from a writer whose own aesthetic concern was always to relate landscape and terrain to the shifting moods of the human psyche. Hemingway was clearly fascinated with Turgenev's ability to create natural settings which stand as "objective correlatives" for the inner terrain of his characters. This was the same problem Hemingway was attempting to solve in his own early stories. For both writers, the solution was linked to a kind of stylistic projection, the projection of human emotion into and through a landscape.

I have attempted elsewhere to explore Turgenev's specific literary influence on Hemingway.[2] It is logical, in tracing the form of that influence, to begin where Hemingway did, with *A Sportsman's*

[2] See my study, *Hemingway and Turgenev. The Nature of Literary Influence*. UMI Research Press, 1986.

Notebook. These stories foreshadow much of what Hemingway would do in his own short fiction seventy years later. one witnesses the same concern for, and love of, landscape and terrain, the same exactness and subtlety of natural description to evoke complex emotional states, the same empathy for simple people who have not entirely lost connection with place, and finally, the same pathos connected with a simpler, more integrated past, the projected desire for a recovered pastoral existence. Turgenev's influence came first and lasted longest but from each of the Russians, Hemingway took something different. from Turgenev a stance in relation to nature, from Chekhov the use of precision and silence, and from Dostoevsky and Tolstoy the prophetic vision which works itself out in the subjects of war and man's alienation from self and society.

Hemingway is perhaps the single post-W.W. I American writer who most clearly came under the spell of the Russians, but there were many others. Thomas Wolfe, Theodore Dreiser, William Faulkner and Carson McCullers all took something from Russian literature, and that was, in the first analysis, an intimation of the kind of achievement which was possible for the writers of a young national literature without centuries of tradition behind it. One does not wish to over-determine the pattern of influence which extends from Russian literature to specific American writers, it was one national literature amongst several others--French, English, German--against which American writers measured themselves from the mid-nineteenth century on. Thomas Wolfe for example read widely in Russian, French, and English literature, but it is difficult not to see Dostoevsky's *Brothers Karamazov* in the conception of Wolfe's own Gant family, a family ruled by blood ties and an explosive mixture of sensual desire and spiritual hunger. The southern American cultural tradition seems particularly close to the patriarchal and hierarchical social reality of nineteenth-century Russia, both cultures aware of great forces gathering beneath a dying way of life. An entire book has been written, in French, detailing correspondences which exist between Faulkner and Dostoevsky[3], and there are undeniable similarities between the two writers. both were oddly conservative in a purely political sense, and *avant garde* in terms of style and form. While Dostoevsky continued to believe in a manifest destiny for a spiritual and religious Russia, was a Slavophile and an anti-Westerner

[3] See Jean Weisgerber, *Faulkner et Dostoievski. confluence et influence*. Presses Universitaires Bruxelles, 1968.

in intellectual viewpoint, Faulkner was the cruel elegist of the passing of Southern aristocracy, its ideals and forms, and its replacement by a new class of carpetbaggers without values beyond the assertion of power. Even Faulkner's negroes are reminiscent of Dostoevsky's Russian folk, figures in a more coherent world which leads along the route back toward pastoral–but both writers knew that the pastoral retreat was a false dream Perhaps because of this, in both artists there is much cruelty and violence, an exploration of the psychic underground which explodes through the veneer of corrupt culture. At a slightly later date Carson McCullers devoted an article to mapping the social realities out of which nineteenth-century Russian literature and modern Southern writing emerged. "Modern Southern writing seems . . . most indebted to Russian literature, to be the progeny of the Russian realists," she wrote in 1941 (Brewster 216). In McCullers' view Southern writers such as Faulkner and Taylor Caldwell write out of a social vision which has much in common with the conditions of nineteenth-century Russia. physical life is tenuous, violence erupts easily and without restraint, both societies possess rigid class structure and endemic poverty. McCullers suggests that these similar social conditions directly influenced what novelists could write about. These insights do suggest a cultural mirroring which is reflected in the similar styles and thematics of Dostoevsky and Faulkner. But even McCullers is forced to admit that the prophetic insight and philosophical depth of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky lead to artistic territory where Southern writers have not yet been able to follow, and her admission that the Southern realism of cruelty is based on incomprehension and spiritual inconsistency, could not take us further from the cruelty of Dostoevsky's prose which is based on profound examination of social corruption. In fact, cruelty and violence as corollaries of social corruption and personal alienation, are the elements which link Faulkner most closely to Dostoevsky's moral universe.

Critics have noticed Dostoevsky's influence as well in Theodore Dreiser's social novels, particularly *An American Tragedy*, but really, beyond superficial thematic parallels, no two writers could be further apart. Dreiser a chronicler of social determinism and literary naturalism, whose view of human nature is finally rather mechanical and heavy-handed, and whose style is realistically adequate to the kind of social

reportage he favours, and Dostoevsky who details the radical freedom of the human spirit, from its lowest depths in violence and degradation to its heights in experiential otherness, whose style is the reverse of mechanical, its rhythms and sudden turns the perfect counterpart of a psychic underground which he was first to explore. The Dreiser/Dostoevsky connection is an example of superficial similarity which masks a more profound difference in literary and philosophical approach.

What the last few pages should make apparent is the impact that Dostoevsky has had on American writers particularly in the period between the two wars. His late flowering is not really very surprising. Turgenev's greatest influence came at a time when nineteenth-century American writers were seeking to move beyond the provincialism of their roots, this artist's artist provided many of them with a more elegant and flexible aesthetic. The cult of Tolstoy came later, his moral and social views bound up with a burgeoning republic's need to identify its own national destiny. Of the great Russian writers of the nineteenth century, Dostoevsky was the last to gain a serious readership in America. His insights into the alienation of the underground man, and into cultural exhaustion, were at first too cruel, too painful, for American writers to see any clear reflection of their own social experience. The events of the first world war, the unleashing of a violence and cruelty on a scale which few men could have imagined up to this time, had the effect of a cruel education on many American artists. Social cataclysm was re-figured as personal experience, catastrophe was driven underground and experienced in the human psyche in a way which made Dostoevsky's earlier prophetic novels understandable for the first time. Post-War American writers finally began to give up a *naiveté* about their own isolated national experience, the dark otherness of Dostoevsky's world was no longer foreign territory but provided an image of modern experience which was potentially both Russian and American. The widespread introduction, too, of Freudian psychology after W W I, provided Americans with a language of the self, decentered and ruled by underground passions, which explained at least some of the apparent chaos in Dostoevsky's great novels. Until this time the vocabulary of human experience had not caught up with Dostoevsky's polyphonic vision.

II

> "Contact between the peoples of our two huge countries [United States and Russia] is absolutely essential."
>
> (Solzhenitsyn, *Washington Post*, April 2, 1974)

American fascination with Russian otherness has continued in both literary and political senses since W.W. II. A simplified dialectic of the Cold War, the figuration of Russia as the rejected "other" of American destiny, has begun in the decade of the 1980s, and now 90s, to give way to public professions of a new political era of *glasnost* or openness, and one trusts as an observer of the two super-powers that at least some of the rhetoric has a basis in changing cultural realities.

Perhaps the single most fascinating crossover between literature and politics since W.W. II was the removal of Alexander Solzhenitsyn in 1974 from the Soviet Union first to Europe and then to America. Solzhenitsyn's life long battle with Soviet ideology has been detailed subtly in a series of great novels, most notably *The First Circle* and *Cancer Ward* and more graphically in historical works such as the *Gulag Archipelago* and his memoirs *The Oak and the Calf*. When Solzhenitsyn finally left his homeland, his departure was initially treated as a great propaganda coup by the Western world. Here after all was Russia's greatest writer no longer welcome in his own country--certainly an unavoidable symbol of a Russian otherness which rejected freedom both artistic and political. And by extension, the West was the possessor of those freedoms which the Soviet Union lacked. Conservative American Republicans, in particular, were anxious to use Solzhenitsyn's immense moral authority to drive home the threat of Soviet world dominance, its direct challenge to enlightened principles of Western democracy. A controversial portion of the 1976 Republican national platform read. "We recognize and commend that great beacon of human courage and morality, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, for his compelling message that we must face the world with no illusions about the nature of tyranny. Ours will be a foreign policy that keeps this ever in mind" (Dunlop 36). As John Dunlop has written. "Solzhenitsyn's expulsion from the USSR came at a critical point in modern

American political life . . Solzhenitsyn arrived in the West at a time when a demoralized and somewhat volatile America was groping around for a proper response to a perceived 'Soviet threat'" (26).

Because of his symbolic value in a larger political dialectic of identity and otherness between East and West, Solzhenitsyn was welcomed with open arms by the West. In the first days after his arrival in Germany only Solzhenitsyn's immense self-possession and private nature saved him from becoming a Russian bear in a Western cage on view for the fascinated gaze of the democratic world. The mood of the time was triumphant, a large fragment of the Russian "genius" had become Western property. But then Solzhenitsyn began to do what so many great artists have done in the past, and with similar results. He began to think for himself and speak his mind, habits which have always been viewed as questionable by political regimes whatever their ideology. This departure from the Western desire to package Solzhenitsyn as a Russian martyr welcomed into the soft arms of American democracy, happy in his free ability to express his genius, at first baffled Western observers, writers, intellectuals and political observers. Evidently Solzhenitsyn was not as thankful as he might have been for his sanctuary in the West, he was not so easily packaged as a literary symbol within a dominant Western political hegemony.

The Russian questioned the very basis of the democracy which had *saved* him. At first it was an ancient Slavophilism--that the West had sunk deep into a decadent materialism which had destroyed its will if not its soul--with which Solzhenitsyn flayed the West. Later he informed the West, in writings such as "Letter to the Soviet Leaders" and "A World Split Apart," that the preferred form of government, at least in Russia, was neither democratic nor communist but a benevolent authoritarianism (*East and West* 134).[4] The West, he wrote, was suffering from "a decline in courage" (44), a moral paralysis brought on by rampant materialism, and unfettered pursuit of personal desire and freedom. Against what he called a disastrous "humanistic autonomy" (64), Solzhenitsyn argued for a spiritual revaluation "so that one's life journey may become above all an experience of moral growth. to leave life a better human being than one

[4] These views are put forward in Solzhenitsyn's "Letter to the Soviet Leaders," (1973) and his Harvard Commencement Address later collected as "A World Split Apart" (1978), both included in the volume entitled *East and West*.

started it" (70). It was as if the otherness of Russia had returned from the repressed, taking the shape of an iron-willed, bearded man, and come to live as a cancer in the body of America. Solzhenitsyn's critique of the West, with America at its center, was of course intolerable to the dominant political ideology and social mythology of the United States. Before too many years had gone by he had been dismissed, particularly by liberal intellectuals, as an important world voice, and his value as Western property diminished drastically.[5]

Although Solzhenitsyn continues to live and write from his secluded property in Vermont (complete with a Russian Orthodox chapel) and by all accounts continues to be a genius, his has become a Cassandra-like voice in the American wilderness. Solzhenitsyn's career in the West is a profound example of cultural or literary otherness as it comes into conflict with the dominant structures of an information society.

At first there is fascination with the other if it can be rendered harmless and helpful to the dominant culture's own vision of itself; then there is a period of bewilderment as the projected other returns to critique the very things which the dominant culture cannot allow itself to know about itself. This is followed by a period of intellectual/political polemic, as a counter-argument and refurbished social mythology is constructed to put the other in its place; this is a time of disaffection or falling out of love. Once the debate has gone on long enough, whatever its intellectual outcome, a period of indifference or lethargy sets in; neither the public nor its information organs are fascinated by the "other" any longer. The voice of the other, along with its potential to outrage and to change minds, begins to disappear as it is incorporated into a vast cultural indifference, which itself is a function of mass information society.

The defusing or packaging of Solzhenitsyn in the West is a cautionary tale for all those who ponder the relationship between political ideology and the artistic imagination. In this instance Solzhenitsyn's ideas have been dismissed in ways which are different, but no less effective, than the Soviet model of repression

[5] The American writer, Tom Wolfe, describes the willed indifference of the liberal press to Solzhenitsyn in a 1976 *Harpers* article. He writes: "Solzhenitsyn's tour of the United States last year [1975] was like an enormous funeral procession that no one wanted to see. The White House wanted no part of him. The *New York Times* sought to bury his two major speeches.... And the literary world in general ignored him completely" (34).

for artists and writers. In one respect the Western version may be even more insidious than the Soviet. A writer such as Solzhenitsyn is allowed a physical freedom to express himself within a culture programmed to be indifferent. His American tale leads one to believe there is more than one type of Gulag in the world.

III

"For now we see through a glass darkly. . . ."

(Corinthians 13:12)

Since the writing of this study began, the political world has changed dramatically and with it the relations which exist between Russia and America. Mikhail Gorbachev, just a few years ago a hero in the Soviet Union, and a hugely respected figure in the West, began a revolution which moved beyond his own vision of social *perestroika* and within months made him a casualty of historical change he himself had initiated.[6] Following a failed military coup in the late summer of 1991, the world is witnessing not only a social revolution in Russia, but also the first stages of the dismantling of the Soviet Empire. Only a short while earlier, Soviets and Americans were gazing at each other uneasily over the Persian Gulf and unrest in the Baltic Republics, two super-powers intent, even in an era of *glasnost*, in viewing the *other* as a dark projection of its own cultural definition, its own fate and intentions. Now, the very concept of a Soviet Union has begun to recede into history as the remaining national republics attempt to relegitimate themselves within a loose commonwealth. The future of Mikhail Gorbachev, of Russia under its current President, Boris Yeltsin, and of the many other former Soviet Republics which are awash in a rising tide of nationalism and independence movements--all of these things are unclear. With vast historical change

[6] Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union as a political entity through the autumn of 1991, Mikhail Gorbachev resigned as President of the USSR on Christmas day. In his resignation speech, he indicated his desire to play a role in the continuing process of *perestroika* within the commonwealth, to argue for economic and political cooperation between both the Russian and non-Russian republics.

comes, too, a shift in the historical narrative which has bound Russia and America together in a prolonged gaze of mutual fascination, each gaining a sense of its own cultural "identity" in relation to the perceived "otherness" of its opposite. The cultural projections and re-figurations which have characterized national self-images in both countries have entered into a new phase, both more complex and intense than in the past.

The story, as James, and Cather, and Anderson each prove in their response to Russian literature and culture, is not yet finished. Influence, whether social or literary, as Valéry so passionately argued five decades ago is "the progressive modification of one mind by the work of another. . . . that *what a man does* either repeats or refutes *what someone else has done*--repeats it in other tones, refines or amplifies or simplifies it, but thereby assumes it and has invisibly used it" (Valéry 187-88). The question of influence or contextuality can be looked at through many different theoretical windows. Whether in Bakhtin's dialogic imagination on a cultural level, or Bloom's intertextuality of will, desire and imagination, de Man's linguistic displacement and figuration, one symbol locating itself and making meaning against the absence left by another, or Said's political otherness, a cultural desire for priority projected onto the absence which is the other--we hear the sound of many unmerged voices, all with their own absolute rights to exist and mean, none ever reaching a final truth or signification, and all depending on each other to create linguistic and cultural space within which each can exist. And within this space, each signified reality is the momentary crystallization of an infinity of past traces linguistic and cultural, a vast fabric of deferrals which themselves open a potential space for new meaning. Literary or cultural influence are the critical terms we use when we attempt to capture intellectually the sound of these voices.

If Bakhtin were alive today to witness the current polyphony, some would say cacophony, on a world level, he would almost certainly say that the voice of the other -cultures, women, third world people, poets, and artists--has not yet been fully heard, or listened to, has continued in fact to be treated as a means to power and not an end in itself.

Even the most self-aware of literary artists do not entirely escape the psychic power relations which

are part of the necessary metalepsis of literary forebears. What one sees, though, in James and Cather and Anderson, and others in their relation to the Russians, is a more complex and finally positive figuration of the "other" than has been seen in any purely political realm. At the same time that these Americans have misread and transumed the work of their Russian forebears, entering into the psychic maelstrom of influence, as have we all, they have also been aware that in their very rejections and swervings, evasions and misreadings, were the seeds of a more powerful literary expression which grew out of the foreign soil, the "otherness" of Russian literature and culture. In the dark mirror into which they gazed as they looked at the Russians, these writers did not turn away in disgust or fear, but embraced in the "other" a potential image of themselves. Theirs is a lesson which should not be ignored, politically or aesthetically, as we move into the last decade of the twentieth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Texts

Fiction: American Writers

a.) Sherwood Anderson

The Teller's Tales. Sel. and Introd. Frank Gado. Schenectedy, New York. Union College Press, 1983.

Winesburg, Ohio (1919). Introd. Malcolm Cowley. New York: Viking, 1960.

b.) Willa Cather

O Pioneers!. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913.

A Lost Lady. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1923.

The Professor's House. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925.

Death Comes For the Archbishop. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927.

c.) William Dean Howells

Annie Kilburn (1888). New York: Harper, 1891.

The Minister's Charge (1886). Boston: Ticknor, 1887.

d.) Henry James

The Portrait of A Lady (1881). Afterword Oscar Cargill. New York. New American Library, 1963.

The Princess Casamassima (1886). Ed. & introd. Derek Brewer. Harmondsworth, England. Penguin, 1986.

Fiction: Russian Writers

a.) Fyodor Dostoevsky

Crime and Punishment (1866). Trans. Constance Garnett. New York: Bantam, 1981.

Notes from Underground, The Double (1864, 1846). Trans. & introd. Jessie Coulson. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1972.

b.) Leo Tolstoy

Great Short Works of Leo Tolstoy. Trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude. New York. Harper and Row, 1967.

Stories and Legends. Introd. Dorothy Canfield Fisher. Trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude. New York. Pantheon Books, n.d.

What Is Art? (1896). Trans. Aylmer Maude. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1960.

c.) Ivan Turgenev

A Sportsman's Notebook (1852). Trans. Charles and Natasha Hepburn. London. Cresset, 1950.

First Love. Trans. Isabel F. Hapgood. New York: Scribner's, 1904.

On the Eve (1860). Trans. Isobel F. Hapgood. New York: Scribner's, 1904.

Virgin Soil (1877). Trans. Rochelle S. Townsend. London: Dent, 1963.

II. Theoretical Works: Influence/Reception/History/Aesthetics

Altieri, Charles. "The Hermeneutics of Literary Indeterminacy. A Dissent From the New Orthodoxy." *New Literary History* 10 (1978): 71-99.

Archibald, Douglas N. "Yeats's Encounters. Observations on Literary Influence and Literary History." *New Literary History* 3 Spring 1970: 439-69.

Attridge, Derek, Geoff Bennington and Robert Young, eds. *Poststructuralism and the Question of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space*. Trans. Maria Jolas. Boston. The Beacon Press, 1969.

Bakhtin, M. M. *The Dialogical Imagination* Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin. U of Texas P, 1981.

---. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Intro. Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis. U of Minnesota P, 1984.

Barthes, Roland. "Historical Discourse." *Structuralism A Reader*. Ed. Michael Lane. London. Jonathan Cape, 1970. 145-55.

Bate, Walter Jackson. *The Burden of the Past and the English Poet*. Harvard. Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations*. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York. Schocken, 1969. Particularly, "The Story Teller," "Theses on the Philosophy of History," and "The Task of the Translator."

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence. A Theory of Poetry*. New York. Oxford, 1973.

---. *The Breaking of the Vessels*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982.

---. *Kaballah and Criticism*. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.

---. *A Map of Misreading*. New York: Oxford, 1975.

Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant Garde*. Trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis. U of Minnesota P, 1984.

Carroll, David. "Freud and the Myth of Origins." *New Literary History* 6 (1975). 511-28.

Coates, Paul. *The Double and the Other. Identity and Ideology in Post-Romantic Fiction*. London. MacMillan, 1988.

Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction. Theory and Criticism Since Structuralism*. Ithaca, New York. Cornell UP, 1982.

de Certeau, Michel. *Heterologies. Discourse on the Other*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis. U of Minnesota P, 1986.

de Man, Paul. *Allegories of Reading. Figural Language in Rousseau, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Proust*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.

---. *Blindness and Insight. Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism*. Second Edition, revised. Introd. Wlad Godzich. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1983. Contains "The Rhetoric of Temporality": 187-228, and a "Review of Harold Bloom's Anxiety of Influence'. 267-76.

--. "Introduction." *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception*, by Hans Robert Jauss. Minneapolis. U of Minnesota P, 1982.

Derrida, Jacques. *Positions*. Paris. Minuit, 1972. English trans.. Chicago. U of Chicago P, 1981.

---. *L'Ecriture et la Difference* Paris. Seuil, 1967. English trans. *Writing and Difference*. Trans. with introd. Alan Bass. Chicago U of Chicago P, 1978. Especially "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences": 278-293.

Eliot, T.S. "Reflections on Contemporary Poetry." *Egoist* VI (July 1919): 15-17.

---. *Selected Essays. 1917-1932* [New Edition]. New York. Harcourt, Brace & World, 1950. Includes "Tradition and the Individual Talent". 3-11, "The Function of Criticism". 12-22, and "Religion and Literature": 343-54.

Emerson, Ralph Waldo. "Shakespeare, Or, the Poet." *Representative Men*. London. Ward, Lock & Bowden, 1883.

---. "Quotation and Originality." *The Portable Emerson*. Selected and intro Mark Van Doren. New York. Viking, 1946. 284-303.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Press, 1972.

---. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. New York. Cornell UP, 1977. Particularly, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History". 139-64.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "On the Origins of Philosophical Hermeneutics." *Philosophical Apprenticeships*. Trans. Robert R. Sullivan. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1977. 177-93.

---. *Truth and Method. Fundamentals of a Philosophical Hermeneutics*. No trans. New York. Seabury Press, 1975.

Hume, David. *Essays. Moral, Political and Literary*. Philosophical Works. vol III. Eds. Thomas Hill Green and Thomas Hodge Grose. Rprt. London edition 1882. Scientia Verlag Aalen, 1964.

Jameson, Fredric. "On Interpretation Literature as a Socially Symbolic Act". (17-102) and 'Conclusion. The Dialectic of Utopia and Ideology". (281-99). Both in *The Political Unconscious. Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1981.

---. "Marxism and Historicism." *New Literary History* 11 (1979): 41-73.

---. "Regarding Postmodernism - A Conversation with Fredric Jameson." Anders Stephanson. *Social Text* 17 (1987): 29-54.

Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward An Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis. U of Minnesota P, 1982. Contains "Literary History As Challenge to Literary Theory". 3-45, and "History of Art and Pragmatic History": 46-75.

Kermode, Frank. *The Classic. Literature, Images of Permanence and Change*. New York. Viking, 1975.

---. "Modern Poetry and Tradition." *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 14 (1965). 5-15.

Kolodny, Annette. *The Lay of the Land. Metaphor As Experience and History in American Life and Letters*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1975

Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language.* (1974). Trans. Margaret Waller. New York. Columbia UP, 1984.

Lacan, Jacques. *Ecrits. A Selection.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York. Norton, 1977.

Lentricchia, Frank. *After the New Criticism.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois *The Post Modern Condition.* Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Foreword by Fredric Jameson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984.

---. "The Sign of History" *Post-Structuralism and the Question of History.* Eds. Derrick Attridge, Geoff Bennington and Robert Young. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987: 162-80.

Miller, J Hillis *The Ethics of Reading Kant, De Man, Eliot, Trollope, James and Benjamin.* New York. Columbia UP, 1987.

---. "The Search For Grounds in Literary Study." *Rhetoric and Form Deconstruction at Yale.* Eds. Robert Con-Davis and Ronald Schleifer. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1985: 19-36.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil.* Trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York. Vintage Books, 1966.

---. "The Genealogy of Morals." *The Birth of Tragedy and The Genealogy of Morals.* Trans. Francis Golffing. New York: Doubleday, 1956. 147-299.

---. "On the Uses and Disadvantages of History For Life." *Untimely Meditations.* Trans. R.J. Hollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983. 57-123

Rorty, Richard. *Consequences of Pragmatism. Essays, 1972-80.* Minneapolis. U of Minnesota P, 1982. Particularly "Introduction. Pragmatism and Philosophy". XIII-XLVII, and "Nineteenth-Century Idealism and Twentieth Century Textualism": 139-59.

---. "Freud, Morality, Hermeneutics." *New Literary History* 12 (1980). 177-86.

---. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.

Rowe, John Carlos. *Through the Custom-House. Nineteenth-Century American Fiction and Modern Theory.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1982.

---. "'To Live Outside the Law, You Must Be Honest'. The Authority of the Margin in Contemporary Theory." *Cultural Critique* 2 (1985-86): 35-68.

Said, Edward. "Intellectuals in the Post-Colonial World." *Salmagundi* 70-71 (1986). 44-64.

---. *Orientalism.* New York: Pantheon, 1978.

---. "Orientalism Reconsidered." *Cultural Critique* 1 (Fall 1985): 89-107.

---. "The Problem of Textuality. Two Exemplary Positions." *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1978) 673-714.

Sale, Roger. *Literary Inheritance.* Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1984.

Thompson, E.P. *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays.* London: Merlin, 1978.

Tompkins, Jane, ed. *Reader Response Criticism.* Baltimore. Johns Hopkins UP, 1980. Particularly Tompkins' "The Reader in History: The Changing Shape of Literary Response": 201-32.

Valéry, Paul. *Oeuvres Choisies.* Lausanne. Abbaye du Livre, 1947. Particularly "Lettre Sur Mallarmé". 136-201.

Wellek, René, and Austin. Warren. *Theory of Literature.* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1956.

Wellek, René. "The Concept of Evolution in Literary History." *In Concepts of Criticism.* New Haven. Yale UP, 1963.

White, Hayden. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Baltimore. Johns Hopkins UP, 1973.

Gender and Literary Influence

Abel, Elizabeth. "(E)merging Identities. The Dynamics of Female Friendship in Contemporary Fiction by Women." *Signs* 6.3 (Spring 1981): 413-35.

Chodorow, Nancy. *The Reproduction of Mothering. Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender.* Berkeley. U of California P, 1978.

Dinnerstein, Dorothy. *The Mermaid and the Minotaur. . . Sexual Arrangements and the Human Malaise.* New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

Erkkila, Betsy. "Dickinson and Rich. Toward A Theory of Female Poetic Influence." *American Literature* 56.4 (December 1984): 541-59.

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic. The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth Century Literary Imagination.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.

Hirsch, Marianne. "Mothers and Daughters." *Signs* 7.1 (Autumn 1981): 200-22.

Kolodny, Annette. *The Land Before Her. Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers, 1630-1860.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1984.

. "Reply to Commentaries. Women Writers, Literary Historians, and Martian Readers." *New Literary History* 11 (1980): 587-92.

Ortner, Sherry. "Is Female to Male As Nature is to Culture?" *Women, Culture, and Society.* Eds. Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1984. 67-87.

Showalter, Elaine. "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." *Critical Inquiry* 8.2 (Winter 1981). 179-205.

III. Cultural History/Criticism/Literature: Russia and America

Anschel, Eugene. *The American Image of Russia. 1775-1917.* New York. Ungar, 1974.

Babey, Anna. *Americans in Russia: 1776-1917.* New York, 1938.

Bailey, Thomas A. *America Faces Russia Russian-American Relations from Early Times to Our Day.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell UP, 1950.

Bercovich, Sacvan, Ed. *Reconstructing American Literary History.* Cambridge. Harvard UP, 1986.

Berlin, Isaiah. *Russian Thinkers.* New York: Viking Press, 1978.

---. *The Hedgehog and the Fox. Tolstoy's View of History.* New York. Simon and Schuster, 1953.

Beveridge, Albert J. *The Russian Advance.* New York: Harper & Bros., 1903.

Billington, James H *The Icon and the Axe. An Interpretive History of Russian Culture.* New York. Knopf, 1966.

Bolkhovitinov, N. N. *The Beginnings of Russian American Relations.1775-1815.* Trans. Elena Levin. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1975.

Boyesen, H. H. "A Visit to Tourgueneff." *Galaxy* 17 (1874): 456-66.

Brewster, Dorothy. *East-West Passage. A Study in Literary Relationships.* London. George Allen & Unwin, 1954.

---. "The Russian Soul: An English Literary Pattern." *American Scholar* 17 (1948).

Brewster, Dorothy and Angus Burrell. *Dead Reckonings in Fiction.* New York, 1924. Rprt. Books for Library Press, 1969.

Carr, Edward H. *The Romantic Exiles.* London. Gollancz, 1933. Boston. Beacon Press, 1961.

Chase, Richard. *The American Novel and Its Tradition.* Garden City, New York. Doubleday, 1957.

Chekhov, Anton. *Five Major Plays.* Trans. and introd. Ronald Hingley. New York. Oxford, 1977.

---. *The Kiss and Other Stories.* Trans. and introd. Ronald Wilks. Harmondsworth. Penguin, 1982.

---. *Lady With A Lapdog and Other Stories.* Trans. and introd. David Magarshack. Harmondsworth. Penguin, 1964.

Cohen, Stephen F. *Sovieticus. American Perceptions and Soviet Realities.* New York. Norton, 1986

Davie, Donald. "Turgenev in England. 1850-1950." *Studies in Russian and Polish Literature*. Ed. Zbigniew Folejewski. Mouton, 1962. 168-84.

Debreczeny, Paul and Jesse Zeldin, trans. and eds. *Literature and National Identity. Nineteenth Century Russian Critical Essays*. U of Nebraska P, 1970.

Decker, Clarence. "Victorian Comment on Russian Realism. *P.M.L.A.* June, 1937.

Dunlop, John B. "Solzhenitsyn's Reception in the United States." *Solzhenitsyn in Exile. Critical Essays and Documentary Materials*. Eds. Dunlop, Haugh and Nicholson. Stanford, California. Hoover Institute Press, 1981. 24-55. Also contains Robert Conquest, "Solzhenitsyn in the British Media.": 3-23.

Egan, Maurice Francis. *Modern Novels and Novelists*. New York: Scribner's 1888.

Fanger, Donald L. *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1965.

---. "Gogol. The Apotheosis of the Absurd." *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism*. Cambridge. Harvard UP, 1965.

Fischer, George. *Russian Liberalism. From Gentry to Intelligentsia*. Cambridge. Harvard UP, 1958.

Fodor, Alexander. "The Acceptance of Leo Tolstoy in the United States." *Research Studies* 45.2 (June 1977): 73-81.

Freud, Sigmund. "Beyond the Pleasure Principle." *Complete Psychological Works*. Vol. 18. Trans. and ed. James Strachey. London: Hogarth Press, 1955.

---. "Family Romances." *Complete Psychological Works*. Vol. 9. 237--241.

---. "The 'Uncanny'." *Collected Papers*. Vol. 4. Trans. Alix Strachey. New York, 1959. 368-407.

Fuller, Bob. "AmerRuss." *Mother Earth News*. (Winter, 1986-87): 30-41.

Garrison, Mark and Abbot Gleason, eds. *Shared Destiny. Fifty Years of Soviet American Relations*. Boston. Beacon Press, 1985.

Gettmann, Royal A. *Turgenev in England and America*. Urbana. U of Illinois P, 1941.

Gibian, George and H. W. Tjalma, eds. *Russian Modernism. Culture and the Avant Garde. 1900-1930*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1976.

Gifford, Henry. *The Hero of His Time. A Theme in Russian Literature*. London. Edward Arnold, 1950.

Gogol, Nikolai. *Dead Souls: An Authoritative Text*. New York: Norton, 1985.

---. *The Overcoat and Other Tales of Good and Evil*. Trans. and introd. David Magarshack. New York. Norton, 1965/1957.

Gorky, Maxim. *Reminiscences of Tolstoy, Chekhov, and Andreev*. London. Hogarth, 1948.

---. *New York American.* April 12, 1906: 1.

---. *The World.* April 13, 1906: 6.

Halperine-Kaminsky, E. *Tourguéneff and His French Circle.* New York: Holt, 1898.

Hecht, David. *Russian Radicals Look to America, 1825-1890.* Cambridge. Harvard UP, 1947.

Hegel, G W.F. *The Philosophy of Hegel.* Ed. with introd. Carl J. Friedrich. New York. Modern Library, 1953.

Hemingway, Ernest. *A Moveable Feast.* New York: Scribner's, 1964.

---. *Death in the Afternoon.* New York: Scribner's, 1932.

---. *Green Hills of Africa.* New York: Scribner's, 1935.

---. *Selected Letters, 1917-1961.* Ed. Carlos Baker. New York: Scribner's, 1981.

Herzen, Alexander. *My Past and Thoughts. The Memoirs of Alexander Herzen* Vol. 4. Trans. Constance Garnett. Revised Humphrey Higgens. New York: Knopf, 1968.

Hingley, Ronald. *Russian Writers and Society in the Nineteenth Century.* London. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977.

Karlinsky, Simon and Alfred Appel Jr., eds. *The Bitter Air of Exile. Russian Writers in the West, 1922-72.* Berkley: U of California P, 1977.

Kaul, A. N. *The American Vision. Actual and Ideal Society in Nineteenth Century Fiction.* New Haven. Yale UP, 1963.

Kennan, George F. *Russia and the West Under Lenin and Stalin.* New York. New American Library, 1960/61.

---. "A Visit to Count Tolstoi." *Century Magazine.* XXXIV (Oct. 1887): 329-58.

Kenner, Hugh. *The Pound Era.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1971.

Kirby, David K. *America's Hive of Honey, or Foreign Influences on American Fiction Through Henry James.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1980.

Lampert, Evgenii. *Sons Against Fathers. Studies in Russian Radicalism and Revolution.* Oxford. Clarendon, 1965.

Laserson, Max M. *The American Impact on Russia, 1784-1917.* New York, 1962.

Lawrence, D. H. *Studies in Classic American Literature.* New York. Viking, 1971 [1923].

Leon, Derrick. *Tolstoy: His Life and Work.* London: Routledge, 1944.

Lewis, R. W. B. *The American Adam. Innocence, Tragedy, and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1955.

Lowe, David. *Turgenev's Fathers and Sons.* Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1983.

McCarthy, Harold T. *The Expatriate Perspective. American Novelists and the Idea of America.* Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1974.

Martin, Jay. *Harvests of Change. American Literature, 1865-1914.* Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Marx, Leo. *The Machine in the Garden. Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America.* New York. Oxford UP, 1964.

Matthiessen, F. O. *American Renaissance.* Oxford UP, 1968.

Mirsky, D. S. *A History of Russian Literature.* New York: Knopf, 1949.

---. *Russia, A Social History.* London: Cresset, 1931.

Muchnic, Helen. *Dostoevsky's English Reputation.* New York: Octagon Books, 1969.

Mumford, Lewis. *The Brown Decades. A Study of the Arts in America 1865-1895.* 2nd ed., rev. New York. Dover, 1955.

---. *The Golden Day. A Study in American Literature and Culture.* Boston, Mass.. Beacon Press, 1957.

Nabokov, Valdimir. *Lectures on Russian Literature.* Introd. Fredson Bowers. New York. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1981.

---. *Nikolai Gogol.* New York: New Directions, 1961.

Nuhn, Ferner. *The Wind Blew From the East. A Study in the Orientation of American Culture.* Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1967 [1942].

Peterson, Dale E. *The Clement Vision. Poetic Realism in Turgenev and James.* Port Washington. Kennikat Press, 1975.

Phelps, Gilbert. *The Russian Novel in English Fiction.* New York: Rinehart, 1957.

Poggioli, Renato. "Realism in Russia." *Comparative Literature* 3 (1951): 253-67.

---. *The Phoenix and the Spider, Essays on Some Russian Writers.* Cambridge. Harvard UP, 1957.

Pritchett, V. S. *Ivan Turgenev. The Gentle Barbarian.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1978.

Rahv, Philip, ed. *Discovery of Europe. The Story of American Experience in the Old World.* Boston. Houghton-Mifflin, 1947.

Reeve, F D *The White Monk An Essay on Dostoevsky and Melville*. Nashville. Vanderbilt University Press, 1989.

Reilly, Alayne P. *America in Contemporary Soviet Literature*. New York UP, 1971.

Ripp, Victor. *Turgenev's Russia. From Notes of A Hunter to Fathers and Sons*. Ithaca. Cornell UP, 1982.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *Letters of Theodore Roosevelt*. Ed. Elting E. Morison. 8 Vol. Cambridge, Mass.. Harvard UP, 1951-54.

Ruland, Richard. *America in Modern European Literature. From Image to Metaphor*. New York. New York UP, 1976.

Seyersted, Per E. "Turgenev's Interest in America." *Scando-Slavica* 11 (1965): 25-39.

Smith, Henry Nash. *Virgin Land. The American West as Symbol and Myth*. New York. Vintage Books, 1950.

Solzhenitsyn, Alexander. *East and West*. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.

— *The Mortal Danger How Misconceptions About Russia Imperil America*. Trans. Michael Nicholson and Alexis Klimoff. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.

—. (Interview) "Solzhenitsyn: U.S. Press Misread Cali." *Washington Post*, April 2, 1974.

Steiner, George. *Tolstoy or Dostoevsky*. New York: Knopf, 1959.

Thompson, E. P. *The Heavy Dancers*. New York: Pantheon, 1985.

Tolstoy, Leo. *Anna Karenin*. Trans. Rosemary Edmonds. Harmondsworth, England. Penguin, 1954.

—. *War and Peace*. Trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude. New York. Simon & Schuster, 1942.

—. *What I Believe [1883] and A Confession [1882]*. Trans. Aylmer Maude. London. World's Classics. 1921.

—. *What Then Must We Do?* (1886). Trans. Aylmer Maude. London. Oxford UP, 1925. Revised 1935.

Turgenev, Ivan. *Fathers and Children* (1862). Trans. Isabel F. Hapgood. N.Y.. Airmont Publishing Company, 1967.

—. *Ivan Turgenev. Stories and Poems in Prose*. Trans. Olga Shartse. Moscow. Progress Publishers, 1982.

—. *Literary Reminiscences and Autobiographical Fragments*. Trans. David Magarshack. New York. Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1958.

—. *A Nobleman's Nest*. (1859). Trans. Isabel F. Hapgood. N.Y.. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

—. *Spring Freshets*. (1873). Trans. Isabel F. Hapgood. N.Y.. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

Twain, Mark. *Complete Travel Books of Mark Twain, The Early Works. Innocents Abroad and Roughing It.* Ed. Charles Neider. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.

Ulam, Adam Bruno. *Ideologies and Illusions. Revolutionary Thought From Herzen to Solzhenitsyn.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976.

Walsh, Harry. "The Tolstoyan Episode in American Thought." *American Studies* 17.1 (Spring 1976). 49-67.

Weisgerber, Jean. *Faulkner and Dostoevsky. Influence and Confluence.* Trans. from the French by Dean McWilliams. Athens, Ohio: Ohio UP, 1974.

Wellek, René. *Confrontations. Studies in the Intellectual and Literary Relations between Germany, England, and the United States During the Nineteenth Century.* Princeton UP, 1965.

-. "Introduction. Chekhov in English and American Criticism." *Chekhov. New Perspectives.* Ed. René and Nonna D. Wellek. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1984: 1-30.

—. "A Sketch of the History of Dostoevsky Criticism." *Discriminations. Further Concepts of Criticism.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1970. 304-26.

White, Ralph R. *Fearful Warriors. A Psychological Profile of U.S. - Soviet Relations.* New York. Free Press, 1984.

Whitman, Walt. *Prose Works.* New York. Putnam [Camden Edition], 1902. Comments on Russia and America: 259-61.

Williams, William Appleman. *American-Russian Relations, 1781-1947.* New York. Rinehart, 1952.

Wilson, Edmund. *To the Finland Station. A Study in the Acting and Writing of History.* New York. Doubleday, 1953.

—. *The Shock of Recognition.* New York: Random House, 1955.

- . "Turgenev and the Life-Giving Drop." *Ivan Turgenev. Literary Reminiscences and Autobiographical Fragments.* New York: Farrar-Straus, 1958. 3-64.

—. *A Window on Russia. For Use by Foreign Readers.* New York: Farrar, Giroux, 1972.

Wolfe, Tom. "The Intelligent Co-ed's Guide to America." *Harpers* (July 1976): 34.

Woodcock, George. "The Elusive Ideal. Notes on Turgenev." *Sewanee Review* 69 (1961). 34-47.

Yarmolinsky, Avrahm. *Russians Then and Now. A Selection of Russian Writing From the Seventeenth Century to Our Own Day.* New York: MacMillan, 1963.

IV. Works By and About Individual American Writers

a.) Henry James

Anderson, Quentin. *The American Henry James.* New Brunswick, N.J.. Rutgers UP, 1957.

Auchincloss, Louis. "Henry James and the Russian Novelists." *Novelists on Novelists.* Ed. Louis Kronenberger. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1962.

Banta, Martha. "Beyond Post-Modernism. The Sense of History in *The Princess Casamassima.*" *Henry James Review* 3 (Winter 1982): 96-107.

Briggs, Anthony D. "Someone Else's Sledge. Further Notes on Turgenev's *Virgin Soil* and Henry James *Princess Casamassima.*" *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 5 (1972): 52-60.

Dupee, F. W. *Henry James.* New York: William Sloane Associates, 1951.

Edel, Leon. *Henry James. The Untried Years. 1843-1870, The Conquest of London. 1870-1881, The Middle Years: 1882-1895, The Treacherous Years. 1895-1901; The Master. 1901-1916.* 5 vols. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1953-1972.

Fogel, Daniel Mark. *Henry James and the Structure of the Romantic Imagination.* Baton Rouge. Louisiana State UP, 1981.

Fowler, Virginia C. *Henry James' American Girl. The Embroidery on the Canvass.* Madison, Wisc.. U of Wisconsin P, 1984.

Hamilton, Eunice C. "Henry James' The Princess Casamassima and Ivan Turgenev's Virgin Soil." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 61 (1962): 354-64.

Holder, Alan. *Three Voyagers in Search of Europe. A Study of Henry James, Ezra Pound, and T. S. Eliot.* Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania, 1966.

James, Henry. *The American Scene.* London: Chapman and Hall, 1907.

---. *The Awkward Age* (1899). Ed. Ronald Blythe. Harmondsworth, England. Penguin, 1987.

---. *The American Scene.* New York: Scribner's, 1907.

---. *A Small Boy and Others.* London: Macmillan, 1913.

—. *The House of Fiction. Essays on the Novel by Henry James.* Ed. Leon Edel. London. Rupert Hart-Davis, 1957. Contains the essay "Turgenev and Tolstoy."

—. *Introduction to The Novels and Tales of Ivan Turgenieff.* Trans. Isabel Hapgood. Vol. 1 (*Memoirs of A Sportsman*). New York, 1903.

---. "Ivan Turgenef's New Novel." *Nation* 24 (1877). 252-53. Reprinted as "Ivan Turgenev's 'Virgin Soil'" in *Literary Reviews and Essays on American, English, and French Literature*. Ed. Albert Mordell. N.Y.: Vista House, 1957. 190-96.

---. "Ivan Turgenieff." *Atlantic Monthly* 53.315 (January, 1884). 42-55. Reprinted in *Partial Portraits*. London: MacMillan, 1899. 289-323.

---. "Ivan Turgenieff (1818-1883)." *Library of the World's Best Literature*. Vol. 25. New York, 1897.

---. "Ivan Turgeniew." *North American Review* 118 (1874). 326-56. Reprinted in *French Poets and Novelists*. London: MacMillan, 1878. 269-320.

---. *Letters to A.C. Benson and August Monod*. N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930.

---. *The Letters of Henry James*. Ed. Percy Lubbock. New York: 1920.

---. "Preface." *The Portrait of A Lady*. Riverside Edition. Ed. & introd. Leon Edel. Boston. Houghton-Mifflin, 1963. 3-15.

---. *Roderick Hudson* (1876). New York Edition. Vol. 1. N.Y.. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

---. *What Maisie Knew* (1897). New York Edition. Vol. XI. N.Y.. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

Kelley, Cornelia P. *The Early Development of Henry James*. Urbana. U of Illinois P, 1930.

Lerner, Daniel. "The Influence of Turgenev on Henry James." *Slavonic Yearbook* 20 (1941). 28-54.

Long, Robert Emmet. "James's Roderick Hudson. The End of the Apprenticeship – Hawthorne and Turgenev." *American Literature* 48 (1976-77): 312-26.

Matthiessen, F. O. *Henry James: The Major Phase*. London: Oxford UP, 1944.

---. *The James Family*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947.

Pacey, Desmond. "Henry James and His French Contemporaries." *American Literature* 13 (1941). 240-56.

Rowe, John Carlos. *Theoretical Dimensions of Henry James*. Madison. U of Wisconsin P, 1984.

Selzer, Mark. "The Princess Casamassima. Realism and the Fantasy of Surveillance." *American Realism. New Essays*. Ed. Eric Sundquist. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1982.

Tilley, W. H. *The Background of 'The Princess Casamassima.'* Miami. U of Florida Monographs, 1960.

Trilling, Lionel. "Reality in America". (3-23) and "*The Princess Casamassima*". (58-92). *The Liberal Imagination: Essays on Literature and Society*. New York: Doubleday, 1953.

Wasiolek, Edward. "Tolstoy's The Death of Ivan Illych and Jamesian Fictional Imperatives." *Modern Fiction Studies* 6 (Winter 1960): 314-24.

Wegelin, Christof. *The Image of Europe in Henry James*. Dallas. Southern Methodist UP, 1958.

b.) The Atlantic Monthly Group (Howells, Perry, Schuyler)

i) William Dean Howells

Cady, Edwin H., ed. *William Dean Howells As Critic*. London. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973.

Howells, Mildred, ed. *Life in Letters of William Dean Howells*. Garden City, New York. Doubleday, 1928.

Howells, William Dean. *A Foregone Conclusion*. Boston. James R. Osgood & Co., 1875

---. "In Honour of Tolstoy." *Critic* 30 (October, 1898).

---. *My Literary Passions*. New York: Harper, 1891.

Kirk, Clara Marburg. *W. D. Howells and Art in His Time*. New Brunswick, N.J.. Rutgers UP, 1965.

Kirk, Rudolph and Clara. *William Dean Howells*. New York. Grosset & Dunlop, 1962.

Lynn, Kenneth S. *William Dean Howells. An American Life*. N.Y.. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1970.

ii) Thomas Sergeant Perry

Harlow, Virginia. *Thomas Sergeant Perry. A Biography, And Letters to Perry From William, Henry, and Garth Wilkinson James*. Durham, N.C.: Duke UP, 1950.

Perry, T. S. *Evolution of the Snob*. New York, 1887.

---. "Ivan Turgenieff." *Atlantic* 33 (1874): 565-75.

---. "Ivan Turgenieff." *Nation* 12 (1871): 340-41.

---. "Julian Schmidt: A German Critic." *Atlantic* 34 (1876): 279-87.

iii) Eugene Schuyler

Schuyler, Eugene. *Memoir and Essays*. New York: Scribner's, 1901.

c.) Willa Cather

Bardin, John Franklin. "Turgenev and Cather." *New Leader Literary Section* 31 (11 September 1948). 10.

Bogan, Louise. "American-Classic." *Willa Cather and Her Critics*. Ed. James M. Schroeter. Ithaca. Cornell UP, 1967. 126-33.

Cather, Willa. *Alexander's Bridge* (1912). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1912.

---. *Collected Short Fiction, 1892-1912*. Ed. Virginia Faulkner. Intro. Mildred R. Bennett. Lincoln. U of Nebraska P, 1970.

---. Interview. Flora Merrill. *New York World* 25 April 1925.

---. *The Kingdom of Art. Willa Cather's First Principles and Critical Statements, 1893-1896*. Ed. Bernice Slote. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1966.

---. Letter to H. L. Mencken. 6 Feb. 1922. Enoch Pratt Library, Baltimore.

---. Letter to Mr. Miller. 24 Oct. 1924. Newberry Library, Chicago.

---. *My Antonia* (1918). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1954.

---. "Nebraska: The End of the First Cycle." *The Nation* 117 (1923): 236-38.

---. *Not Under Forty*. New York: Knopf, 1936.

---. "On the Novel" [Radio Speech, 1933]. In Bohlke, *Willa Cather In Person*: 170-71.

---. *On Writing. Critical Studies on Writing as an Art*. New York. Knopf, 1949. Contains "The Novel Démeublé". 35-43, "My First Novels". 91-97, "On the Art of Fiction". 101-04, and "Light on Adobe Walls": 123-26.

---. *The Song of the Lark* (1915). Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.

---. *Willa Cather In Person Interviews, Speeches and Letters*. Ed. L. Brent Bohlke. Lincoln. U of Nebraska P, 1986.

---. *The World and the Parish. Willa Cather's Articles and Reviews, 1893-1902*. Ed. William M. Curtin. 2 vols. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1970.

---. *Youth and the Bright Medusa*. New York: Knopf, 1920.

Daiches, David. *Willa Cather: A Critical Introduction*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1971.

Fryer, Judith. "Cather's Felicitous Space." *Prairie Schooner* 55 (Spring/Summer 1981): 185-98.

Gelfant, Blanche H. "The Forgotten Reaping-Hook. Sex in My Antonia." *Critical Essays on Willa Cather.* Ed. John J. Murphy. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1984. 147-64.

Keeler, Clinton "Narrative Without Accent. Willa Cather and Puvis de Chavannes." *Critical Essays in Willa Cather.* Ed. John J. Murphy. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1984. 251-65.

Lewis, Edith. *Willa Cather Living.* New York: Knopf, 1953.

—. Middleton, Jo Ann *Willa Cather's Modernism A Study of Technique and Style.* London. Associated UP, 1990.

Moers, Ellen. *Literary Women. The Great Writers.* Garden City, N.Y. Doubleday, 1977.

Moorhead, Elizabeth. *These Two Were Here. Louise Homer and Willa Cather.* Pittsburgh. U of Pittsburgh P, 1950.

Morrow, Nancy. "Willa Cather's *A Lost Lady* and the Nineteenth- Century Novel of Adultery." *Women s Studies* 11 (1984): 287-303.

Murphy, John J., ed. *Critical Essays on Willa Cather.* Boston: G. K. Hall, 1984.

— *Five Essays on Willa Cather The Merrimack Symposium.* North Andover, Mass.. Merrimack College, 1974.

O'Brien, Sharon. *Willa Cather: The Emerging Voice.* New York: Oxford UP, 1987.

Schneider, Lucy. "Artistry and Intuition. Willa Cather's 'Land Philosophy'." *South Dakota Review* 6. IV (1968): 53-64.

—. "Willa Cather's Early Stories in the Light of Her Land Philosophy." *Midwest Quarterly* 9 (1967). 75-93.

Schroeter, James, ed. *Willa Cather and Her Critics.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1967.

Stouck, David. "*O Pioneers!*. Willa Cather and the Epic Imagination." *Prairie Schooner* 46 (1972). 23-33.

—. *Willa Cather's Imagination.* Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1975.

—. "Willa Cather and *The Professor's House.* 'Letting Go With the Heart'." *Western American Literature* 7 (1972): 13-24.

—. "Willa Cather and the Russians." *Cather Studies 1.* Ed. Susan J. Rosowski. Lincoln. U of Nebraska P, 1990.

Woodress, James. *Willa Cather. Her Life and Art.* New York. Western Publishing Co., 1970.

Yongue, Patricia Lee. "*A Lost Lady.* The End of the First Cycle." *Western American Literature* 7 (1972). 3-12.

a.) Sherwood Anderson

Anderson, David. *Critical Essays on Sherwood Anderson.* Boston: G. K. Hall, 1981.

Anderson, Sherwood. *A Story Teller's Story.* New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1924.

---. *Letters of Sherwood Anderson.* Ed. Howard Mumford Jones and Walter B. Rideout. Boston. Little, Brown, 1953.

---. *Sherwood Anderson's Love Letters to Eleanor Copenhaver.* Ed Charles E. Modlin. Athens. U of Georgia P, 1989.

---. *Sherwood Anderson's Memoirs.* Ed. Paul Rosenfeld. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1942.

---. *Sherwood Anderson. Selected Letters.* Ed. Charles E. Modlin. Knoxville. U of Tennessee P, 1984

---. *The "Writer's Book" by Sherwood Anderson. A Critical Edition.* Ed. Martha Mulroy Curry. Metcuchen, N. J.: Scarecrow Press, 1975.

Cowley, Malcolm. "Introduction" to *Winesburg, Ohio.* New York: Viking, 1960 1-15.

Crowley, John W., ed. *New Essays on Winesburg, Ohio.* New York. Cambridge UP, 1990. Contains Crowley's "Introduction". 1-26, and Marcia Jacobson's "*Winesburg, Ohio* and the Autobiographical Moment": 53-72.

Campbell, Hilbert H., and Charles E. Modlin, eds. *Sherwood Anderson. Centennial Studies.* Troy, N.Y. Whitson Publishing Co., 1976.

Duffey, Bernard. *Chicago Renaissance in American Letters.* East Lansing. Michigan State College Press, 1954.

Ferres, John H., ed. *Winesburg, Ohio. Text and Criticism.* New York: Viking, 1977.

Fussell Edwin. "*Winesburg, Ohio.* Art and Isolation." *Modern Fiction Studies* 6 (Summer 1960). 106-114.

Gado, Frank. "Introduction." *The Teller's Tales.* Schenectedy, N.Y.. Union College Press, 1983. 1-20.

Greasley, Philip. Myth and the Midwestern Landscape. Sherwood Anderson's Mid-American Chants." *Critical essays on Sherwood Anderson.* Ed. David Anderson. Boston. G. K. Hall, 1981. 210-16.

Howe, Irving. *Sherwood Anderson.* New York. William Sloane Assoc., 1951. Particularly "The Book of the Grotesque": 91-109.

Ingram, Forrest L. "American Short Story Cycles. Foreign Influences And Parallels." *Proceedings of the Comparative Literature Symposium V. Modern American Fiction, Insights and Foreign Lights.* Ed. Wolodymyn T Zyla and Wendell M. Aycock Lubbock: Texas Tech U. 19-37.

Jones, Howard Mumford. "Introduction." *Letters of Sherwood Anderson.* Ed. Jones and Rideout. Boston. Little, Brown, 1953.

Phillips, William L. "How Sherwood Anderson Wrote *Winesburg, Ohio.*" In *The Achievement of Sherwood Anderson.* Ed. Ray Louis White. Chapel Hill, 1966. pp 62-85.

Rideout, Walter B. *Sherwood Anderson. A Collection of Critical Essays.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, 1974.

---. "The Simplicity of *Wineburg, Ohio.*" *Shenandoah* 13 (Spring 1962): 20-31.

Stouck, David "Sherwood Anderson and the Postmodern Novel." *Contemporary Literature* 26 (Fall 1985). 302-16.

---. "*Winesburg, Ohio* and the Failure of Art." *Twentieth Century Literature* 15 (October 1969). 145-51.

---. "*Winesburg, Ohio* As A Dance of Death." *American Literature* 48 (January 1977). 525-42.

Stewart, Maaja. "Scepticism and Belief in Chekhov and Anderson." *Studies in Short Fiction* 9 (Winter 1972): 29-40.

Sutton, William A. *The Road to Winesburg A Mosaic of the Imaginative Life of Sherwood Anderson.* Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, 1972.

Trilling, Lionel. "Sherwood Anderson." *The Liberal Imagination.* New York, 1950. 22-33.

White, Ray Lewis, ed. *The Achievement of Sherwood Anderson Essays in Criticism.* Chapel Hill. U of North Carolina P, 1966.