

the concluding portion of his novel on events which took place when seven eighths of the work had already been composed and published. Some critics have seen in this a definite failing and believe that the last Book of *Anna Karenina* marks the triumph of the reformer and pamphleteer over the artist.

I think not. The most stringent test of the aliveness of an imagined character—of its mysterious acquisition of a life of its own outside the book or play in which it has been created and far exceeding the mortality of its creator—is whether or not it can grow with time and preserve its coherent individuality in an altered setting. Place Odysseus in Dante's *Inferno* or in Joyce's Dublin and he is Odysseus still, though barnacled from his long voyage through those imaginings and remembrances of civilization which we call myths. How a writer imparts this germ of life to his personages is a mystery; but it is clear that Vronsky and Levin possess it. They live with the times and beyond them.

Vronsky's departure is a gesture of some heroism and abnegation; but Tolstoy's view of the Russo-Turkish War is such that Vronsky's action strikes us as yet another surrender to impulses which are, at bottom, frivolous. This surrender underscores the principal tragedy in the novel. To Levin the war is one of those irritants which exasperate his mind to self-scrutiny. It compels him to make articulate his rejection of prevailing moral codes and prepares him for Tolstoyan Christianity.

Thus, Book VIII of *Anna Karenina*, with its unpremeditated polemic and its tractarian intent, is not an accretion adhering clumsily to the main structure of the novel. It expands and clarifies that structure. The characters respond to the new atmosphere as they would to a change of circumstances in "real life." There are many mansions in a Tolstoyan edifice and in them the novelist and the preacher are equally present. This is possible solely because Tolstoy builds in sovereign disregard of the more formal canons of design. He does not aim at the kind of radical symmetry which we find wonderfully carried through in James's *Am-bassadors* or at the self-enclosedness of *Madame Bovary*, in which either addition or retrenchment would be a mutilation. There could well be a Book IX in *Anna Karenina*, recounting Vronsky's search for martial expiation or the beginnings of Levin's new life. Indeed, *A Confession*, on which Tolstoy began work in the fall of 1878, takes up precisely where *Anna Karenina* ends. Or would it be more accurate to say, where it breaks off?

GEORGE CIBIAN

Two Kinds of Human Understanding and the Narrator's Voice in *Anna Karenina*[†]

Several apparently inconsistent or even contradictory features in *Anna Karenina* strike our attention. On one hand, there are many manifestations of what we might group as activities of reason and will. Tolstoj uses many expressions indicating logical relationships. Conjunctions expressive of causal connections and listings are common. There are abundant references to characters who "understand" something. They also often exert their wills; they plan, they intend. Anna toward the end watches experience by a "bright light", a traditional image for understanding; in a related strand of images, her life is compared to a candle.

On the other hand, however, there is an abundance of passages pointing in the opposite direction: characters who rely, fruitfully, on intuitive or instinctual perceptions; human beings unable to exert their wills; actions done involuntarily or even counter to characters' plans. The truest, most significant actions are sometimes arrived at irrationally. Turning points hinge on the sudden, immediate, unexpected, not on the rational or the willed.

It is the thesis of this article that the presence of these two groups of elements in *Anna Karenina* is connected with Tolstoj's central concern in the novel—his preoccupation with the relationship between reason and unreason; that the interplay between these two principles and his attitude towards them constitute the keys to an understanding of Tolstoj's view of the human condition in general and Anna's and Vronsky's predicament in particular; and that by an examination of the ways in which Tolstoj presented the antitheses of clarity vs. non-clarity, and the verbal and logical versus the non-intellectual and intuitive roads towards understanding, we may come to grips with Tolstoj's basic categories in the book.

Some of the features which will engage our attention are not unique to *Anna Karenina*. Rather they are typical of Tolstoj's outlook and manner of writing in general. Others, however, are either more pronounced in *Anna Karenina* than in his other works, or present only in this work. We shall not examine all of them equally thoroughly, wishing merely to note, not explore, some of them. This essay chiefly proposes to look for a connection between them and in brief, to try to examine one of those "inkings" (*scéplenie*) of which Tolstoj himself spoke and to which he wanted his critics to pay attention:

[†] Reprinted from Dietrich Gerhardt, ed., *Ortho Scripturae: Dmitrii Tschizewski zum 70. Geburtstag* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1966), pp. 315-22 by permission of the author.

In everything, almost everything, that I have written, I was guided by the need to gather together interrelated thoughts in order to express myself, but every thought expressed separately by words loses its meaning and is terribly degraded by being taken out by itself from that linking in which it is found. The linking itself is brought about not by thought (I think), but by something else, and to express the basis of that linking immediately in words is in no way possible; it can only be done indirectly by describing with words, images, acts, situations . . .

... We need people who would show the senselessness of seeking out separate ideas in a work of art and would continually guide readers in that endless labyrinth of linkings which the essence of art consists of, and to the laws which serve as basis for that linking

We shall not, then, be exploring the important topics which for the most part have preoccupied critics and scholars writing about Tolstoj—such subjects as Tolstoj's manner of interweaving the two main plots of the novel, of Vronskij-Anna and of Levin-Kitty; the problem of his attitude towards Anna's destruction and the relevance of the epigraph "Vengeance is mine, I shall repay"; the divisions of the carefully elaborated and defined social worlds of the book, the country-city sphere, the various levels of social life in the two capital cities; the tragic course of the development of Anna and of her and Vronskij's love. Instead, we shall develop our topic by considering seven features of *Anna Karenina* which may be related to a basic and hitherto insufficiently recognized quality of Tolstoj's artistic procedure.

1. The language of *Anna Karenina* is rich in syntactical structures suggesting that human experience can be arranged clearly and precisely, sorted out, and neatly ordered, like a classical French garden. There are many conjunctions of causal connection. *Potomu čto* is especially common. We find various series—lists of one, two, three; divisions into sub-categories. The readers of Tolstoj are often struck by what is usually referred to as the clarity of his style. Comments have been made on the directness, plainness of his narrative style, which we may call transparent. The world of *Anna Karenina* is not really one of order and causality, but now we must note the intensity of the appearance of order and intelligibility which the novel gives, at least superficially, and observe one group of causes for this impression: the profusion of conjunctions, series, signposts—*nesmotrija na čto, xotja, tak kak, ne potomu—no potomu, potomu*.

2. Related to the first point is the appearance of the word "understand" (*poniat'*) which is not merely frequent but emphatic: "Vronskij, understanding that she is in one of her good moods" . . . or "Vronskij understood that Goleniščev chose some kind of a liberal high-minded activity, and therefore (*potomu*) . . . resisted . . ." (In the two or three pages following, "understood" appears several more times.) This frequent

cropping up of the word "understand" may seem to go still further towards giving the impression of a clear, graspable world, of life as an experience which people can master, divide, analyze, arrange. However, we must be careful. Here we also encounter evidence directly contrary to our argument thus far. *Poniat'* appears often in the negative form—*ne poniat'*. Thus it also works in a manner contrary to what we have described thus far. The many places where the novel says of someone he or she "did not understand", "could not understand", build an impression of human ignorance, of the world's being beyond man's easy grasp.

3. The theme of understanding and not understanding life is connected by Tolstoj with the image of the "bright light". Anna is being driven in a light carriage, on the last day of her life, in her mad, agonized race. She finds fault with everyone she sees. We might say she projects her mood onto her surroundings. Looking at strangers, she thinks: "Count Vronskij and I also did not find that joy (*udovol'stvie*), although we expected much from it", and then "for the first time she turned that bright light, by which she saw everything, on her relations with him, which she had until then avoided thinking about."

A few lines later Tolstoj repeats his allusion to the light. "That [her thoughts] was no supposition; she saw it clearly, by that penetrating light which now revealed the meaning of life and human relations to her."

To speak of intellectual understanding in terms of a light is one of the oldest, traditional similes. Yet Tolstoj is not using the image in this manner. Anna's bright light does not stand for clear understanding—far from it. If we allowed a stock response to the image, derived from its usage in other contexts in our past reading, to steer us towards applying it to Anna, we should be in serious error. Anna's bright light is the light of her disappointment, resentment, desire to avenge herself, to make Vronskij pay for imagined slights, to make him feel sorry for Anna and to repent. It is the same *distorting* light by which she now judges everyone whom she encounters to be hateful, repulsive, unhappy. Its dazzling brightness blinds instead of revealing. Its clarity is one of special selection, distortion. It is intense but misleading and keeps out the pleasant, positive sides of life. This is made further clear through a second, related image which Tolstoj uses. About to drop on her knees on the rails, Anna experiences a feeling similar to the sensation familiar to her from having prepared herself to walk into water. "She crossed herself. The customary gesture of the sign of the cross called forth in her a whole series of girlish, childish recollections, and suddenly the darkness which was covering everything for her tore apart, and life stood before her for a moment in all its past, bright joys." It is now that *true* light illuminates her life for her. Tolstoj continues in the next sentence: "But she did not take her eyes off the wheels of the next car which was approaching." Anna commits suicide despite her momentary lucid vision; her deed follows out of the earlier, negative light.

Even when Tolstoj's characters feel they are seeing exceptionally clearly, Anna's illusory (and destructive) light shows, they may be deluded. For as our next category illustrates, more frequently than the opposite, Tolstoj's characters suffer self-deception and frustration of will.

4. Tolstoj's characters often do things which they did not want to do—as if they were doing them against their will. They plan and “intend”, but then the reader finds them (and they find themselves) doing or saying or feeling something quite different from what they meant to. Or they say and do things unconsciously. As a result, frequently they are surprised by themselves, by what others do, by what life does. They are shown as not being in control. What they feel, even when it is happiness, may be “not at all what he [Levin] had expected”. Levin, visiting his dying brother Nikolai, “expected” many things, “but he found something quite different”. Some of the central events in the novel are of this kind. Vronskij is going to accept a post in Taskent after his suicide attempt; all between him and Anna is finished, if one is to trust what his mind tells him. Tolstoj describes his decision and plans in detail. But then, in a passage narrated by Tolstoj concisely, and hence all the more strikingly (through the breakneck speed with which it takes place as well as the speed with which it is reported by the novel's narrator, it acquires a sharp cutting power of unexpectedness), it is sufficient for Vronskij to visit Anna—ostensibly to say goodbye, for him to change his mind. The two lovers throw everything over and leave together for Europe. Sudden impulse (based on passion) easily, immediately conquers a rational decision of long standing.

A very characteristic passage illustrates our point both in Kitty's inability to live up to her plan of being “coldly-venomous”, as well as in the very characteristic, beautifully (and most clearly) analyzed mental turmoil in Levin's mind:

‘You are having a gay time . . .’ she started, wishing to be calmly-venomous. But hardly had she opened her mouth when words of reproach of a senseless jealousy, of all that had tormented her in those half hours, which she had spent motionlessly sitting in the window, burst out of her. Only now, for the first time, did he clearly understand that which he had not understood, when, after the wedding, he had led her out of the church. He understood that she was not only close to him, but that he did not know where she ended and where he began. He understood (*ponjal*) it through that tormenting feeling of doubling (*razdvoenija*) which he felt in that moment. In the first moment he was hurt, but at the same moment he felt that he cannot be hurt by her, that she is himself. He experienced in the first moment a feeling similar to that which a man experiences when, having received a sudden, strong blow from the back, he turns around with indignation and the wish for revenge to find the guilty person, and discovers that it was he himself who

had unwittingly hurt himself, that there is no one at whom to be angry, and that he must endure and calm his pain.

In the turning point of the book, ch. 25 of Part II, we watch the life of Anna and Vronskij together at the moment when they begin to veer away from the hitherto increasing passion, away from the ascending line of movement of the two lovers towards ever greater love, and begin to move downwards, in a descending line. It is the beginning of Anna's personal deterioration: her dissatisfaction, restlessness, growing jealousy, then frenzy, and ultimately death. It is the defeat of “what ought to have happened”, if one calculated from a rational consideration of factors involved and from personal emotions—a defeat by “things-as-they-are”, by the irrational.

Still another example of the crossing of purposes had been realized by Anna somewhat earlier:

‘I unavoidably caused the unhappiness of that man [Karenin]’, she thought, ‘but I do not want to take advantage of that unhappiness. I also suffer and shall suffer. I am doing without that which I cherished more than anything else. I am giving up my honest name and my son. I acted badly and therefore (*potomu*) do not want happiness. I do not want a divorce and I shall suffer shame and separation from my son’. But no matter how sincerely Anna wanted to suffer, she did not suffer. There was no shame . . . Even the separation from her son, whom she loved, did not torment her during the first period.

There are examples of characters beginning to do one thing, and then doing another instead:

“Instead of going into the drawing room, in which he could hear voices, he stopped on the terrace, leaning on the railing, and looked up at the sky.”

Or: “He [Vronskij] wanted to say that he had not slept all night and that he felt asleep, but looking at her [Anna's] excited and happy face, he felt ashamed. So he told her that he had had to go to make a report about the departure of the prince.”

Extraordinarily often, characters do something unconsciously (*bessoznatel'no*). In her meeting with Levin, against her better judgment, Anna *bessoznatel'no* tries to stir up his love for her. The passage describing this is particularly important in illustrating Tolstoj's manner. It begins with an extraordinarily clearly structured sentence. There are three concessive phrases beginning with *xotja*. The very distinct articulation gives the impression of experience mastered, ordered. But this rational chain of links in fact states something contrary to man's rational control. It underscores the power over man of his non-rational side. Despite the three reasons to the contrary, “Anna stopped thinking about him as soon as he left the room”.

5. Sometimes Tolstoj does present his characters performing rational acts, or exerting their wills and succeeding in these efforts, but in such a way as to suggest that this amounts to hypocrisy or self-deception. He depicts them thus only to condemn the characters and to show their sterility. Karenin, for instance, has the ability to make himself forget what he wants to forget, to feel what he wants to feel, but this is presented by Tolstoj as evil, as a lie, as the unfeeling hypocrisy of a cold fish.

Sergej Ivanyc, who has devoted all his life to duty, "is not so much unable to fall in love, as rather lacking in that weakness which is needed to fall in love". This "lack of a weakness" is a serious flaw. It reveals the inability to pass the limits of the confinement by the rational. Sergej Ivanyc is not complete. (But let us not forget, also, that Anna, on the other hand, has too much of the ability to fall in love—and ends destroyed.)

To lack some weak spot, like Sergej Ivanyc, to stress too much control by one's will and reason—like Karenin; to extrapolate confidently and arrogantly an assured expectation of the future from one's ideas of past events—all these are shown by Tolstoj to be snares and weaknesses.

6. *Anna Karenina* is unusually full of passages in which one character looks at another and can "tell" (usually Tolstoj uses the word for "read") the mood and intention of that person, merely from the look, from the expression. It is a rapid, immediate grasp of something from the total Gestalt of the person listened to and looked at. The novel says explicitly at times that the person doing the "reading" did not listen to the words, but "read" what he did in something else. People thus often communicate through "looking at each other"—*pereglyadyvavutsja*. This is presented by Tolstoj as a subtle communication superior to the intellectual. It is an intuitive, non-verbal, non-analytic process. Kitty's mother referred to it when Kitty asked her how her father had proposed. The mother replied:

"You think you invented something new? It is always done in the same way—it was settled by the eyes, by smiles."

"But what words did he say?"

"What words did Kostja say to you?" her mother answered.

(Kosťa, we know, had written in chalk the initial letters of the words in a long sentence which Kitty was able to decipher with almost supernatural intuitive clairvoyance.)

In particular the children in Tolstoj's works have the sensitivity to read a great deal from one glance. Serjoža looks at his teacher and does not hear what he is saying, yet knows the teacher is saying something that he does not really think.

Anna, in her turn, during her clandestine visit to her son, understands Serjoža's unspoken words with extraordinary acuity: she knows that when Serjoža says "He will not come soon", he is really asking her what he ought to think of his father. Kitty and Levin, as one would expect, enjoy

almost perfect non-verbal communication. Kitty understands complex attitudes in Levin, and Levin "unconsciously" invites her to tell the causes for her distrust. In many places in Part VI, ch. 3, only a small part of what is being said is expressed in words spoken by the characters. It appears, then, from what we have looked at thus far that the novel stresses on one hand the clarity and rationality; and on the other, the mysteries of life and the importance of the non-rational.

What is the relationship between the various ways in which Tolstoj conveys to us his characters' failures in the rational sphere and their great sensitivities in intuitive perceptions and also creates a sense of simplicity and order?

The key to an answer is in the need to distinguish carefully between the characters' experiences and the voice of the narrator. Life is a mystery to the characters. It is they who try to understand and fail, who exert their wills inefficaciously, vainly, and who, also, on the other hand, perceive without verbalization, who expect to be happy because all indicates they ought to be—yet find they are not happy, who want to suffer and do not, who fail to fall in love, or who fall in love disastrously and perish. Life is dark to them. The best they can do is to understand life intuitively, in the particular as well as in the unity of existence—to cut through complexities with flashes of immediate insight. At worst, they are inhuman: rigid, emotionally and morally crippled. They move on a darkling plain, equipped with the uncertain, delusive light of reason, as well as with the second light—more trustworthy, but intermittent and sometimes even destructive—of immediate feeling and intuition. The latter can lead to excessive passion and then becomes "terrible", fraught with fight and awe, because of the trembling depths which it touches. (Tolstoj emphasizes the terror and awe which Anne feels in the first stages of her love for Vronskij. Anne's central quality, her excess of vivacity (*bezozhlyemost'*), here comes into play.)

Whence the sense of clarity and order in the novel, then? They are the narrator's. He is the only one exempt from the blind man's buff played by the characters. The characters do not comprehend what they are doing; he does. He understands both the realms of reason and non-reason. It is he who constructs triple concessive constructions; he tells us the rich complexities of what one glance signified to another character. Experiences too complex for the intellect of the character are simple to the author. The veil of confusion is lifted for him.

The following passage illustrates the subtle modulation from the characters' vision to the narrator's at the phrase "the meaning of which was: (*! smysl kotorogo byl takov*)":

At this meeting, Vronskij grasped (*ponjal*) that Golensicëv chose some kind of high minded liberal activity and as a result wanted to despise the activity and position of Vronskij. Therefore (*poëtomu*)

Vronskij in his meeting with Golienšev gave him that cold and proud resistance which he knew how to give to people and the meaning of which was: You may like or you may not like my way of life, but it is all the same to me. You must respect me if you want to be acquainted with me. Golienšev was contemptuously indifferent to Vronskij's tone. This meeting, it would have seemed, should have split them still more. But now they brightened and exclaimed with joy upon recognizing each other. Vronskij did not at all expect that he would be so glad to see Golienšev, but probably he did not himself realize (*ne zna*) how bored he had been. He forgot his unpleasant impression at his last meeting and with an open, joyful face reached out his hand to his former colleague.

What is complex and dark is written about by Tolstoj's narrator as if it were neatly laid out, easy, under a glass. He, the narrator, sees clearly, directly; his is the transparent style. He is not on level with his own characters, but like a God, high up, watching from a superior vantage point. It is Tolstoj's basic structural device of the contrast between the narrator's perception and manner of speaking and the characters' which is responsible for the doubleness of effect of the novel—its rational-clear, and non-rational, intuitive elements. It underscores them, and it unifies and links them.

The distinctions between these two poles, the narrator's and the characters' perceptions, and the rational and non-rational, furthermore tie in with two other features of the novel: the contrast between scenes of routine life and scenes of emergency, and with what is usually called Tolstoj's "technique of estrangement".

7. Another basic element of the structure of Anna Karenina is the alternation of scenes of normal, everyday, routine life (such ordinary scenes, for instance, as the meeting of Vronskij and Golienšev in Italy) in contrast with extraordinary events, "emergency situations". Tolstoj envisages human beings as living at their most intense in the latter scenes of emergency, when experience is violent, when they do not understand, but rather live in a mental state of turmoil. The "scenes of emergency" in which he places them fall into two categories: some might be called agonies, others ecstasies. Unusual, puzzled, disturbed, tensely involved states of mind and perception, when characters do not quite know what is going on, and feel everything has become strange and new, are present in both types of "emergency situations".

In the normal, everyday scenes, experience is familiar, even regular. In exceptional scenes, which we have called scenes of emergency, the character becomes excited. His reactions to everything are as to something strange. He is in a state of intensive response to his environment. He sees it as surprising, new to him. Examples of such emergency situations, which stand out like peaks jutting above the general level, are: Levin before his wedding; Levin during the birth of his child; the

ice skating scene, where Levin sees Kitty; the steepchase; Vronskij's suicide attempt; Anna before her suicide; Anna and Vronskij during Anna's delivery of her child.

A paragraph which illustrates Tolstoj's handling of such emergency situations is this account of Levin while Kitty was giving birth to a baby:

Suddenly Levin felt himself transported out of that mysterious, terrible, not of this world world, in which he had lived these twenty-two hours, into the former, ordinary world, which, however, now glittered with such new light of happiness that he could not endure it. The faint strings broke. Sobs and tears of joy, which he had completely failed to expect, broke out of him with such force, shaking his whole body, that for a long time they prevented him from talking.

Previously, if someone had told Levin that Kitty had died and that he had died together with her, and that their children were angels, and that God is there in front of them, he would not have been surprised by anything. But now, having returned to the world of reality, he made great mental efforts to understand that she is alive, healthy, and that the creature so desperately screeching is his son. Kitty was alive; her sufferings had ended. He was unspcakably happy. He understood that and was fully happy because of it. But the child? From where and why had he come? He could in no way understand; he could not accustom himself to that idea. It seemed something excessive, superfluous, to him, to which he would not be able to become accustomed for a long time.

Even within scenes of everyday, ordinary life, Tolstoj shows his characters, we have seen above, as stumbling, making errors, preys of involuntary, unconscious actions and impulses. Ever since the Russian formalists called attention to it, it has been customary to speak of his technique of "estrangement" or "making it strange". This is usually taken to be an artistic device intended to avoid stereotyped responses on the reader's part and to give a fresh view of reality, by treating experience as if seen in a new light. Such is indeed much of Tolstoj's writing; but the technique goes deeper than that. It is an outgrowth of Tolstoj's view of the human condition—of what we have been examining throughout this essay: his stress on the difference between "normal", routine, everyday life; and exceptional scenes, moments or periods of unusual tension; and his basic antithesis of the rational and the intuitive. The technique of "making it strange" is derived from and connected with Tolstoj's emphasis on the non-intellectualist side of life. It is a basic structural principle of the book—its artistic root as well as the main spring of what Tolstoj is saying about how people live. In various ways, the novel presents the opinion that the highest values are the irrational, instinctive, spontaneous ones; and that the negative factors in life are the intellectual

and rational. Tolstoi disapproves of self-consciousness (dramatized by Varen'ka, whose charity is flawed by being *willed* and whose love for Sergej Ivanyc is stillborn because she lacks heart and passion.) He is suggesting that no simple code, whether Vronskij's or Karenin's, can withstand the impact of actual, intense life. Reason and codes are rigid and inadequate. The proper way of living is to participate in life organically, naturally, instinctively. To Tolstoi the highest moments of life are the states of happy, unintellectual flowing along with the stream of existence, exemplified by Levin's happiness in the bodily exertion of mowing or Levin's and Kitty's "laconic, clear, almost wordless communication" and interpretation of each other's gestures and expressions "without logical subtleties and words."

Anna Karenina is a novel the central effects of which are achieved through an artistic as well as epistemological contrasting of the rational-logical and instinctive-irrational sides of human life. This has been conveyed to almost every reader of the novel; but what is most striking is how this antithesis pervades all areas of the novel, and how the nature of the narrator complicates and sometimes obscures in our minds this antithesis. The narrator himself is not subject to the limitations of the characters; he is never in the dark.

Anna Karenina is a study of human understanding: its limits, its various kinds, its potentialities. (In his *Confession*, a short time later, Tolstoi wrote: "The world is something infinite and unintelligible. Man's life is an ungraspable part of the ungraspable 'all'.") It presents the tragedy of human ignorance—the tragedy of human beings who live under given conditions, over which they enjoy only limited powers of rational analysis, comprehension, and control, and with which they may come to satisfactory terms best of all by using non-rational, intuitive means of approach.

LYDIA GINZBURG

Causal Conditionality¹

Tolstoi not only refined conditionality and made it more detailed, he also created an extremely intense variety of it—something like a magnetic field within which his characters move. Tolstoi could leave nothing as

¹ From Lydia Ginzburg, *On Psychological Prose*, trans. and ed. Judson Rosengrant (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 259–63, © 1991 by Princeton University Press. Reprinted by permission of Princeton University Press. (The original Russian version, *O psihologicheskoy proze*, was published in Leningrad in 1971.) Lydia Ginzburg (1902–1990) was the author of many important literary studies. Edward J. Brown called her "one of the most distinguished and original minds to have worked on the nature of verbal art, its processes, and its position within a particular culture."

it appeared to be, could permit nothing to remain untouched (which particularly irritated Turgenyev). Everything was continually passed through the creative mechanism of his art, which transformed, explained, and verified it. Because of the intensity of this process, the novel itself was turned into something different, something quite unlike anything that had existed before.

Unlike the writings of Dostoevskii, those of Tolstoi belong to the explanatory and conditioning branch of nineteenth-century psychologism. But conditionality in Tolstoi's hands is extraordinarily particularized, concentrated, and multivalent. The combining of contradictory elements is as a result the basic principle of connection in the Tolstolian artistic structure. Rousseau was aware in the *Confessions* of the multi-layered and simultaneous nature of spiritual experience, but that awareness was the consequence of brilliant intuition and of conjectures that were far in advance of their time. For nineteenth-century realism, that simultaneity had already become a necessary result of the multiform conditionality of the individual by means of a myriad of concurrently operative causes.

What had been merely a tendency in the pre-Tolstolian novel became a conscious principle in Tolstoi's writing; another hypostasis of Tolstolian fluidity. Fluidity presupposes process—a conditioned alternation of psychic states. Tolstoi proceeded logically from alternation to combination. He showed that it is possible for a person to be both vainly egocentric and selfless, or to be both overcome with grief and worried about the impression he is making (as is the case with Nikolen'ka Iten'ev at his mother's coffin). He showed how Nikolai Rostov both loved Dolokhov and hated him, how Natasha both loved Prince Andrei (whom she in fact never stopped loving) and felt an irresistible attraction for Anatole,¹ and how Aleksei Aleksandrovich Karenin both knew about his misfortune and did not want to know about it, how he wished to crush Anna with his contempt and was at the same time afraid of her, since he feared the pain she was capable of inflicting on him. External and internal stimuli distributed among the various levels of spiritual life and originating in the different realms of human experience operate simultaneously. Elements that are mutually exclusive from a logical point of view are shown to be compatible from a psychological one. If the personality is conceived as a soul that is always equivalent to itself alone, its contradictions can only be regarded as irrational or puzzling. Such was the romantic enigma, disturbing yet requiring no solution. But if consciousness is movement, if the individual human being is a dynamic entity that contains everything in itself—from physiological irritants to the loftiest spiritual activity—and an entity, moreover, that is capable of responding to every conceivable kind of stimulus, then

¹ Iten'ev is the hero of Tolstoi's trilogy *Youth*; the others are characters in his *War and Peace*.