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ABSTRACT

Anna Karenina Illustrated: Russian and Soviet Illustrated Editions of the Novel, 1878-1982

PhD 2013

Timothy Richard Ormond

Graduate Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Toronto

This dissertation discusses illustrations of Anna Karenina created in Russia and the USSR in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It first considers Mikhail Vrubel’s illustration from 1878 and then examines four illustrated editions published in 1914, 1933, 1953 and 1982. It accomplishes the following: it attends to the lack of attention illustration receives, generally in literary studies, but especially in Russian; it fills in a part of the history of publication practices in Russia and the USSR, as it pertained to illustration; it describes the intended audience for these works; and it offers close readings of the artists’ illustrations, thereby demonstrating the changing reception of Tolstoy’s novel over time. Vrubel’s illustration confronts the treatment of the heroine and marks the beginning of his life-long dislike for Tolstoy. The illustrations of Shcheglov, Korin and Moravov in the 1914 Sytin & Co. edition aided in reading comprehension, suggesting that the intended audience were readers who were new to Tolstoy. Since most of the illustrations were commissioned during the Soviet period, they reveal a great deal about how that regime intervened in the reception of Anna Karenina and its author. For example, Piskarev’s illustrations, aimed at American readers, show that even though Tolstoy was considered to be one of Russia’s great geniuses, there were important distinctions to be drawn between his ideas and those of the CPSU. Samokhvalov’s illustrations of 1953 also emphasize Tolstoy’s importance as a genius and try to formalize Anna Karenina’s pertinence to
some of the main tenets of communism. Vereiskii’s illustrations reveal the readership’s turn away from the Marxist view of the epic dialectic of history and turn towards the intimate sphere of the family and the household.

The broader implication of my dissertation is its hint at the rich tradition of illustration in Russia in the 20th century. It thereby takes a preliminary step into outlining the progression of this history and into describing its characteristics.
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NOTE ON ILLUSTRATIONS

I have provided a list of figures in the following section to help navigate through the large quantity of illustrations in the main body of the dissertation. I have also created an appendix for each of the four editions, wherein I outline the total quantity and specific placement of all the illustrations. The enumeration in the main body does not reflect that of the appendix. In order to clarify where an illustration is situated in the appendix, I offer a numeric code in brackets. The first Roman numeral refers to the number of the appendix and the second Arabic numeral to its location within said appendix: for example, the abbreviation for Fig. 3 is I.42 (i.e. Appendix One, item #42). These codes appear in the description of each figure.
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INTRODUCTION

If academic discourse has already taken the “pictorial turn,” then illustration ought to hold a privileged position. Few other art forms depend on such a direct connection between the verbal and the visual, and yet scholars rarely study literary illustration.

This is surprising: illustrations have accompanied novels and other prose works in most European countries and throughout most of the history of book creation. By the middle of the nineteenth century, many serially published novels included illustrations. This was especially true in England, where there were professional illustrators like George Cruikshank and Phiz, and even illustrator/authors like William Makepeace Thackeray.

Illustration’s fall from grace accounts for the lack of interest in it. Shortly after reaching its zenith in England in the Golden Age of the 1860s, its reputation started to decline. By the end

---

2 W.J.T. Mitchell suggests that a pictorial turn is occurring in response to the “linguistic turn” Richard Rorty identifies in his Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature. Rorty wants to defend “our speech” against “the visual” and to end philosophy’s obsession with the model of the image and mirror “as a figure[s] of representational transparency and realism,” which lead to “the temptation of scientism and positivism.” For Mitchell, Rorty’s suspicion of the visual and effort to end its influence is “a sure sign that the pictorial turn is taking place.” This latest turn in research does not reduce encounters between the verbal and the visual to a “single thesis,” but it recognizes that “pictures form a point of peculiar friction and discomfort across a broad range of intellectual inquiry” (Picture Theory 13).

3 There are of course notable exceptions. Moving chronologically, these works are Olga Podobedova’s On the Nature of Illustration (1967), J.R. Harvey’s Victorian Novelists and Their Illustrators (1971), Hodnett’s Image and Text (1982), J. Hillis Miller’s Illustration (1992), though dealing primarily with film adaptations of literature, Kamilla Elliott’s Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate (2003) has a lot to say about illustration. I will outline the arguments of these works below.

4 George Cruikshank (1792-1878) was a British illustrator and caricaturist. He made illustrations for many British authors, including Charles Dickens, with whom he was friends.

5 Phiz was the pseudonym of Hablot Knight Browne (1815-1882), another leading British illustrator, whose works accompanied the novels of Charles Dickens, Charles Lever, William Harrison Ainsworth and others.
of the nineteenth century illustrators were regularly attacked by authors and critics. By the middle of the twentieth century, even in reprints of Dickens’ and Thackeray’s novels were rarely illustrated. To this date there is no theory of the nineteenth-century novel that considers illustration (Elliott 46).

In her *Rethinking the Novel/Film Debate*, Kamilla Elliott accounts for the decline in book illustration by examining the growing competition between the illustrator and the author. The Romantic paradigm of shared imagination may have fostered the collaborative spirit of the illustrated serial novel of the preceding decades, but by the second half the nineteenth century perceptions shifted, perhaps under the influence of Darwinism, and illustrators had come to be regarded as competitors. Illustration and prose now had to occupy separate spheres (Elliott 32-3). What distinguished the attack on illustration at the end of the nineteenth century from earlier word and image debates was the anxiety that illustration and prose shared “essential similarities, similar functions and shared rival territory” (Elliott 33). For example, Henry James recounts how, as a child, *Oliver Twist* “seemed more Cruikshank’s than Dickens’” (*A Small Boy and Others* 120). As a mature writer, James fought against illustration and “pressed the novel towards an aesthetic of pure prose” (Elliott 49). In his essay “Sur le livre illustré,” Stéphane Mallarmé calls for an absolute prohibition—“aucune illustration.” Otherwise the image will influence “everything a book evokes before it [has a chance] to pass through the spirit of the reader” (878). James and Mallarmé assume that illustration is redundant, since it lends narrative, semantic and interpretive support, something a literary text accomplishes on its own (Elliott 42). They also implicitly acknowledge illustration’s power to supplant prose: the former offers an immediate

---

6 Separating image from text was not a new phenomenon. For example, it lay at the heart of eighteenth century aesthetic debates, expressed most notably in 1766 by Gotthold Effraim Lessing in his *Laocoon: or, The Limits of Poetry and Painting*. That work distinguishes between the verbal and visual arts on the basis of their essential differences—poetry is best at representing time and the plastic arts are best at representing space.
image when the latter can only evoke it (Miller 67). The illustrator, who had once collaborated so closely with authors, was now vilified. As authors and critics fought against the coupling of image and text in the novel, illustrations gradually fell out of fashion.

Another source of the decline is the trenchant bias in literary studies throughout most of the twentieth century in favour of the word and against the image, an explicit logophilia and an embedded iconophobia (Stam and Raengo 5). This bias was established very influentially by figures like Irving Babbitt and schools like New Criticism and Formalism. There can be little room for discussions of analogies between “sister arts” when criticism strives to uncover what makes a text distinctly literary (Elliott 26-30). Russian Formalist critic Yuri Tynianov makes the case against illustration in his 1923 essay “Illiustratsii.” He vehemently opposes illustrations on the grounds that they cannot translate strictly literary devices. If a publisher insists on hiring an illustrator, he should direct him to limit his depiction to the world implicit in the novel (i.e. fabula) and never to translating its literary devices or narrative structures (i.e. siuzhet) (311). Including illustration in a book of poetry, he says, would be absolutely superfluous.

ILLUSTRATION IN RUSSIA, 1861-1917

The situation as regards illustration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was quite different in Russia. As illustration fell from prominence in Western Europe, Russian culture became increasingly visually-oriented (Brooks “External Appraisal”). (Tynianov made his criticism of illustration in reaction to the increasing visual orientation of his culture at the time. It demonstrates how certain leading members of the Russian intelligentsia regarded the turn to the visual and its impact on literature.) Jeffrey Brooks demonstrates in his When Russia Learned to Read that this shift coincided with the immense social transformation taking place in
Russia after the Great Emancipation of 1861. As peasants moved to live and work in cities, they acquired greater literacy. As a result, their cultural frame of reference shifted: they turned away from their folk roots and sought out new stories that pertained to their particular milieu and experiences. Technological advancements enabled publishers to meet this demand with popular magazines and to include illustrations.⁷

The massive move towards the visual in late imperial Russia was therefore centred primarily on popular literature. To be sure, illustration had accompanied Russian literature in the nineteenth century, but never to the same extent as it had during the 1860s in England, the so-called “Golden Age” of illustration. There was no collaboration on the scale of Dickens and Cruikshank or Dickens and Phiz. From 1861-1917 the Russian intelligentsia was not participating in this visual orientation to the same degree as popular audiences, at least not in its direct association with literature.⁸

Its association with popular literature meant that illustration was supposed to explain the text to the readers. In this intermediary role, it appeared not only in popular serial stories and potboilers, but increasingly in the novels of leading authors. One excellent demonstration of this phenomenon is Tolstoy’s Resurrection as it appeared with Leonid Pasternak’s illustrations in Niva. Niva was the most popular illustrated journal of the time and Tolstoy selected it precisely because it could reach “the broadest possible public” and not just “educated readers” (Brooks “Chekhov, Tolstoy and the Illustrated Press” 214). This is an example not only of that author’s effort to use literacy to bridge social gaps, as also evinced by his writing of Primer (1872), a New

---

⁷ Though lithographies and the engine presses (skoropechatnyi stan) were introduced into Russia after the Napoleonic War, their quantity increases substantially after 1860; the rotary press was introduced in the 1870s and increased the speed and quality of publication; these printing technologies were facilitated by other advancements, such as the binding of books on site and cheaper distribution (Brooks When Russia Learned to Read 92).

⁸ I make that comment cautiously, however, because, as Brooks shows, popular readers were getting more and more access to classic Russian literature thanks to Niva (When Russian Learned to Read 111-3).
Primer (1875), his rewriting of the Gospels (1881) and his involvement with the Posrednik press (starting in 1885). Publishing illustrations for adult readers acknowledged (or capitalized) upon a social transformation. The result was that new readers gradually gained better access to the literary canon. In other words, illustration had immense cultural power as literacy increased.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF Anna Karenina, 1878-1982

My dissertation takes this discussion from the late Imperial period and into the twentieth century through a consideration of one illustration, made in 1878, and four illustrated editions of Anna Karenina, published in Russia and the USSR in 1914, 1933, 1953 and 1982. I show that Tolstoy’s novel attracted serious artists whose work repays careful analysis. Since most of these illustrations were commissioned during by the Soviet Union, they reveal a great deal about how that regime tried to manage the reception of Anna Karenina and its author. Illustration continued to play the intermediary role it had in the late Imperial period, and increasingly it facilitated readings that espoused the latent and explicit ideologies of the times in which they were published. My dissertation is a first step toward mapping the rich tradition of illustration in Russia as it developed at the end of the Imperial period and into the twentieth century: it thereby begins to fill a significant gap in our knowledge. The dissertation also discusses the history of publication practices in Russia and the USSR, as it pertained to illustration as well as the intended audience for the works on which I concentrate.

Anna Karenina is an excellent choice for this first step because it has no definitive set of illustrations. This has not been true for other texts. Bilibin’s colourful prints for Pushkin’s fairytales (1910s), Pasternak’s illustrations for Resurrection, and Lansere’s work on Tolstoy’s Cossacks and Khadzhi-Murat were embraced instantly by readers and have been republished
with subsequent editions. No such limitation exists for *Anna Karenina*. As I show, there have been several attempts to illustrate it. Each attempt has resulted in sensitive and intricate interpretations, worthy of attention in and of themselves, but not definitive and therefore somehow outside of time. One illustration I discuss is by Mikhail Vrubel’. It is a nineteenth-century drawing made shortly after Tolstoy completed the novel. The remaining illustrations were created during the twentieth century and each is a reflection of watershed moments in Russia’s cultural history. The number and placement of iterations of *Anna Karenina* leads to a more panoramic view of illustration’s capacity to communicate the latent ideologies and mores that prevailed at various times in Russia and the USSR since the novel’s publication.

The other major cases of illustration in classic Russian literature are *Dead Souls* and *War and Peace*. Several artists—Agin and Bernardskii (1847) and Boklevskii (1860s)—have created canonical illustrations for *Dead Souls*. Even though their work holds enormous importance for the history of illustration in Russia and the USSR, I decided not to consider it. Republished repeatedly, these illustrations show how nineteenth-century evaluations of Gogol’s work retained their appeal well into the twentieth century. They do not tell us how twentieth-century artists brought new evaluations to a classic and canonical text, something that does happen with the illustrations to *Anna Karenina*. *War and Peace* attracted numerous illustrators, but the chronological placement of their work offers a much less expansive view of illustration’s relationship to publishing because most of it is confined to one period—the 1940s and 1950s. Konstantin Rudakov worked throughout the 1940s on his illustrations and the work of Vladimir Serov and Dementii Shmarinov appeared in the mid-1950s. The other *War and Peace*

---

9 Mark Chagall also created notable illustrations for Gogol’s *poema*. These have never attained the status of the earlier illustrations, however.
illustrations were of secondary importance. Because most of the *War and Peace* illustrations come in reaction to the Great Patriotic War, it means that they are more confined to the spheres of propaganda and patriotism.

*Anna Karenina*, with its emphasis on the personal, enabled its illustrators to initiate other discussions, ones that do not represent the regime’s official policies so strongly. To be sure, some illustrations espouse the main tenets of Marxism, but for the most part they offer a view of a latent acknowledgement of other longings and aspirations as well. *Anna Karenina* is therefore a special case in the history of illustration in Russia and the USSR.

A final reason for the suitability of *Anna Karenina* is its encounter with Mikhailov, whose painting *Pilates’ Admonition* takes Matthew 27 as its inspiration and is therefore an illustration. Rather than regarding Mikhailov’s significance for ekphrasis in the novel, as others have done, I wish to limit my analysis to what his painting implies about illustration and thereby set the stage for outlining my methodology.

**Mikhailov, Pilates’ Admonition and Scenes of Interpretation**

I agree with Vladimir Alexandrov that Golonishchev, Vronsky and Anna’s interpretations of *Pilate’s Admonition* overlook its implications and reflect their own values (296-7). Mikhailov creates the painting in order to grapple with his questions about mortality, immortality and forgiveness. The other characters read the painting in entirely personal ways. Their viewing of Mikhailov’s painting is therefore emblematic of what Alexandrov reveals about the entire

---

10 Bashilov’s illustrations remain popular with readers to this day, but they are only sketches, appearing only as footnotes to academic and school editions, formal illustrations never having been published; Leonid Pasternak made a few illustrations, but nothing matching the quantity of his work on *Resurrection*; Nikolaev’s paintings from the 1980s are complete, but they obviously derive their source from Bondarchuk’s film adaption of the 1960s and therefore lack originality.

11 See Amy Mandelker *Framing Anna Karenina* 101-21.
novel—that Anna Karenina identifies universal truths at the same time as it demonstrates the irreconcilability of those truths to each character’s particular point of view (297).

When the characters discuss Pilate’s Admonition, it is as if there are two pictures: one stands on the easel, portraying “the divine in human form and the relation between divine and human judgment (83)”; the other is Tolstoy’s picture, a “scene of interpretation,” where the drama of encountering a work of art is played out (Mitchell Picture Theory 76-7). Of these two pictures, the narrator seems to stress the latter. We get only a vague sense of how the painting deals with its themes. The characters’ readings take centre stage. We depend on them for our access to the painting and the narrator repeatedly tells us that they are incorrect: Golonishchev sees the painting in terms of his own polemic, Vronsky appreciates it primarily for its technique and Anna’s interpretation is undermined by her desire and need to please Mikhailov.

If we consider how illustrators have dealt with this episode, we see that the composition of their illustrations resembles Nicolas Poussin’s Et in Arcadia Ego (Fig. 1). Three shepherds and one shepherdess have stumbled upon a cenotaph. Upon it is engraved a message—death is in Arcadia too. The message that even the residents of paradise should expect to die is no less significant or universal than Mikhailov’s, but, just like Tolstoy, Poussin stresses communication and the process of interpretation: “the shepherds’ gestures and interwoven gazes…represent stages in the process of encounter, apprehension, puzzlement and discussion” (Mitchell Picture
The process culminates in the shepherdess’s comprehension of the inscription of the cenotaph (77). The shepherd next to her turns to her in disbelief, hoping to find affirmation; but her look (and inability to meet his gaze) does nothing to assuage his concerns. Her stance and the other shepherd’s deference towards her make her the authority. She is the main actor in this “scene of interpretation.”

Three of the Russian illustrators discussed in this research produced illustrations of Mikhailov’s studio during the viewing of *Pilate’s Admonition*—Shcheglov’s black and white plate from 1914 (Fig. 2), Samokhvalov’s 1953 colour plate (Fig. 3), and Vereiskii’s two-tone sketch from 1982 (Fig. 4). It is helpful to turn to Poussin’s painting as a model for analyzing these illustrations. They, too, stage a scene of interpretation and move through the process Mitchell identifies (i.e. encounter, puzzlement, discussion and comprehension). On the other hand, there is no ultimate person of authority in the episode except Mikhailov, whose thoughts and motivations are known only on the level of author and reader.

---

12 W.J.T. Mitchell calls this a “metapicture,” or a picture about pictures because, in our efforts to decode the text, we are also implicated in this scene of interpretation (*Picture Theory* 38; 76-7). See also Louis Marin for his discussion of this painting and its “metapictorial” qualities.
Moving in terms of relevance, we begin with Shcheglov’s treatment of the scene. It is admittedly sparse. The artist’s portrayal of Anna and Vronsky hardly seems worthy of mention. They are present for the encounter. Other than that, there is little more to be said about them. Golonishchev’s portrayal is the most interesting. His body language is hostile. His head is tilted to suggest not only his concentration on the painting, but also his resistance to it. Likewise, the way he holds his cane, driving it into the floor with a little more weight than seems necessary, suggests that he is looking at an enemy, not an inanimate object. Certainty drives his animosity, thereby putting him into the role of Poussin’s shepherdess. This is an ironic designation. He has no authority as far as the reader is concerned: we know his interpretation is wrong. Nor does he have any authority over the other characters. No one looks to him for meaning the way the shepherd defers to the shepherdess. Shcheglov shows that his comprehension is confined to himself.

Vereiskii’s painting also stages a scene of interpretation and he follows Poussin’s emphasis on interpretation more closely than Shcheglov. Golonishchev takes up the role of discussant. Golonishchev faces Mikhailov and aggressively directs his comments to him. As in the Shcheglov illustration, Golonishchev behaves as if he holds authority, but utterly lacks it. He does not even look at the painting, which suggests his main concern is engaging Mikhailov in a debate, not reading the painting. Vereiskii’s Vronsky looks deeply moved, which could mean that he is jealous of Mikhailov’s skilful technique or that Vereiskii makes Vronsky more perceptive than he actually is in the novel. Anna stands at the heart of Vereiskii’s illustration, which suggests her authoritative position. Vereiskii covers her face in shadow, not in order to
conceal the nature of her reading, but in order to highlight her appreciation of the painting’s moral implications. It is as if to say that it makes her want to hide.

Samokhvalov goes much further than Shcheglov and Vereiskii, and ends up with a more dramatic and meaningful result. Vronsky illustrates the initial and pre-critical encounter with the painting. His face shows no trace of puzzlement or desire for discussion. His vacuous look suggests his comprehension is superficial, if not entirely absent. Golonishchev here plays the role of discussant. As in Vereiskii’s illustration, he does not even look at the painting as he talks about it with a sneer. He gesticulates with hostile pedantry. Anna’s gaze, on the other hand, suggests absolute focus and comprehension, thereby putting her into the role of the shepherdess. By making her focus so intense and by emphasizing her with lighter tones, Samokhvalov implies that Anna correctly grasps Mikhailov’s message.

Returning to my proposition that this chapter contains two pictures (Mikhailov’s and Tolstoy’s), it is clear that the three illustrators share Tolstoy’s emphasis on interpretation. The clearest demonstration of this is their consistent refusal to illustrate Mikhailov’s painting, the other picture. What we gain from juxtaposing these illustrations of Tolstoy’s scene to Poussin’s painting is the iconographic support for Alexandrov’s thesis: each character’s appreciation of the painting is confined to him or herself (84). Vronsky’s interpretation is superficial because he cares primarily for technique. He believes that it is just a skill to be mastered. Golonishchev, despite his intellectual pretensions, fails to read the painting correctly. His attacks are primarily ad hominem and reflect his longing to appear the master and connoisseur. Anna’s reading is obviously the most significant and deserves more attention. In both the Vereiskii and Samokhvalov illustrations, Anna has the shepherdess’s authority because she correctly understands the painting’s most important idea—its emphasis on forgiveness. This obviously
holds relevance for her as a “fallen woman” and confronts her with her longing for a resolution to her predicament. She therefore appreciates that the painting’s significance is moral, and consequently it resonates for her on a personal and emotional level.

I have analyzed these illustrations as scenes of interpretation not only to introduce some of the illustrators and their work, but also to articulate my methodology. Just as Tolstoy shows the characters’ interpretations to be determined by their desires and world outlook, I identify the illustrators’ interpretations of Anna Karenina in similar fashion. As I say above, there have not been any definitive illustrations for this novel. Now we can say this stems at least in part from its emphasis on the particularity of interpretation. I will discuss this in terms of Aristotle’s idea of imagination and the mental image. Before I do that, however, I would like to offer an overview of methods for analyzing literary illustration.

**METHODOLOGY: SYNTHESIS VS. MENTAL IMAGE**

My survey of existing illustration research in Russian and English indicates two paths for analyzing illustration’s connection to literature. The first looks at the properties of the visual and verbal arts and focuses on what they can share and what distinguishes them. I call this the “synthesis” approach. The second methodology looks, rather, at the illustrator, his education, tastes, biases, his attitude toward the author or work in question and any other factor that might shape or influence his perception. These factors help the artist form a mental image before he ever creates a concrete one. With this in mind, I call this the “mental image” approach.

The study of illustration as synthesis bases its lines of inquiry on their common object and different means of representation. Here I refer to a distinction Aristotle draws in his Poetics about the nature of representation (Poetics 1447a). The poetic object makes its appearance by
various media. To take a familiar example, Cervantes’ uses language to describe Don Quixote’s appearance; Dali, Picasso, Daumier and the many other artists who have drawn Don Quixote use visual media. Despite these different means they all share the same object—Don Quixote. The purpose of synthesis criticism is to evaluate the illustrator’s success in transferring objects from their literary texts into new visual habitats.

Olga Podobedova’s *On the Nature of Book Illustration* espouses the view that illustration is synthesis. Emphasizing that illustration is a movement from the means of literature to those of art, she envisages the artist as decoding the author’s message: the author “tells the artist how to sketch or paint a character’s physical traits” (276). Because illustration takes its lead from literature, the aesthetic values the work espouses determine how successfully its words may be synthesized into images. Illustrators of Romantic and Sentimental literature are limited to employing decorative vignettes and ornamental headpieces. Illustrators of the psychological novel can assume a more active role and portray characters’ psychological and moral development (276). Illustrators of modernist texts are once again limited and must return to a more metaphorical, decorative and ornamental style.

Podobedova’s theory of illustration is valuable for its effort to look beyond the qualitative differences between word and image, but it does not capture all the features of the synthesis it identifies. Her presentation of the process is too transparent, too immediate. In her conception,

---

13 For an overview of the many illustrated editions of *Don Quixote*, see *Don Quixote Illustrated: Textual Images and Visual Readings. Iconografía del Quijote*, edited by Eduardo Urbina and Jesús G. Maestro and Rachel Schmidt’s *Critical Images: The Canonisation of Don Quixote through Illustrated Editions of the Eighteenth Century.*

14 Its Russian title is *O prirode knizhnoi illiustratsii.*

15 If we compare her explanation of illustration’s role in psychological prose to that of J.R. Harvey in his *Victorian Novelists and Their Illustrators*, it immediately becomes clear that she takes a too simplistic view of the connection. Harvey demonstrates that illustration became part of the novel in the mid-nineteenth century because visual caricatures had migrated out of the visual arts and into the novel. Authors like Dickens worked so closely with illustrators because of the profound influence caricaturists had on their work. For example, in his introduction to *Oliver Twist*, Dickens says he wants to “paint” with his novel a picture of criminals as faithful and useful to the public as the drawings of Hogarth.
the illustrator merely translates literature into images and we judge his success by his ability to find the unity between the two modes of representation. She discusses illustrators primarily as if they were authors’ accompanists and overlooks the ways in which the illustrator can alter, skew or even supplant the original.

Edward Hodnett’s *Image and Text: Studies in the Illustration of English Literature* also takes a synthesizing approach to illustration similar to that of Podobedova. The illustrator’s task is to find visual equivalents to the novel and Hodnett considers “any reader” to be up to the task of judging the artist’s success in the transferal. Like Podobedova, Hodnett assumes too much immediacy in the movement from text to image.

Nevertheless, Hodnett does propose one very important idea, what he calls “the moment of choice.” Hodnett emphasizes that every illustration is the product of an artist’s decision. This occurs in two stages: the artist first picks a scene and then decides the most suitable composition and style. He takes Don Quixote’s charge of the windmills to make his point. The artist may focus on any moment between Don Quixote’s disagreement with Sancho Panza and the painful aftermath of his attack. He might then choose from a range of compositional choices, such as how far away to portray the action, from what angle, etc. I like Hodnett’s idea because it allows us to imagine why the artist chooses to illustrate a certain scene and the particular choices he makes within each illustration. I think, however, that the artist wields much more power than Hodnett envisages.

It is possible to ascribe many more variables to the element of the artist’s choice. For example, in the case of this famous scene from *Don Quixote*, it is necessary to ask how the artist may be responding to the numerous precursors who have also drawn or painted it. Where does an

---

16 There are echoes of this attitude in the work of another Soviet critic, Adamov—cf. “Stylistic Unity between the Work of Literature and Illustration.”
artist position himself in this vast array of figures, stylistically, aesthetically, ideologically, spiritually and intellectually? Our analysis would equally benefit from an understanding of the artist’s attitude toward idealism and madness, in general, and toward their treatment in *Don Quixote*, in particular. Perhaps the artist holds certain ideological convictions that influence his attitude towards class. These will surely appear in his portrayal of Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. What these questions reveal (and it would be possible to come up with many more), is that, while his idea is correct, Hodnett offers it in too simplistic terms. There is more at stake in “the moment of choice” than the artist’s decisions about time and space. Nevertheless, his emphasis on the role of choice in illustration opens the door to a discussion of the artist’s motivations, and, therefore, to a discussion of the “mental image” approach to illustration.

J.R. Harvey summarizes the assumptions of regarding illustration as mental image when he says “If the mind’s eye sees patchily it is because it sees with purpose” (170). The task of my research is to identify the artist’s “purpose” and to account for the ways in which his mind’s eye sees “patchily.” It is not my aim to draw attention to the artist’s failure or infidelity to the original text, but to emphasize the subjectivity underlying every illustration. Podobedova and Hodnett envisage illustration as the synthesis from text into image; I envisage it as a synthesis between the novel and the illustrator’s response, which is subjective. To this end, I will briefly retrace Aristotle’s description of the mental image in order to situate how I comprehend and apply it.
Mental Images

Aristotle’s De Anima is the source of the concept of the mental image. It is a synthesis of thought and sensation and therefore it forms the basis of the imagination, which is the intellectual “motion brought about by the activity of sense” (428b). “Without sensation there can be no imagination” (427b) and this explains the etymological connection between mental image and imagination: each word comes from the Greek word for light, thereby tying them to vision, “for vision is the sense in the highest degree, and without light it is not possible to see” (429a). A mental image is therefore first of all the imprint of reality left on consciousness. It is a received “image” before it becomes associated with the mind, that is, before it becomes a “mental” image.

Explained thus, Aristotle appears to be an empiricist; but imagination is also about what the subject introduces into his interaction with the world. For Aristotle, error is one proof of our active participation in perceiving the world (426b). Whereas the sensation of “proper sensible objects” is least prone to error, imagination is more prone to it than any other facet of thought. Imagination resembles knowledge, opinion and belief in that it is “some power or habit by which we discriminate, whether truly or falsely,” but, unlike those other intellectual activities, its

---

17 Much of the twentieth-century debate about theories of the mind has sought to discredit the mental image, not only as Aristotle envisaged it, but also as the eighteenth-century empirical philosophers understood it. One source of opposition is its supposed “visual” nature which is unverifiable (Mitchell Iconology 15). I employ the idea because it seems to provide a reasonable way to account for how Tolstoy understands consciousness and accounts for its ethical dimension. By the time he was writing Anna Karenina, under the influence of Schopenhauer, Tolstoy had come to fear the power of human will (Orwin Tolstoy’s Art and Thought 158), and therefore the power of the mental image and imagination. If my consciousness is active, if I play a role in the formation of my mental images, then I must assume responsibility for the judgments I form on their basis.

18 Aristotle is careful to stipulate that he only chooses light and vision as the prime examples of imagination because “vision is the sense in the highest degree,” not the only one. He does not envisage mental images in completely visual terms, nor even in generally sensual ones (Mitchell Iconology 15). The mental image and imagination are primarily about the interaction of subject and object and need not have anything to do with a hypothetical internal “image” visually present in the mind. Though I look at visual art in this dissertation, my interest in the mental image has nothing to do with supporting or attacking its potential visual presence in human minds. For me, mental image is one of the tools human consciousness has in its interpretative arsenal, albeit one weakened by bias and emotion, as I will soon show.
reliability is negligible. “Most imaginations turn out to be false” (428a) because they originate in the part of the intellect that is “sometimes clouded by passion or disease or sleep” (429a). The mental image, therefore, is that part of human consciousness closest to sensory perception and yet most tempted by illusion.

Since it is a combination of intellectual motion and sensory perception, imagination involves a delicate balancing act between subject and world, between mind and matter. Pure perception of “proper sensible objects” might be least prone to error, but the subject rarely perceives so purely; more often than not imagination adulterates perception. Significantly, Aristotle names passion as one source of the imagination’s unreliability; one might say that mental images are motivated discriminations. His association of passion with disease and sleep indicates the negative value he ascribes to it. The person who cannot check the power of his passions runs the risk of allowing his mental images to frame his perception to such an extent that they lead him away from “the good” and towards his own particular good, thereby putting him at odds with the world.

**Methodology, Continued: Illustration as Mental Image**

Aristotle’s discussion of the imagination and mental images pertains to illustration in the following senses. The derivative status of imagination and its equivocal nature offer clear parallels to illustration. Just as imagination begins as a received image of the world, so too does illustration have its origin in something else, the novel. Likewise, just as imagination becomes adulterated by subjectivity and passions, so too does illustration. It is not the perfect transmission of the object of representation from one medium to another; it is the product of a subjective reaction to a novel. It is the product of a reading.
The novel the artists read in this research is Leo Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*. There are perhaps an infinite number of factors that might influence each artist’s particular grasp and response to that novel; I will focus on four. The first is the artist’s biography, especially with regard to his professional career. Who was he and how did his experiences shape him? What type of artist was he? Was he a professional illustrator or was illustration merely a sideline for him? Answering questions such as these will shed light on his ability and general attitude towards the task. Second, since all the artists I discuss are men, their attitudes towards women and how they represent them are of supreme importance. Although Aristotle does not mention sex explicitly in his definition of the mental image, sexual fantasy clearly belongs there. The artists’ ideas about women, acceptance of their sexuality and their changing roles most certainly will shape their appreciation of *Anna Karenina* and thereby appear in their illustrations. The third factor at work is the canonical status of the novel and the importance of Tolstoy, especially in Russia. All the artists I discuss are Russian and they each had an identifiable attitude towards *Anna Karenina* and its author long before receiving their commission. Their attitudes ranged from adulation and devotion to rivalry and hatred. The fourth point extends out of the third: because of *Anna Karenina*’s cultural importance, publishing houses imposed specific and stringent expectations upon the artists. This takes on special significance during the Soviet era, when the publisher’s aim was part of a larger ideological plan. The artists needed to be sensitive to meeting these expectations. Another way in which this fourth factor operates is in how publishing houses use illustration in high quality publications to send to international competitions. In these cases the aim is to impress the rest of the world with the technical and artistic abilities of the industry. While the publisher’s expectations might seem like a moot point
in forming the mental image, one must not forget that illustration is a “working art” (Male 20-1). Meeting the demands of the client plays a significant role in how the artist approaches his task.

J. Hillis Miller’s definition of cultural studies (in his aptly titled *Illustration*) helped to form the basis of my methodology. Cultural studies assume that outlining the historical context of a work is one of the most effective ways of understanding it. It aims to demonstrate “the material, social class, economic, technological and gender circumstances in which the work was produced and consumed” (13). Likewise, cultural studies break down traditional disciplinary separations, such as the one between illustration and prose (14). In addition to understanding the historical context, cultural studies assumes that a work of art retains its best value if it remains understood in relation to some specific people or group (15). For this reason my research focuses solely on the Russian and Soviet relationship to *Anna Karenina*, despite the international significance of the work. The narrowing down of my methodology to the exposition of four elements (biography, women, Tolstoy and publishers) reflects my effort to apply J. Hillis Miller’s ideas.

An exposition of these factors will form the basis of each of the five chapters to follow. Chapter one considers Mikhail Vrubel’s illustration, *Anna Karenina’s Reunion with Her Son* (1878). Vrubel was an opponent of Tolstoy, aesthetically and intellectually. His animosity is reflected in his drawing. Chapter Two looks at a 1914 edition of *Anna Karenina* published by I.D. Sytin & Co. in Moscow. Three artists collaborated on this book, Mikhail Mikhailovich Shcheglov, Aleksei Mikhailovich Korin and Aleksandr Viktorovich Moravov. In addition to shedding light on the particular readings these illustrators offered, their attitudes towards women, Tolstoy and their publisher, this chapter will reveal how illustration was used to finance Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin’s ambitious effort to publish the first *Complete Works* of Tolstoy after his
death. The third chapter considers a 1933 edition published by Goznak in Moscow for the Limited Editions Book Club of New York. Woodcut artist and bookmaker Nikolai Ivanovich Piskarev was responsible for every aspect of the book’s design, not just its illustrations. In his selection of scenes Piskarev reveals his bias against Anna and in favour of Levin. The book’s importance as a showpiece of Soviet creativity and productivity cannot be understated either. Wealthy New York bibliophiles were its intended recipients. It was one of the finest quality books published in the USSR up to that point. Chapter Four examines the paintings Aleksandr Nikolaevich Samokhvalov made for a 1953 edition published in Moscow by Goslitizdat. Samokhvalov was a prolific artist who worked primarily in the fine arts and only occasionally in illustration. Though he conformed to the dictates of socialist realism, he had roots in the avant-garde and a well-defined feminine aesthetic. Samokhvalov’s paintings of Anna met the dictates of the state while simultaneously allowing him to continue to develop his particular portrayal of women. It will also demonstrate how the publication of Samokhvalov’s work coincided with the state’s larger publishing strategy to make Anna Karenina more available to the average Soviet reader. Lastly, Chapter Five discusses the illustrations of Orest Georgievich Vereiskii published in 1982 in Moscow by Khudozhestvennaia literatura. With 159 published illustrations, this gargantuan project offers the most comprehensive treatment of Anna Karenina. Its publication coincided with the enormous publication activity that began in the mid-1970s to mark the 150th anniversary of Tolstoy’s birth. Like Piskarev’s work, Vereiskii’s illustrations were part of a high quality publication aimed at impressing an international audience.

I consulted secondary literature in history, literary criticism, art history, theory and publishing policy in order to address the broad historical reach and interdisciplinary nature of this dissertation. In accordance with the four points I identify in my methodology above, I
provide a brief overview of this wide body of literature and explain its relevance to my methodology.

While there is no research dealing with all the illustrations of Anna Karenina, there are important works by and about individual illustrators. For information about Mikhail Vrubel’s enigmatic illustration of Anna Karenina (Svidanie Anny Kareninoi s synom) I consulted his Perepiska i vospominaniiia (edited by E.P. Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia) and the work of N.M. Tarabukin (1974), Dora Kogan (1980) and Petr Suzdalev (1984 and 1991). For my chapter on the Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin edition of Anna Karenina (1914), Mikhail Mikhailovich Shcheglov’s memoires Sketches from Memory filled in many gaps about how the publishing magnate commissioned him. Minchinikov’s Recollections about the Itinerants, Lapshin’s Aleksei Mikhailovich Korin, 1865-1923 and Giliarovksy’s journalism provided helpful information about Korin’s and Moravov’s participation in the Sytin edition. I found several excellent sources of information about Nikolai Piskarev’s woodcuts for the 1933 edition of Anna Karenina made for the Limited Editions Book Club of New York. Gorlenko’s monograph on Nikolai Piskarev offers an exhaustive consideration of Piskarev’s life and career and devotes an entire chapter to his work on Anna Karenina. N.N. Rozanova’s Moscow Book Woodcut Printmaking of the 1920s and 1930s places Piskarev within the context of woodcut printmaking in the USSR in the first years after the revolution. Despite Samokhvalov’s renown, there is virtually no discussion in the scholarly literature of his Anna Karenina illustrations. By far the most useful work in dealing with this artist is his autobiography, Moi tvorcheshkii put’ (1977). Vera Chaikovskiaia’s characterization of Samokhvalov as two-faced (Tri lika russkogo iskusstva XX-ogo veka) has been very helpful as well. Orest Vereiskii’s comprehensive collection of illustrations has received the least attention in the secondary literature: I found only a few journalistic
announcements about the book and the chapter the artist devotes to *Anna Karenina* in his memoirs, *Vstrechi v puti* (1988). All these sources have furnished me with the biographical information necessary to make accurate observations about the choices these artists made.

I have depended primarily on historical, cultural and literary sources to help me address the portrayal of women in these illustrations. Jeffrey Brooks’ *When Russia Learned to Read* (1985) and Denise Youngblood’s *Magic Mirror* (1999) offer a sense of how women were portrayed in popular literature and cinema during the pre-revolutionary years. My research will show that many of these artists felt threatened by Anna and female sexuality. To help me articulate how their fear manifests itself in their art I have looked at historical and cultural works that discuss male anxiety about women’s changing social roles in America and Western Europe: to this end I have consulted Bram Dijkstra’s *Evil Sisters: the Threat of Female Sexuality and the Cult of Manhood* (1996), Peter Gay’s chapter “Offensive Women and Defensive Men.” *The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud. Volume I: Education of the Senses* (1984) and H.R. Hays *Dangerous Sex: The Myth of Feminine Evil* (1966).

In order to shed light on the publishers’ role in illustration I have referred to the following sources. Charles A. Ruud’s *Russian Entrepreneur. Publisher Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin* (1990) treats the late Imperial period; Efim A. Dinershtein’s *Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin i ego delo* (2003) is the Russian equivalent. Rozanova’s *Moskovskaia khnizhnaia ksilografiia 1920/30-kh godov* (1982) provides important information on the early Soviet publishing industry and reveals insights into the importance of woodcut printmaking in the 1920s. Dinershtein’s essay on “Khudozhestvennaia literatura” discusses the economics of literature in these first years of Soviet publishing. Konstantin Stanislavovich Kuz’minskii’s *Russkaia realisticheskaia illiustratsiia XVIII u XIX vv* (1937), though limited in its approach, perhaps because of the time of its...
publication, provides a history of book illustration in Russia before the period I discuss in my dissertation. Maurice Friedberg’s *Russian Classics in Soviet Jackets* provides an overview of literary publishing policy and economics during the Soviet period up to and including the Great Patriotic War. Boris Gorokhoff picks up where Friedberg finishes with his *Publishing in the USSR* and Gregory P. Walker’s research has been enormously helpful for filling in many gaps in my knowledge. His *Soviet Book Publishing Policy* provides the best overview of publishing during the Brezhnev years. Gregory Walker has also kindly answered many email queries. Edward Kasinec and Robert H. Davis Jr.’s *Slavic Russian Books and Libraries: Occasional Essays and Notes* (2007) and *Essays on Slavic Collections, Bibliography & Book Culture, 1984-2008* (2010) republishes many of their important contributions to the field.

I have grounded my readings of the illustrations by referring to the vast body of scholarship about Tolstoy and *Anna Karenina*. My most important source has been Donna Tussing Orwin. Under her influence I have kept my sight on the complexity and richness of Tolstoy’s moral thought and the importance he places on consciousness and conscience. As is clear from this introduction, the role of consciousness is of particular importance to my argument. Vladimir E. Alexandrov’s *Limits to Interpretation: The Meanings of Anna Karenina* (2004) is of central importance to this dissertation as well. Since my work is about visual interpretations of *Anna Karenina*, I find his sensitivity to the “limits of interpretation” especially useful.

The present research is the first comparative study of twentieth-century Russian and Soviet illustrations of *Anna Karenina* in any language. I limit my research to the four works I identify above because they comprise the main Russian and Soviet illustrated editions of the novel intended for adult readership. Each was published during an important period in Russia
and the USSR’s cultural, political and economic history. I do not include the 1938 edition illustrated by Nikolai Tyrsa (Konasheevich 208-16; Suris 68-92) because with only twelve illustrations, I felt there was not enough material. Moreover, his work had a different aim because it was published at Lendetgiz and therefore intended for younger readers. There are other Russian artists who set out to illustrate Anna Karenina, but I do not include their work in this research because the work was unfinished or deemed poor by the artists themselves. For example, during the Second World War, Konstantin Ivanovich Rudakov was commissioned to illustrate the novel. Though he completed several paintings, he never finished the job and the paintings never went to press with the novel (Litovchenko). Likewise, Mikhail Nesterov completed a series of Anna Karenina paintings very early in his career, but disowned them and called them rubbish (Nesterov 373). There are other illustrated editions published around the world that I chose not to include: of note are the paintings Aram Vanetsian made for a 1953 Ukrainian language edition of the novel and the lithographs British artist Barnett Freedman made for a Limited Editions Club of New York edition in 1952 (Artmmonsky 8). Likewise, I chose not to include 21st century Russian illustrated editions, despite there being two, the one published by Pan Press in 2006 containing the work of Yulia Evstratova and Aleksei Tomilin and the 2010 Vita Nova publication containing the work of Aleksandr Alekseev. The second publication is the more notable of the two, but it was published too recently to be included in this research. Moreover, Alekseev’s illustrations were made in France in the 1950s and therefore raise concerns that pertain to Russian émigré culture and lie outside of the scope of this research (Vita Nova).

19 A frontispiece, four illustrations of Anna, including one with Serezha; Anna and Vronsky on the way back to St. Petersburg; Karenin (who looks remarkably like Pobedonostsev); Kitty and Levin playing secretaire; Levin in the cowshed; Levin shooting snipe; Vronsky; and Vronsky, Anna as they greet Dolly on the way to Vozdvizhenskoe (Konasheevich 212).
My purpose is not to “bring out into the open some abstract idea of illustration or of the relation of graphic to verbal” (Miller 150). Rather, it is to show how illustration, by having its source in the mind’s eye of the artist, is an interpretation offered in an iconographic discourse. These illustrations bring a new appreciation of Anna Karenina into the world and do more than merely reflect its canonical importance. Each illustration is a “newly made cultural artifact” which possesses its own “performative effects,” thereby changing the perception of the original artifact (15). Digging through context and performing iconographic interpretation, each chapter will reveal how these images are historically situated responses to Anna Karenina. Underlying all these efforts is the conviction, obtained in accordance with Mitchell’s argument he began in Iconology and continues to the present, that an image is just as much a product of the mind as a novel. The illustrator invests the novel with a new interiority, a new privacy implicit in his strokes, colours and compositions. Instead of illustrations, we might call them “thought in images” (Mitchell Iconology 19).

---

20 The philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein influenced Mitchell to put material and mental images “into the same category” and show how they belong in the “same logical space”—i.e., human consciousness. “If there were no more minds, there would be no more images, mental or material” (17). The mental image is just as dependent on consciousness as material images. Moreover, material images require human consciousness to create them and to recognize them as more than an assemblage of colours and shapes. Human consciousness has the power to understand the visual arts as representing something that is “there and not there at the same time” (17).
CHAPTER ONE: VRUBEL’S Anna Karenina’s Reunion with Her Son—1878

I begin by analyzing one illustration by Mikhail Aleksandrovich Vrubel (1856-1910) in order to demonstrate my methodology and to offer a concrete example of why illustration is “thought in images.” Anna Karenina’s Reunion with Her Son is an example of the artist’s juvenilia, drawn in 1878, when he was in law school and before he had entered the art academy. It is a drawing that demonstrates how an artist portrays Anna’s consciousness and reveals his own in the process (Fig. 5). One of the more famous visual artists of the Russian canon, well represented in the Tretiakov Gallery and the Russian Museum, Vrubel belongs to the World of Art movement in the arts. His paintings, clay works, set designs and costumes therefore all reflect its decorative, decadent and modernist style. He was also an active member of the Abramtsevo Colony of artists that gathered around Savva Mamontov and made many decorative pieces inspired by Russian folklore, symbols and motifs (Suzdalev Vrubel’ 266). Finally, the

21 Vrubel had art tutors starting in childhood. He only attended law school in order to fulfill his father’s wishes. He did terribly at law school, forcing his father to submit to his desire to attend the Academy of Art in 1880.

22 The Abramtsevo estate was originally owned by the Slavophile author Sergei Timofeevich Aksakov (1791-1859). It became a centre of Slavophile thought during that time. After Aksakov’s death, Savva Ivanovich Mamontov (1841-1918), a wealthy industrialist and patron of the arts, purchased Abramtsevo and during the 1880s and 1890s it became a colony for artists who recaptured Russian medieval and folk art.
poetry and theoretical writings of the Russian Symbolists “cast a spell” on him (Suzdalev *Vrubel’: lichnost’, mirovozzrennie, metod* 134). Participating in each of these movements, Vrubel’s work was reacting against the style and ideas of the Itinerants or *Peredvizhniki* (Tarabukin 35).23

Vrubel’s drawing of Anna Karenina and Serezha predates his association with *World of Art* and the Abramstevo colony. It also predates his most famous work and even his enrolment in the Academy of Arts.24 In her memoires, Vrubel’s sister writes that the young artist created several illustrations in response to works of literature during these pre-Academy years when he was a law student. Along with the one of *Anna Karenina*, these included drawings and paintings of Margarete from *Faust*, Hamlet, Dante and Beatrice, Lavretsky and Liza from Turgenev’s *Nest of Gentlefolk* and Orpheus and Eurydice (Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia 146-7).25 Other than the Anna Karenina drawing, these all seem to be lost, making it difficult establish a pattern.26 Nor is it clear why he turned to literature for subjects at this time. Suzdalev conjectures that it was under the influence of Goethe, whom he read at the gymnasium. Vrubel took seriously Goethe’s injunction that the young artist should not vainly strive after the illusion of originality but find his own voice by reading the classical masters in order to better contribute to the perennial themes that matter most to humanity (*Vrubel’: lichnost’, mirovozzrennie, metod* 128). If true, this

---

23 The *Peredvizhniki*, or Itinterants, were a group of realist artists formed in 1870. Some of its more notable members included Ivan Kramskoi, Grigori Miasoedov, Nikolai Ge, Ilya Repin and Vasili Perov. They took their inspiration from the aesthetic ideas of Vissarion Belinsky. Tolstoy was closely acquainted with most of the Peredvizhniki.

24 Tarabukin notes that Vrubel was only twenty-three when he made this pen and ink drawing. (Tarabukin 39)

25 Only the whereabouts of the drawings of Margarete and Anna Karenina are known. (Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia 347).

26 Possible thematic patterns do emerge from these choices. His likenesses of Faust and Hamlet suggests that Vrubel was drawn to melancholy male figures, which is quite typical for his neo-romantic cast of mind (Suzdalev *Vrubel’: lichnost’, mirovozzrennie, metod*). More important for my purposes is the way in which each of these choices reveals the young artist’s concern with the power and cost of *eros*. It shows that he acknowledges that feminine beauty will always ensure a place for aesthetics within ethics. This theme is important for *Anna Karenina* and it is also a central issue in much of Vrubel’s mature painting. He returns to the erotic literary theme during his Academy years when he paints another image of Faust and Margarete and one of Hamlet and Ophelia (Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia 6). Unlike the law school drawings, these paintings have survived.
suggestion would imply that Vrubel drew the scene from Anna Karenina because he acknowledged its importance (142).

Certain important details about Vrubel’s motivations emerge from his life and correspondence. He started drawing from the age of five and had art instruction privately and in gymnasium in Petersburg, Odessa and Saratov (Suzdalev Vrubel’ 34). He therefore had fixed ideas about the purpose of art before he entered the Academy of Arts in 1880. In a letter to his parents of 6 March 1876, while still a university student in the Faculty of Law, rather than discussing law as his father would have liked, 27 Vrubel defends art for art’s sake and resists utilitarian uses for art.

…now we [i.e. Vrubel and his coevals] are working together on answering the question about the meaning and purpose of the arts: and for this purpose there was la grande Comitée at the Academy of Arts. Tomorrow we are going to take the same route to the Hermitage, this evening we are reading Proudhon about art’s significance for life and next [week] Lessing’s Laocoon; of course in these discussions I am virtually the only one to defend la cause of “art for art’s sake” and a mass of defenders of the utilization of art stands against me… (Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia 65)

Vrubel’s aesthetics set him at odds with the previous generation of Russian artists. 28 For my purposes, it is especially significant that they were the direct opposite of Tolstoy’s and that he expressed them in the mid-1870s, when he would have been reading Anna Karenina and shortly before he made the drawing under discussion here.

27 Kogan notes that in law school Vrubel pursued his interests in art so completely and neglected his studies to such an extent that he had to convince his father to allow him to repeat second year (39). Vrubel’s father had always been the main impetus for his legal career (Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia 4).

28 Tarabukin suggests that Vrubel outgrew his aestheticism and found a way to make public spirited art and recognized the importance of an audience for the artist (6). One wonders if this was the same audience that Itinerant painters had in mind, or if it was the audience one generally associates with Symbolism—i.e. the aristocratic intelligentsia. Suzdalev tends to agree with Tarabukin, arguing that Vrubel’s goal of raising his viewer to a higher level of consciousness and sensibility was intended to cleanse her of petty quotidian matters of existence. According to Suzdalev, this puts Vrubel in the same camp as Tolstoy (Suzdalev Vrubel’ 330). Tarabukin’s analysis reflects the need to justify Vrubel to the Soviet context by making him more amenable. The same may be true of Suzdalev. While Vrubel’s approach to art certainly must have matured as he grew older, everything about him suggests that remained within Russian fin de siècle culture and that he valued aestheticism and fought against the banality of the bourgeoisie and the lack of sophistication of the peasantry. Significantly, his funeral photo from 1910 is a veritable who’s who of Symbolist painters and writers with figures like Aleksandr Blok and Nikolai Rerikh in attendance.
Upon enrolment into the Academy of Arts, Vrubel continued his move towards aestheticism. He quickly distinguished himself and earned the high regard of his instructors, including Ilya Efimovich Repin and Pavel Petrovich Chistiakov. At first Vrubel was thrilled by Repin’s attention, but he eventually cooled towards his teacher. Repin’s *Peasant March in Kursk Province* at the XI Itinerant Exhibition in 1883 especially displeased and alienated him. Vrubel’s displeasure was indicative of the main difference between the Russian artists of the 1860s and 1880s.

Thoughts about art as serving people never ceased to concern the artists [of the 1860s] and [of the 1880s]. But the idea of service was understood differently [by each camp]. The Itinerants wanted to directly intervene in the midst of life, in its most urgent matters. Many of the most talented young artists of the 1880s wanted to enrich and transform the soul with the beautiful and elevated. (Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia 7)

Repin’s *Peasant March* bluntly illustrates the social inequality of Russia. To Vrubel it lacked beauty and he could not appreciate how such a painting, with its focus of dirt, dust and inequality, could have elevated consciousness. So there is no inconsistency here or throughout Vrubel’s life. The same attitude toward art informs his drawing of *Anna Karenina’s Reunion with her Son*.

As a mature and famous artist, Vrubel was an outspoken opponent of Tolstoy (Iaremich 150; Tarabukin 62). Though never clearly articulated, his opinions were quite strong. Allegedly in discussions about the author he would become very agitated, something his peers considered quite out of character (Gomberg-Verzhbinskaia 268). In the early 1890s Vrubel visited

---

29 Vrubel never clearly articulated his philosophical and religious views and we know them only through his rough notes and the observations and memories of his contemporaries (Suzdalev *Vrubel’: lichnost’, mirovozzrennie, metod* 125). P.K. Suzdalev attempts to overcome these deficiencies by considering the importance of Goethe, Kant, Nietzsche, Schopenhauer and other thinkers, including Tolstoy and Dostoevsky in Vrubel’s thought (124-65). I will outline some of Suzdalev’s findings below.

30 In Vrubel’s first biography, Stepan Petrovich Iaremich writes that the artist could not even talk about Tolstoy in a joking manner (*Vrubel* 150)
Yasnaya Polyana. In a note from 1902 entitled, “A Conversation with a Great Celebrity,” Vrubel describes his meeting with Tolstoy in very confrontational and unflattering terms:

Shabby, small, plain, almost resembling one of those little Poles Dostoevsky treats with such disdain, there stood I thanks to the grand hospitality for which the master of “Boring Poliana” is so recognized, before the sullen, penetrating, wolfish and hungry eyes of the venerable and highborn man who is somehow still of peasant stock whose legs are useless despite his exercises on bicycle, on horseback and behind the plough...

Tolstoy greeted his guest with a stone-faced silence:

“So where is the conversation?” the reader will ask...Yes, my interlocutor was silent, but not as Christ was before the Grand Inquisitor, but with the sullenness of the illustrious soothsayer, filling time because he had nothing to say. He could have kissed me in silence as Dostoevsky’s character did, but there is too much of the aristocrat in him, my figure aroused his disgust.

Suzdalev conjectures that Tolstoy ignored Vrubel because he was aware of the artist’s animosity. He also suspects that Vrubel may have been confrontational during the meeting and tried to engage Tolstoy in a discussion about art (Vrubel: lichnost’, mirovozzrennie, metod 145).

Notwithstanding his humiliating treatment at Yasnaya Polyana, Vrubel’s animosity to Tolstoy seems to have been more of a convenient projection than a reasoned consideration of the author’s ideas.

The basis of [Vrubel’s] criticism of Tolstoy was neither Christianity nor the idea of a person’s moral perfection. From his romantic point of view, Vrubel saw in Tolstoy a defender of philistine bourgeois interests... (Suzdalev Vrubel’ 330)

In this interpretation of the situation, we might characterize Vrubel’s critique as that of the Modernist against the perceived backwardness of the previous generation as represented by Tolstoy. For Modernism “now” is new and urgent; the past is dead and must be profaned in the name of modernity (Calinescu 97). Though Tolstoy was certainly no Modernist, Vrubel

---

31 “Razgovor s Velikoi Znamenitost’iu” is stored in the State Tolstoy Museum (GMT) in Moscow. Handwritten and illegible, it was decoded by L.I. Kuzmina in 1973 and is published in Zvezda 8: 195-7. Suzdalev suggests that Vrubel’s second meeting with the author in 1900 may have initiated his indignant recollection of the first meeting at Yasnaya Polyana. Tolstoy’s excommunication in 1901 may have also been a factor. Suzdalev blames a period of illness for the venom Vrubel aims at Tolstoy (Vrubel: lichnost’, mirovozzrennie, metod 143-4).
incorrectly associates him with the bourgeoisie, whom Tolstoy disliked just as much as his young foe and perhaps for more substantial reasons. According to Suzdalev, Tolstoy was a scapegoat for Vrubel, an artist who struggled during his lifetime and who was anxious to blame the bourgeoisie and its perceived allies for his misfortunes (Vrubel’: lichnost’, mirovozzrennie, metod 144).

It must be clear from all this that Vrubel’s Anna Karenina’s Reunion with her Son must be approached with caution. Even if the young artist lacked the audacity and confidence to question Tolstoy directly—as he did so vehemently later in life—it seems unreasonable to see the illustration as an homage. And even if Suzdalev is correct that the younger Vrubel acknowledged the importance of Anna Karenina, it seems that this acknowledgement must have contained an element of criticism; so while it might not be possible to apply the vocal hatred of the mature artist to the law student’s drawing of Anna Karenina, it is nevertheless tempting to see some critical or ironic features there. Something about Tolstoy’s novel troubled the young Vrubel and he needed to create his image in order to wrestle with the dissonance it provoked inside of him.

Anna’s internal life may have bothered Vrubel. His illustration makes no secret that its aim is to show Anna’s troubled consciousness. Every feature of her face, body and attire reveals her inner turmoil. Her eyes and grimacing face convey her intense distress. Her body and attire build upon this impression. She advances abruptly towards her son as she grabs him and takes him forcibly from his bed. Face, body and attire all collaborate to create an image of compulsion and desperation. We may not be able to say precisely what lies behind her compulsion and desperation, but we are certain that its source lies beneath the surface. It is an image of inner struggle, played out on Anna’s face and in her physiognomy.
But once we try to account for the distress we see in Anna, we find Vrubel’s characterization differs entirely from the novel. The exact nature of her distress is unclear. Is it a desperate guilt for having abandoned her son to pursue her selfish and ultimately fruitless romance with Vronsky? Is there a glimmer of anger and jealousy at having to face her son, the person she wants but cannot have? Is this a frightened Anna, fearful of God’s inexorable punishment? These questions arise because the illustration is too emotional. It goes too far and moves past *Anna Karenina*, taking it to a hyperbolic extreme. Anna may have an expression like this when she gasps as Vronsky breaks Frou-Frou’s back, she may have it when in her morphine-induced state the world seems to embody death itself, she may have it as she takes her own life, but it seems impossible to put this face on Anna during her reunion with Serezha (and even less possible to put the same face on her son). True, in the novel Anna’s reunion with Serezha is complicated, but it is not devoid of genuine positive feelings. Vrubel’s illustration shows only turmoil and pain.\(^{32}\)

Having recognized Vrubel’s presentation of Anna’s interiority as selective, we can now identify it as the artist’s projection. The drawing distorts the balance of feelings in the novel, and it reveals the artist’s intellectual interaction with it. Without accusing Vrubel of “infidelity” to *Anna Karenina*, I will now characterize the nature of his distortion.

---

\(^{32}\) Our biggest clue is Serezha, who, in the novel, never fears his mother during this scene. In fact, perhaps unbeknownst to himself, he is in control of the situation. Serezha satisfies, albeit briefly, his mother’s need for unconditional love and forgiveness. This fits in well with the general features of Anna’s relationship with her son. She is always afraid to punish him, to fulfill her role as his mother and affirm his moral sense, because she is more concerned with whether or not he will forgive her. See Orwin Tolstoy’s *Art and Thought* (145). Her sudden appearance destroys Lidia Ivanovna’s lie about her death and her son’s pronouncement that he never believed it gives him an almost Christ-like power over her. This does not mean that Tolstoy wanted this scene to only express such beautiful sentiments. There are hints of Anna’s “greediness” in her reunion with her son.
Such a limited presentation of Anna’s consciousness implies a condemnation. This Anna is an outlaw. The image seems to say that if she appears to suffer, then she gets what she deserves. There is nothing to mitigate her crime. Even her beauty is evil and monstrous. Dora Kogan interprets Vrubel’s illustration this way. To her it is the heavenly punishment promised by the novel’s famous epigraph (42). She proposes that Dostoevsky’s article of July/August 1877 “Anna Karenina as a Fact of Special Importance” is a possible influence on Vrubel’s drawing and believes that Dostoevsky’s interest in evil, justice and his characterization of Anna’s moral degradation at the end of Part VII serve as Vrubel’s inspiration (Kogan 42-4):

[L]ater, at the end of the novel, we have a gloomy and terrible picture of the full degeneration of a human spirit; this we follow step by step through the depiction of that compelling state in which evil, having taken possession of a human being, trammels his every movement and paralyzes every effort toward resistance, every thought, every wish to struggle with the darkness that falls upon the soul; deliberately, eagerly, with a passion for vengeance, the soul accepts the darkness instead of the light. (Dostoevsky 1071-2)

There are problems with Kogan’s proposal. First, she does not establish a conclusive connection between Dostoevsky’s article and Vrubel’s drawing: there is no memoire, no letter, no comment or note by the artist or anyone else, nothing to suggest that Vrubel had even read Diary of a Writer, let alone made his illustration directly in response to it. Second, she misrepresents Dostoevsky, whose description applies to Anna’s destruction, not to her reunion with Serezha in Part V, and whose article is not intended to condemn Anna. Dostoevsky is primarily interested in the power of evil, and, for him, evil is so powerful that it makes it impossible to judge others, at least absolutely.

33 We will need to return to Anna’s outlaw status because it is so important to how readers have responded to her in the twentieth century, particularly in Russia and the USSR. In the Soviet context, her lawlessness lends her legitimacy because she resists an illegitimate society. See, for example, I.N. Uspenskii 228-9. There are other reasons for considering her importance as an outlaw. Orwin discusses her significance as a “lawless individual” in relation to Schopenhauer’s ideas of flux and the natural freedom of the will (Tolstoy’s Art and Thought 158-9).
34 Hence she only says “it is thought [dumaetsia] that Vrubel read Dostoevsky’s article on the novel and followed it completely in his depiction” (43; emphasis added)
It is clear and intelligible to the point of obviousness that evil lies deeper in human beings than our socialist-physicians suppose; and that no social structure will eliminate evil; that the human soul will remain as it always has been; that abnormality and sin arise from the soul itself; and, finally, that the laws of the human soul are so little known, so obscure to science, so undefined, and so mysterious, that there are not and cannot be either physicians or final judges; but there is He who says: “Vengeance is mine, I will repay.” He alone knows all the mystery of this world and the final destiny of man. (Dostoevsky 1071)

Dostoevsky does not condone Anna’s choices, but he does not want to judge her either. He is sensitive to the way Tolstoy portrays her psychology and considers Anna’s story to be “a monumental psychological elaboration of the human soul, with awesome depth and force and with a realism of artistic portrayal unprecedented among us [i.e. the Russians]” (1071). Had Vrubel truly followed Dostoevsky’s lead, he would have created a more sympathetic image.

This does not mean, however, that Kogan is wrong to see Vrubel’s image as one of punishment. Serezha’s intense fear affirms the punitive reading of the illustration because of our natural inclination to identify and empathize with a child. His desperate struggle to get free from his mother’s clutches suggests his fear of the emotional depths of her being, which are incomprehensible to him; he may even be struggling for his life. The illustration’s erotic insinuations make the outcome of his struggle all the more sinister. It is not enough that Anna has abandoned her son; she is here portrayed as victimizing him as well.

Anna Karenina’s Reunion with her Son differs dramatically from what actually happens in Part V, chapter xxix-xxx of the novel. Earlier I characterized Vrubel’s presentation as selective; now I will show that it is superficial as well. Vrubel’s illustration seems to suggest that if Anna is a criminal, she must look like one, that is, a criminal must appear desperate and a moral monster must look monstrous. Show this image to someone who is unfamiliar with Anna Karenina and they might see it as a scene of abduction, not reunion. It reads Tolstoy’s character

35 Kogan compares Anna to a predatory bird (43).
in a way that the novel itself tries to discourage. *Anna Karenina* does not reveal everything about Anna, but it does furnish the reader with enough information to approach her misdeeds with empathy, if not humility. What the reader knows, and what is lacking from Vrubel’s illustration, is Anna’s restraint.\(^{36}\) There is no trace of it here. She just tears towards her son with manic force. If there is any conscience here, it is not a source of inner beauty, as it is in the novel; here it only enforces her guilt and thereby drives the manic spur deeper and fuels her desperation further. To draw Anna like this, without any trace of restraint, is to project lawlessness upon her; this comprises only half the equation of Anna’s character. It seems that the source of Anna’s desperate appearance does not lie within her but within Vrubel, in his judgment of her. His judgment is superficial because it is self-serving: he delves no deeper into her consciousness than he needs in order to affirm what he wants to find.

Vrubel’s reading of Anna departs significantly from the novel. He uproots the suicidal Anna from the end of Part VII and forcibly places her in the same room with Serezha in Part V. Such a move implies Anna is not a tragic figure who falls, and who is thereby worthy of our empathy, but someone who is bad and blameworthy. Otherwise we might be tempted to see the illustration as an apocryphal alternative ending to the novel where Anna secretly visits Serezha *yet again* just before she commits suicide. By placing the suicidal Anna side by side with Serezha, Vrubel makes her look her worst and weakest during a moment when readers normally empathize the most with her. Vrubel’s Anna would never tell Serezha to love Karenin, who is better than she is. Worse still, he makes her torment her son. Moral degradation and innocence do not stand side by side so plainly in the novel. As we shall see in subsequent chapters, other

\(^{36}\) I here refer to Robert Louis Jackson’s observation that Anna’s conflict stems from an imbalance of her incredible life-force and her moral restraint. These exist in equilibrium before she meets Vronsky. Her affair knocks this equilibrium out of kilter. See “Chance and Design in *Anna Karenina*” in *The Disciplines of Criticism: Essays in Literary Theory, Interpretation and History*, ed. Peter Demetz, *et al.* 1968.
illustrators use Anna’s transgressions as evidence of her attractiveness and her heroism; Vrubel’s Anna is absolutely lawless.

Vrubel’s drawing could be a satire that draws heavily on hyperbole and irony. As such, it does not deprive Anna of empathy so much as accuse Tolstoy of being cruel. It draws attention to what many readers perceived to be an unjust ending for Anna. In other words, Vrubel might belong to that camp of readers that accuses Tolstoy of killing Anna. His image would then convey exasperation: if Tolstoy was going to make Anna a monster at the end of the novel, then he might as well just have made her one from the beginning as well. In this interpretation of Vrubel’s illustration, it corrects Tolstoy, expressing dissatisfaction with the author’s design.

Returning to the four criteria I outline in my methodology, it is clear that Vrubel’s aesthetics and his attitude toward Tolstoy lie at the forefront of this illustration. Since he never intended this illustration to be published along with the novel, it is not reasonable to discuss it in terms of the publisher’s expectations. With regard to what this image reveals about Vrubel’s attitude towards women, my feeling is that there is not enough documentary evidence to support any particular reading. That said, it clearly anticipates the representation of “feminine evil” that became so prevalent in fin-de-siècle culture, both in Russia and Europe.37

---

37 For a complete discussion of the representation of feminine evil at the turn of the nineteenth century, see Bram Dijkstra’s Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-de-Siècle Culture (1986) and Evil Sisters: The Threat of Female Sexuality and the Cult of Manhood (1996).
CHAPTER TWO: THE SYTIN & CO. EDITION OF ANNA KARENINA—MOSCOW, 1914

The Sytin & Co. illustrated edition of Anna Karenina reflects the economic motivations of its publisher. Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin sought to create a book that would be elegant and have higher production values than his other popular publications, but he always kept his eye on the bottom line. It is an artifact from “the path not taken” in Russian history (Youngblood 3). It bears no relation to revolutionary or avant-garde culture; nor does it belong to Russian fin-de-siècle culture.

The Sytin & Co. Anna Karenina was part of a large project to publish the works of Tolstoy shortly after his death. The venture included three projects: an elegant twenty-volume Complete Works, a less expensive twenty-four volume set, and a series of luxurious leather-bound and illustrated editions of the major fiction and plays (Biriukov 2, Ruud 113, Dinershtein 173). The twenty-volume Complete Works had a circulation of 10,000 copies and each set sold for 50 roubles (173). The cheaper twenty-four volume edition had a circulation of 100,000 copies and sold for 10 roubles per set (173). This latter edition was also included with Sytin & Co.’s serial publications, The Russian Word (Russkoe slovo) and Around the World (Vokrug sveta); the

38 I take this opportunity to acknowledge the Stanford Library’s generosity in giving me complete access to their copy of this edition.
39 Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin (1851-1934) was a publisher. He began by selling cheap woodcut print chapbooks (lubok) in local markets and fairs. He quickly rose from these humble origins to become one of Russia’s leading publishers and one of its most successful entrepreneurs. Sytin had worked closely with Tolstoy on numerous occasions, perhaps most notably on the venture Intermediary (Posrednik) which began its activity in 1884 and aimed to bring quality literature to the semi-literate masses.
40 Biriukov characterizes these books as “a series of the fictional works of L.N. [Tolstoy] in an elegant illustrated edition” (Biriukov 2).
precise circulation included with these publications is unknown (173). Titles included in the illustrated series were *War and Peace*,41 *Anna Karenina*—the subject of this chapter, a volume of *Dramatic Works*,42 *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth*,43 *Stories and Tales* in two volumes,44 and *Resurrection*.45 Because the illustrated books were associated with these other two publishing ventures, it is necessary to go into the circumstances that led to the creation of the entire project.

Of particular importance were the financial details. These illustrated editions of the major fiction seem to have had the aim of financing the other two publications, which Sytin & Co. published at a loss (Ruud 114). Of the four elements I outline in my methodology, the impact of the publisher’s demands on the final outcome of the illustrations was enormous.

To be the first to publish Tolstoy’s *Complete Works* would have been a matter of special prestige for any publisher after the author’s death. In order to acquire those rights from the Tolstoy family, Sytin & Co. had to overcome several obstacles. Ruud and Dinershtein outline the issues surrounding the transaction thoroughly (Ruud 109-14, Dinershtein 170-3). I will briefly recount the main points. First there were the still unsold copies of the 20-volume *Works of Count L.N. Tolstoy* published by Tolstoy’s wife, Sofia Andreevna Tolstaia. She further increased these numbers by publishing a twelfth edition after her husband’s death in 1910-11 (Dinershtein 170). From an economic perspective, there was no point in investing in the first *Complete Works of L.N. Tolstoy* with so many other volumes from previous editions still available. The problem was

41 Published in 1912 and the first book in the illustrated series, *War and Peace* appeared in three volumes with the illustrations of Aleksandr Petrovich Apsit (Bibliothèque nationale 86).
42 This edition appeared in 1914 and contains “Power of Darkness,” “The Fruits of Enlightenment,” “The First Moonshiner,” “The Living Corpse,” “And the Light Shineth in Darkness” and “The Cause of it All” (Bibliothèque nationale 55).
43 *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth* appeared in 1914 with Apsit’s illustrations (Bibliothèque nationale 69).
44 These *Povesti i rasskazy* appeared in 1914 with the work of various unspecified illustrators. Volume one contains *Cossacks, Sevastopol, The Raid and Treefelling*; volume two contains *Khadzhi-Murat, Father Sergius, Landowner’s Morning* and *Two Hussars* (Bibliothèque nationale).
45 Appearing in 1915, *Resurrection* was the last of the illustrated editions to appear. It reused the illustrations Leonid Osipovich Pasternak made for the 1899 serial publication of the work in *Niva* (Bibliothèque nationale 91; Brooks “Chekhov, Tolstoy and the Illustrated Press in the 1890s” 214)
solved when Sofia Andreevna sold these books to Sytin & Co. in April of 1912 for a sum of 100,358.40 rubles (Dogovor S.A. Tolstoi). Next, there was Marks & Co., a competitor from St. Petersburg. While this company did not enjoy as close a relationship to the Tolstoys as Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin did, it did make very competitive offers. Then there was the problem of Tolstoy’s will and who owned the rights to which works. Sofia Andreevna, for example, held the rights to all of her husband’s fiction written before 1881, rights she had executed eight times between 1886 and 1911 when she published editions five through twelve of the Works of Count L.N. Tolstoy (Bem 77-9). The author drafted a subsequent secret will under Chertkov’s guidance, however, and put the entire body of the author’s work into the hands of his youngest daughter, Alexandra Lvoyna (1884-1979). She was to sell the rights on the condition they would quickly enter the public domain (Shirer 284-6). She was to use the funds from her father’s literary work in order to purchase the family estate Yasnaya Polyana and distribute the land among the peasants who resided there. Sofia Andreevna did not acknowledge this will and would not renounce her rights to her husband’s pre-1881 work. Reaching a deal that satisfied the respective claims of both wife and daughter was one of the main obstacles of the transaction. The last difficulty the publisher had to overcome was offering a price that met the approval of the family, but also one that would not damage the company. While the prestige of publishing the first Complete Works of L.N. Tolstoy was enormous, so was the expense.

The Tolstoys named a figure of 400,000 rubles: Alexandra determined that she would require 300,000 rubles in order to fulfill her father’s wishes, and Sofia Andreevna’s reimbursement for the pre-1881 works ultimately came to a figure of 100,000 rubles. In accordance with Tolstoy’s will, the publisher could own the rights for a period of two years, after which the entire body of work would enter the public domain. Both Sytin & Co. and Marks &
Co. were reluctant to pay such a high price for so short a contract. Moreover both companies expected little direct profit from the venture; rather, profits would come from the inclusion of Tolstoy’s works as supplements to their serial publications, thereby increasing readership and advertising revenues (111). Once again prestige was a factor.

Ruud suggests that Sytin ultimately won the deal because of a payment he made to Sofia Andreevna from his own money in the amount of 100,000 roubles. This sum was to reimburse her for rescinding rights to her husband’s pre-1881 works. He did this in secret, unknown to his competitors and his investors. This, in turn, allowed him to name the much lower price of 300,000 roubles for the official transaction, an amount that would have been satisfactory to his investors. Ruud writes that this transaction was not in Sytin’s personal interest. It was indicative of his commitment to Russian literature (114).

While the Sytin & Co. edition of Tolstoy’s *Complete Works* was not definitive, it was the most complete one up to that point. It was the first time works like *Khadzh-Murat, The Living Corpse, Father Sergius, After the Ball, The Fake Coupon, The Devil* and other later works received mass publication in Russia (Dinershtein 172). Chertkov’s characterization of the publication was both sober and enthusiastic:

> In terms of the collection of material and the precision of its text [this collection] is the most complete and faithful of all other collected works of L.N. Tolstoy to have appeared so far, if, it goes without saying, one does not count the material that is impossible to print in Russia because of present censorship conditions. (172)

---

**46** Vladimir Grigorievich Chertkov (1854-1936) met Leo Tolstoy in 1883 and soon became an important collaborator with the author. In 1883 he organized the *Intermediary* publishing house with the participation of I.D. Sytin and under the advice of Tolstoy. In the last years of Tolstoy’s life, Chertkov had helped establish Tolstoyanism as a movement and had grown so close to him that the author’s wife, Sofia Andreevna Tolstaia, felt threatened. She had good reason to fear him: Chertkov arranged for Tolstoy to write a new will in secret that undermined her rights to her husband’s work. After Tolstoy’s death, Chertkov had all the author’s censored works published in Berlin.
Chertkov had Tolstoy’s censored works published in Berlin in 1912 (Bem 80). There were other works, such as Tolstoy’s diaries and his *Collection of Thoughts* (*Svod myslei*), which the company chose not to include because Sytin deemed them unprofitable (Dinershtein 172). In the cheaper 24-volume supplement to *Russian Word* and *Around the World*, Tolstoy’s work was divided into two parts. Rather than organizing the texts simply chronologically, Sytin & Co., under the editorial direction of Pavel Biriukov, devoted one part solely to fictional works and a second part to religious and polemical essays (Biriukov 1). Overall, the activity of Sytin & Co. from 1912-1915 was the most significant assessment of Tolstoy’s body of work before the *Jubilee* edition began in 1928. While the editorial effort was not as thorough or as academically rigorous as that subsequent and enormous undertaking, it was nevertheless informed and authoritative, thanks to the direct participation of figures like Chertkov and Biriukov.

Given the enormous expense of the negotiation, it is likely the illustrated editions of Tolstoy’s work were created in order to recoup some costs. These editions published the main novels and stories like *Cossacks*, for which there clearly would have been demand. The decision to publish his dramatic texts and previously unpublished works like *Khadzhi-Murat* would have satisfied the consumer’s taste for novelty, controversy and curiosity as well.

The book clearly hoped to raise funds by appealing to collectors. The dimensions of the *Anna Karenina* are large. Unlike the first edition of the novel published in 1878, which was in three volumes, the Sytin edition is divided into two, the first volume containing Parts I-IV in 290

---

47 The *Collection of Thoughts* is a collection of Tolstoy’s thoughts on numerous issues which he gathered over a period of years. It was edited by Chertkov (Chertkov 537).

48 Pavel Ivanovich Biriukov (1860-1931) first met Tolstoy in 1883 when he became the manager of the *Intermediary*. He became a Tolstoyan and one of the first Russian biographers of Tolstoy.

49 This decision follows the distinction Nikolai Konstantinovich Mikhailovsky makes in his essay about “The Right Hand and Left Hand of Leo Tolstoy.” (“Desnitsa i shuysa L’va Tolstogo”) Unlike Mikhailovsky, who divides Tolstoy in two in order to demonstrate the author’s two approaches to social thought, Biriukov’s taxonomy seems to be aimed solely at rationalizing the vast quantity of the author’s work. Biriukov plays this role elsewhere in his *Life of Tolstoy* which ends with a long “List of Tolstoy’s Works,” arranged by theme, rather than by chronology (157-64).
pages and the second containing Parts V-VIII in 334 pages. Pavel Biriukov edited the book and wrote a brief notes section (Biriukov 1). Each volume is leather-bound and hard-cover with the title imprinted with gold leaf. The choice of font for each cover is distinct. On volume one, Lev Tolstoy is in a cursive script and the title in a narrow and tall sans-serif typeface, all capital letters (Fig. 6). The cover of volume two has a more contemporary style; both the author’s name and the title share the same bold, quadratic and san-serif typeface, with the latter somewhat larger (Fig. 7). On the cover of each volume is a metal (probably copper) relief sculpture, the first depicting the mowing scene from Part III, the second depicting Anna’s reunion with Serezha on his birthday from Part V.

**Figure 6**: Cover of Volume I, Sytin & Co. (I.1)

**Figure 7**: Cover of Volume II, Sytin & Co. (I.42)

**The Illustrators**

Even though Ivan Sytin’s choice of materials demonstrate that he was aiming to create a luxury edition of *Anna Karenina*, his choice of artists indicates that he was prepared to cut corners. The artists, Shcheglov, Korin and Moravov, were minor or at best middling figures in the Moscow art scene. Moreover, they were not specialists in book illustration; none of them had
done much work in that field prior to this job and only Shcheglov pursued it further. The very fact that three were enlisted for the job suggests that the editorial board was more interested in simply having pictures than a coherent artistic reading of Anna Karenina. Nevertheless, these were the illustrators involved on the project and their respective biographies reveal why they made the choices they did while working on it.

Mikhail Mikhailovich Shcheglov (1885-1955) created the most illustrations for the Sytin Anna Karenina (Fig. 8). He was born in Samara, where he spent most of his early childhood. His father was a surveyor for the Siberian Railway, a job that landed him a position in Krasnoyarsk when Shcheglov was ten. His mother got a job there working as a housekeeper and cook for the Kuznetsov family, a family involved in the expansion of the Russian railway. This connection proved to be serendipitous because the Kuznetsov family was personally acquainted with Vasilii Ivanovich Surikov, the famous historical painter and member of the Itinerants. They wrote Mikhail Mikhailovich a recommendation letter which would introduce him to Surikov. With letter in hand, he and his mother went to Moscow to meet the artist. He greeted them warmly and helped the young man enroll into the Stroganovsky Art College, where he studied from 1906-1913 (5-6). His first major commission was from Sytin & Co. to do these illustrations for Anna Karenina (Sokolov-Kukryniksy).\footnote{After the revolution, Shcheglov specialized in making satirical and propagandistic placards, living in Crimea for a time and then moving to Kharkov (Shcheglov 10-1). His work in satire and placards continued during the Great Patriotic War. It was not until the last decade of his life that he finally returned to doing book illustrations: he did some children’s books, notably of works by Pushkin and Tolstoy, but also Sergeev-Tsensky’s Sevastopol Harvest (Sevastopol’skaia strada), Popovkin’s Rubaniuk Family (Sem’ia Rubaniuk). Later he did illustrations for Tolstoy’s After the Ball and a collection of Chekhov’s stories (12).}
In his memoirs, Shcheglov briefly mentions his work for Sytin. Writing in the 1950s, he couches his description of the publishing magnate in ideologically correct terms: Ivan Sytin is presented as an exploitative capitalist. That said, Shcheglov does shed some light on the hectic pace at which he produced the illustrations and hints that he was not able to complete them all on time. He shares an extract from a letter he got from Sytin while he was working on the drawings in Tomsk:

With the present [letter] we ask that in as short a time possible you inform us how much time still remains in order to complete the drawings for *Anna Karenina*... The late receipt of the remaining drawings may delay the publication’s release. (81)

He never mentions the other illustrators involved, but it is fair to assume that Sytin hired them once he realized Shcheglov would not be able to meet the deadline. In addition to working too slowly, there is some indication that some of Shcheglov’s work was deemed inadequate or inappropriate: in his memoirs there is a plate depicting the scene where Levin visits his brother Nikolai in L.xxiv-xxv, an illustration absent from the final work (Fig. 9). I will characterize his work in greater depth once I have provided the biographical information about the other two artists.

The next illustrator involved was Aleksei Mikhailovich Korin (1865-1923). From the village of Palekh, in Ivanovskaia oblast, Korin was born into a family that had worked in icon painting and folk art for generations. He started drawing at a very early age, and by the age of 20, having worked in many icon workshops, he had already become a skilled painter of icons and palekh (Korina-Ryseva 6). He studied at the Shokorevskaia workshop, but soon left for Moscow,
against his father’s will and without financial support, to enroll into the College of Art
(Uchilishche zhivopisi, vaiania i zodchestva) (Zhidov 2). He did well in school, but lived on a
very tight budget, residing in the Liapinka, a residence run by the merchant Liapin where
students shared small apartments because they could not afford places of their own (Korina-
Ryseva 8-9). Korin’s time at Liapinka had long term consequences for his health. He suffered
from chronic respiratory problems. There was one subsequent benefit to having lived there: later,
when he became an instructor at the College of Art, his time at Liapinka endeared him to his
students, many of whom then being residents there (Giliarovsky 178).

With his migration to Moscow, Korin moved away from the folk art of his ancestors and
into the world of fine art, something few Russian artists before him had done (Zhidov 2). He first
participated in the XIX Itinerant Exhibition in 1891, after which he made regular contributions to
this annual event. Perhaps his most important painting to come out of the exhibition process was
his Sick Artist (Bol’noi khudozhnik, 1892), which currently hangs in the Tretiakov Gallery. As a
mark of the respect and trust he had earned among them, Korin gradually became more and more
involved in the Itinerants. In 1894, the organization allowed him to exhibit work without
submitting it under the ballot process. In 1900 he was appointed as one of the artists to organize
the XXVIII Itinerant Exhibition in Moscow (Korina-Ryseva). He continued showing at these
exhibitions until the mid to late 1910s. Despite mostly favourable reactions from critics and the
esteem of his peers, Korin failed to become one of the main figures of the Itinerant movement.
His poverty was the main factor, though he also suffered from the Itinerants’ waning cultural
significance.

51 The journalist Vladimir Giliarovsky characterizes the Liapinka as a dirty residence where students lived
completely unsupervised. They had few pleasures other than free admission to galleries and exhibitions.
In addition to his permanent teaching position at the College of Art and participation in Itinerant exhibitions, Korin also received several important commissions, including a portrait of N.V. Medyntsev, a patron of the arts. Perhaps his most important and ambitious commission was the mural he painted in the Alexander Nevsky Cathedral in Sofia, Bulgaria.\textsuperscript{52} Working as a teacher during the school year, Korin spent six summers on this large project (Baksheev 65).

It seems strange that such an accomplished artist who had never set out to illustrate books would complete several illustrations for Sytin’s Anna Karenina. Moreover, if Korin was attempting to branch out into illustration, one would expect him to take a more dominant role in this project; by 1914, Shcheglov was only a recently graduated art student and Korin was an established artist. The cause seems to have been Korin’s financial problems. He continuously had to take on small commissions in order to pay the bills and this prevented him from participating more actively in Moscow’s fine art scene (Lapshin). Minchenkov provides the most thorough account of Korin’s situation.

With time, Korin became a significant figure—as the teacher of the College of Art. He got married, acquired a decent apartment, and, gradually becoming involved in the circle of intelligentsia-bourgeois life, started to pay for it. His work at the College could not have covered all the expenses this life demanded, and he was forced to take on contract work, which was burdensome and had a harmful influence on the artist’s work. (Minchenkov 322)

More than likely, Korin’s participation in the Sytin edition was one of these contract jobs. The fact that every book dealing with Korin makes no mention of his work on Anna Karenina supports this hypothesis. In all, Korin contributed seven illustrations to the book.

Aleksandr Viktorovich Moravov (1878-1951), the final illustrator involved in this project, was also a minor figure in the late Itinerant movement, beginning to participate in exhibitions in 1903 (Minchenkov 440). He taught at Sytin’s School of Technical Drawing and

\textsuperscript{52} Several Russian artists went to Bulgaria to make paintings and frescoes for this cathedral, including Viktor Mikhailovich Vasnetsov. Alexander Nevsky Cathedral still stands and Korin’s work is still visible.
Lithography (Shkola tekhnicheskogo risovania i literaturnogo dela), founded in 1903. Moravov and Korin both participated in the XL anniversary exhibition of the Itinerants in 1912 (Lapshin 54). In 1908, Moravov completed a portrait of Korin (Lapshin 153). In 1916, he painted Sytin’s portrait. In all, Moravov completed five illustrations for this edition.

A consistent thread running throughout the creation of the Sytin & Co. edition of *Anna Karenina* is money. Sytin made the book to recoup costs. Shcheglov, the principal illustrator for this job, would have been in need of work and set an attractive price. As it turned out, he was too inexperienced to manage so many illustrations, at least under Sytin’s terms, and the publisher had to enlist the help of more illustrators. Korin’s participation was small and he did the work to make ends meet. Moravov’s employment at Sytin’s firm made him readily available.

In certain respects, these economic motivations compromise some of the book’s cohesiveness and quality. Despite Shcheglov’s enthusiasm, his illustrations are amateur, a weakness Korin and Moravov’s better work makes apparent. There are inconsistencies in the placement and distribution of illustrations, a problem explained best by Shcheglov’s tardiness. Of all the illustrated editions of *Anna Karenina* produced in Russia and the USSR in the twentieth century, the Sytin edition is the weakest. A lack of unity does not mean absolute chaos,

---

53 The school was located next to the Sytin & Co. typography on Piatnitskaia. Its students were trained to produce illustrations for Sytin’s publishing ventures, thereby allowing the publishing house to produce illustrations at more affordable prices. Graduates usually became lithographers and drawers for the firm, but some left the publishing industry in order to pursue a formal artistic education (Minchenkov 449).

54 As of 1981, the whereabouts of this portrait were unknown (Lapshin 191).

55 On a side note, Sytin sent Moravov to Yasnaya Polyana to meet Tolstoy and in order to assist Nikolai Vasilievich Orlov in completing illustrations for an American edition of the author’s work. Orlov lived near Yasnaya Polyana from 1907 to 1910 (Baksheev 39).

56 There are two illustrations that are unattributed—numbers 46 and 54 in Appendix One. It is difficult to be sure who made number 46, but it seems that either Korin or Moravov must have made number 54.

57 The book shows physical traces of Shcheglov’s tardiness. Volume One shows almost perfect consistency in the distribution and placement of illustrations. Each of the novel’s four parts gets equal illustration. Shcheglov made all the illustrations except for one. Volume Two, by contrast, is chaotic. There are illustrations by all three artists, there are far more illustrations devoted to Part V than any other, and many of the illustrations to Part V are physically located in Parts VI and VII. All these points are clarified in Appendix One at the end of this dissertation.
however, and I will now analyze the illustrations to demonstrate how the artist’s experiences shape their work.\footnote{\textit{Since Moravov’s participation in the project was minimal, I have decided not to include his work in my analysis.}}

\textbf{The Two Novels, Illustrated}

The illustrations in the Sytin & Co. edition reflect the common reaction that \textit{Anna Karenina} is in fact two separate novels in one, Levin’s and Anna’s. The first person to make this comment was Sergei Rachinsky, who shared his impression with Leo Tolstoy in a letter of 8 January 1878. There he says the book lacks architecture, that there are two themes developing side by side that the author never ties together. Tolstoy disagreed with Rachinsky, saying that the two themes are connected by an “inner unity.” In another letter to Nikolai Strakhov, Tolstoy characterizes the novel’s inner unity as an “endless labyrinth of connections” (Alexandrov 105).\footnote{\textit{For a recent effort to make this network of linkages clear, see Browning \textit{A ‘Labyrinth of Linkages’ in Tolstoy’s Anna Karenina} (2010).}} The illustrations do not demonstrate this unity. They favour Levin and fail to link Anna’s story to his. Nowhere is this clearer than in volume two. It follows Levin’s marriage and family life and virtually ignores Anna, who, visually speaking, almost disappears.

The ten plates dealing with Part V favour the Levin/Kitty plot over the Anna/Vronsky one. The first four plates all portray Kitty and Levin’s wedding and the events leading up to it: Levin at confession (Fig. 10); Levin tells Kitty not to marry him (Fig. 11); the arrival of guests (Fig. 12); and the wedding ceremony (Fig. 13). The next two plates treat the Anna/Vronsky plot, but zero in specifically on their meeting with Mikhailov: the artist drawing before their arrival with Golonishchev (Fig. 14); and the viewing of \textit{Pilate’s Admonition} (Fig. 15 – repeat of Fig. 2). The next three plates deal with the early married life of Levin and Kitty and Nikolai’s death: Kitty stares flirtatiously at Levin’s neck (Fig. 16); Levin receives the letter from Maria
Nikolaevna about Nikolai’s deteriorating health (Fig. 17); and Nikolai’s deathbed (Fig. 18). The final plate illustrates Anna’s brief reunion with Serezha on his birthday (Fig. 19).

Figure 10: Levin at confession, Korin (I.43)  
Figure 11: Levin asks Kitty to reconsider, Moravov (I.44)  
Figure 12: Arriving at Kitty and Levin’s wedding, Shcheglov (I.48)  
Figure 13: The wedding, Shcheglov (I.49)  
Figure 14: Mikhailov, Moravov (I.50)  
Figure 15: Mikhailov’s studio, Shcheglov (I.52)

The emphasis on Levin and Kitty continues in Parts VI, VII and VIII. Fig. 20 shows the women gathering on Levin and Kitty’s terrace in VI.ii with Agafia Mikhailovna in the foreground making jam, begrudgingly without the addition of water. Fig. 21 shows Levin vainly attempting to awaken Stiva and Vasenka Veslovsky to join him on the morning hunt. Fig. 22 illustrates Princess Marya Borisovna, Kitty’s godmother. Fig. 23 shows Levin in discussion with Katavasov and Metrov and Fig. 24 shows the billiard room at the club where Levin and Vronsky
become reconciled. Fig. 25 portrays Levin at the apothecary in preparation for Kitty’s confinement. In Part VIII, Fig. 26 shows the volunteers leaving for Serbia. Vronsky is nowhere to be found, though Stiva can be seen giving a donation to a young and attractive woman and Koznyshev talks pointedly with Countess Vronksaia. The following two illustrations, Fig. 27 and 28, follow Levin through his thought processes and inability to realize them perfectly. The final image of the entire novel is the tailpiece to Part VIII, a portrait of Levin (Fig. 29).

Figure 16: Kitty stares at Levin, Moravov (I.54)
Figure 17: Levin receives letter from Marya Nikolaevna, Shcheglov (I.56)
Figure 18: Nikolai’s death, Korin (I.57)
Figure 19: Anna’s reunion with Serezha, Shcheglov (I.59)
Figure 20: Shcherbatsky women at Pokrovskoe, Korin (I.60)
Figure 21: Levin attempts to rouse Veslovsky and Stiva, Shcheglov (I.61)
Figure 22: Marya Borisovna, Shcheglov (I.62)

Figure 23: Levin, Katavasov and Metrov, Shcheglov (I.63)

Figure 24: Levin plays billiards, Shcheglov (I.64)

Figure 25: Levin at the apothecary, Korin (I.65)

Figure 26: Departure to Serbia, Shcheglov (I.66)

Figure 27: Levin and Ivan in the wagon, Korin (I.68)

Figure 28: Pokrovskoe, Moravov (I.67)

Figure 29: Levin, Shcheglov (I.69)
In all, Anna appears only three times in volume two. Numerous other characters supplant her, some of them rather curiously. For example, while it is natural for the illustrators to take an interest in drawing Mikhailov, it is strange to draw him at Anna’s expense. More strange still is the plate of Marya Borisovna. One would at the very least expect to see her with Kitty; instead we see her all alone. In fact, no other illustrator considered Kitty’s godmother important enough to merit her own illustration; here Shcheglov draws her more clearly and with more sympathy than he ever draws Anna. Nowhere do we find an illustration of Anna at Vozdvizhensk or during her final days in Moscow. Apparently the illustrators did not consider it necessary to create illustrations for these pivotal moments in the novel. The preference for the Levin plot is symptomatic of the artists’ comfort with a male character, with which they would have identified more readily. This preference may also have stemmed from their interest in Tolstoy, who is so closely identified with this character. The artists’ unwillingness to portray Anna suggests that they were uncomfortable with her, an observation that deserves a discussion of its own.

The Portrayal of Anna

In a collection of 69 illustrations of Anna Karenina one would expect at least one definitive portrait of Anna; and yet there is not a single attempt to portray her clearly in the entire book. Her face is often shaded, shown only in profile or facing away from us. When she does face us, her features are drawn too loosely or too small to be seen clearly. The first time we see Anna, she is consoling Dolly and facilitating her reconciliation with Stiva (Fig. 30). Her face is in profile and her bangs conceal her eyes from our view. Fig. 31 shows Anna at the ball. Instead of “standing out” from what she wears, as if bursting from a frame, here she is small and uninteresting. Shcheglov fails even to make her the focal point of the illustration. In Fig. 32 Vronsky declares his passion on the train platform on the way back to Petersburg. Anna faces us
in this drawing, but her expression and features are vague. There is little to indicate that
Shcheglov grasps the significance of this scene for Anna. Next is the text illustration of Anna as
she observes Karenin sleeping (Fig. 33). Her face—completely black and in profile—is a
silhouette not a portrait. The two plates of the steeplechase show us only the back of Anna’s
head (Fig. 34 and 35). As Vronsky reads Karenin’s letter in Fig. 36 Anna stands aloofly and in
profile, her face concealed beneath a maroon veil. Next we find her in profile in Mikhailov’s
studio (Fig. 15), then sitting alone at the theatre (Fig. 37) and lastly in Serezha’s bedroom on his
birthday (Fig. 19). This outline of all the illustrations of Anna in the novel reveals a serious
reluctance to portray her, a fact underscored by the complete absence of any illustrations of her
by either Korin or Moravov.

Figure 30: Anna with Dolly, Shcheglov
Figure 31: Anna at the ball, Shcheglov
Figure 32: Vronsky pursues Anna, Shcheglov

60 I read the halo around Anna’s head as Shcheglov’s attempt to visually portray the narrator’s comment that Anna
can see her eyes sparkle in the darkness (Part II.ix)
61 Though Anna’s audacious visit to the opera comes after her visit to Serezha in the novel, the illustrations appear in
the order I describe. This is another outcome of the unusual placement of plates in volume two I describe above.
62 In fact, there are only 10 illustrations of her throughout the entire book. Compare this to the 22 illustrations of
Levin.
Fear may partially account for the artists’ reluctance to draw her. They may have felt uncomfortable making an image of Tolstoy’s heroine and thereby competing with the author. Korin and Moravov did not dare, and Shcheglov, because of his inexperience, proceeded cautiously. The prevalence of drawings of Levin by all three illustrators undermines this suggestion, however.

If fear played a role in making the illustrators reluctant to portray Anna, it seems more likely that it stemmed from her being a female character and the moral and social significance of her choices. Their hesitance to draw her may be a manifestation of their anxiety about the
Woman Question in Russian society, not as it was understood in the 1870s, when Tolstoy was writing the novel, but as it manifested itself in the years leading up to the First World War. This was a time when rapid urbanization and increased literacy dramatically transformed the lot of women. Many men perceived this transformation as a threat. The pervasiveness of their anxiety is detectable in cultural artifacts of the time, namely in cinema (Youngblood), and in popular literature (Brooks). Shcheglov’s illustrations may be an extension of this playing out of social transformation in the cultural arena. They definitely reflect how Anna Karenina triggered his insecurities. Korin and Moravov’s absolute unwillingness to draw her suggests the same.63

Shcheglov’s reluctance to draw Anna’s face reveals his discomfort and implies that he projects significantly more guilt onto her conscience than is the case in the novel. Just as a person will avoid eye contact when he lies, Shcheglov deprives the reader of a clear look at Anna when her conscience burns, or at least when he thinks it should. He never offers an image that acknowledges Anna’s power. For example, we never encounter an image of her as a mother or wife, as Serezha and Karenin would see her at the beginning of the novel. We never see her wielding any authority, which is to say we never see her the way Dolly does. Most importantly, we never get any acknowledgement of her erotic energy, something which manifests itself so clearly to Vronsky and at other times to Kitty and to Levin. Instead all that we get is a small Anna who avoids our gaze. To be sure, Anna’s inability to clarify her guilt leads to her demise (Gustafson 125-6). We should expect to see images of her moral struggle as the novel progresses; but to only portray her as if she is ashamed is to betray the careful attention the novel

---

pays to her downward trajectory from mother, authority and erotically vital woman to an ostracized being.

Shcheglov does not acknowledge this transformation. She always appears evasive and effacing. As Anna wanders further and further away from socially acceptable norms, we see her less and less clearly, and by volume two it becomes virtually intolerable to show her at all. Of the three images of her in volume two, the first two are dull and uninteresting, and, as mentioned, the last image reinforces the idea of motherhood.

HYBRID AESTHETICS: SHCHEGLOV’S POPULAR INFLUENCES VS. KORIN’S ACADEMIC STYLE

Having three artists work on the same edition demonstrates the role subjectivity and identity plays in illustration very well. For example, Shcheglov and Korin’s approaches to composition and style reveal a great deal about their respective educations and aesthetic tastes. Despite Shcheglov’s formal training at college, it is obvious that his approach to composition is inferior to Korin’s. His illustrations depict entire scenes and look more like sketches taken from tableaux vivants or from stills of a silent film. Korin, on the other hand, approaches his illustrations in much the same way he does his major exhibition pieces. They manifest an academic style. This is not only clear from how they stylistically resemble the genre paintings upon which he based his career as an Itinerant, but also in how they explore themes that emerge in his own painting rather than merely represent scenes out of the novel.

Shcheglov emphasizes entire scenes, rather than focusing on characters, their figures or faces. Using the terminology from film to describe the framing of a shot, most of Shcheglov’s
compositions are either medium long or long shots.\textsuperscript{64} Take, for instance, the depiction of Anna at the ball I discussed above in relation to the portrayal of Anna (Fig 31). The reason why we can’t see Anna clearly is because Shcheglov finds it important to show everyone. Figure 38 shows Kitty and Varenka in the same framing, even though this is an intimate scene and Shcheglov could have made them larger. Figure 39 portrays Dolly and her children attending the rural church service in Part III. Again, the figures are so small that Dolly is barely detectable. In each case, the illustrations lack a focal point. It is not clear why Shcheglov approaches scenes in this matter. Perhaps it merely stemmed from his lack of experience, or a basic lack of talent. It is possible that he wanted to recreate as much of the world in Tolstoy’s novel as he could, regardless of the harm it did to his drawings, stylistically speaking. It is even possible that the similarity between his drawings and \textit{tableaux vivants} and film stills suggests the influence of these art forms on his work. Unfortunately he never discusses his own work from a critical perspective that would clarify these questions. What is certain is Shcheglov does not take a painterly approach to his paintings. Korin’s work makes this deficiency obvious.

\textsuperscript{64} According to Bordwell and Thompson a shot is medium long when it frames the figures from the knees up which allows a balance of figure and surroundings. A Long shot includes the entire human figure. Human figures are more prominent than in an extreme long shot, but background still dominates (\textit{Film Art} 191).
Korin’s style and composition exhibit the traits of a classically trained painter accustomed to making genre paintings. His illustrations are superior to Shcheglov’s not only because of their attention to the human figure, but also because of how much better they employ the devices of drawing. With an experienced hand, he uses aerial perspective, linear perspective, foreshortening and overlapping to create the sense of space Shcheglov tries so ineffectively to convey in his scenes. Compare the use of aerial perspective in Korin’s depiction of Kitty and Levin skating in Part I (Fig. 40) to Shcheglov’s depiction of Karenin offering to take Anna home after the accident at the steeplechase (Fig. 35 and detail Fig. 41). Both illustrations are of outdoor scenes, but Korin clearly has a better grip on the technique. Despite its light tones and fuzzy brushstrokes, Korin still creates a recognizable image in the background. Likewise, Korin creates the impression of the type of atmosphere and daylight one might expect during winter late in the
afternoon. The pastel colours suggest frostiness and a low sun. Looking at the detail of Shcheglov’s drawing, it is clear that aerial perspective is treated as an afterthought.65

Comparing the artists’ command of linear perspective is another way of illustrating Korin’s superiority. Take Figures 17 and 18. The first, by Shcheglov, portrays the moment when Levin receives the letter from Marya Nikolaevna asking him to come to his dying brother, Nikolai. The second, drawn by Korin, portrays the moment leading up to Nikolai’s death. The table in Shcheglov’s drawing looms so large in the composition so as to be ridiculous. In addition to sticking out on account of its size, its lines do not bear any detectable spatial relation to the floor or ceiling.66 In Korin’s drawing, Nikolai’s bed looms large too, but it makes sense here because Nikolai lies in it. It is the focal point of the scene. In any case, the bed is still smaller than the table in the previous drawing. And here we feel that the bed’s lines of perspective are in alignment with the other lines in the room. Korin sets the establishment of space as his goal and accomplishes it.

Another way in which Korin’s academic style appears in these illustrations is in their resemblance to many of the genre paintings he did between 1891 and the mid-1910s. These works focused primarily on family themes, but also on illness and mortality. First, he made many portraits of his family members, not only of his parents, but also of his grandfather (Fig. 42) and his uncles. Undoubtedly these paintings not only honed his portrait-painting skills, but also allowed him to reflect on his own identity and family narrative. Korin also devoted several large canvases to the depiction of family scenes. These explore the conflict between individual freedom and the family’s expectations. Take, for instance, the paintings *Failed Again* (1891) and

---

65 I selected this painting of Shcheglov’s for its claim to representing similar distances in the background. The same observation could be made about any of his paintings in the book.
66 This would not be a criticism if it were deliberate, as in a cubist painting. Shcheglov is obviously not aiming for cubist or avant-garde aesthetics, however.
In the Wife’s Absence (1893). The first painting plays out the young man’s anxieties about disappointing his family’s expectations (Fig. 43); the second shows a scene from the young artist’s struggle to balance his familial duties and career (Fig. 44). The Sick Artist, his most famous work, also fits into this pattern. Note how the artist’s wife sits dejectedly in the background, waiting for her ill and newlywed spouse to achieve results (Fig. 45).
The preoccupations underlying these paintings pertain to what we know about Korin’s life. While Failed Again does not pertain directly to his personal experience, he was something of a prodigal son, having abandoned folk art and moved to Moscow against his father’s will. The other paintings are obviously reflections on his own large family and the material constraints it imposed upon him. The emphasis on illness in The Sick Artist may be a reference to his chronic respiratory problems. Autobiographical echoes such as these demonstrate that the problem of the family was of central concern to Korin and suggest that he would have been receptive to Tolstoy’s aim to show that each unhappy family is unhappy in its own way.

CONCLUSION

All four aspects I identified in my introduction with regard to the mental image are present in the Sytin & Co. Anna Karenina. The biographies of Korin and Shcheglov shed light on their approach to illustration, their level of talent and aesthetic sensibilities. Though there is no direct evidence of these artists’ anxiety regarding women, their discomfort with portraying Anna is clear. Moravov and Korin refused to draw her at all and Shcheglov offers a portrayal that is at best meek and at worst judgmental. To be sure the largest forces influencing the outcome of the illustrations were the importance of Tolstoy and Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin’s aim to be the first and exclusive publisher of the Complete Works of Leo Tolstoy. Consequently, the Sytin & Co. illustrated Anna Karenina of 1914 was only a sideshow. The publisher felt no qualms about the choice of Shcheglov until it was clear that he would not complete the task on time. Never again would a Russian or Soviet publisher commission such an inferior and inexperienced artist to illustrate Anna Karenina.

67 It is also possible the artists were uncomfortable with portraying Anna on account of her social position.
CHAPTER THREE: NIKOLAI PISKAREV’S WOODCUT PRINTS OF ANNA KARENINA FOR THE LIMITED EDITIONS CLUB OF NEW YORK—MOSCOW, 1933

The backstory of the Limited Editions Club’s Anna Karenina of 1933 explains why Nikolai Ivanovich Piskarev created the illustrations he did. The artist’s biography and education mark him as an apolitical artist, a perhaps surprising detail given the date of publication. These factors also place him in the Moscow School of Woodcut Printmaking and therefore explain many of his stylistic, thematic and media choices. Piskarev’s attitude towards women and importance of Tolstoy seem to have played ancillary roles in this particular project. The publisher’s expectations, by contrast, were extremely important. The book involved an intercultural exchange between the USSR and the USA and therefore had to satisfy two sets of demands. First, the commission came from the Limited Editions Club of New York (LEC). Distance, economics and language caused numerous hiccups along the way, but the collaboration ended in a final product that is generally regarded as Piskarev’s best work. The second set of demands came from the Soviet state. By producing a book worthy of the most discerning of bibliophiles in New York, the publisher hoped to demonstrate how effectively the First Five-Year Plan had raised the publishing sector out of the rubble of revolution.

68 Located at 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, 10175, the Limited Editions Club was founded in 1929 by George Macy and its ownership remained in the Macy family until 1970. It changed hands several times during the 1970s until Sidney Shiff, a Wall Street investment broker, acquired it in 1979, giving most of the managerial and artistic decisions to his son, Benjamin Shiff (Grossman; Fleming 211). As of July 2010, the Shiff family retains ownership of the Club (Majure). The LEC’s mandate has always been to publish illustrated limited editions of literary classics. During the 1930s a subscription cost $10 per book, with an average of 12 books a year. In 1985, an annual subscription fee of $2000 brought members six titles (Fleming 211). Currently a subscription to the LEC costs $5000 a year and includes between one to four editions (Majure). I have not been able to verify if George Macy bore any relation to the Macy’s Department store. In any case, the Macy family lost ownership of the store in 1895, when it was acquired by Isidor and Nathan Straus (Grippo).
THE ROLE OF GOZNAK

Commissioned towards the end of the First Five-Year Plan, the book served as a demonstration of Soviet excellence in the graphic arts, bookmaking and publishing. It was the best quality book that a state-owned publisher had ever created in the USSR up to that point. Great care was taken in its production. GIKhL (State Publishing House of Literature) directed the project and the book was produced at GOZNAK, an important typographical institution that continues to print Russia’s currency today.69

One of the chief indicators of this book’s high quality is its paper. In the early Soviet years, the publishing industry suffered from a paper shortage. This problem was especially acute during the years of War Communism. In 1920 the paper supply was over 13 times less than that of prerevolutionary levels and in 1921 the supply fell again to half that of the previous year (Dinershtein “Khudozhestvenaia literatura” 95). Though this problem improved over time, it continued to hinder the Soviet publishing industry throughout its entire existence (Walker “Soviet Publishing since the October Revolution” 73). This meant that long novels like War and Peace and Anna Karenina were among Tolstoy’s least printed works (Friedberg 28).70 The state adopted an ambitious literacy policy, and Tolstoy and other Russian classics were included in it, but in order to reach as many readers as possible, the state normally chose to publish shorter works. Devoting so much paper to one book was too dear when “a single copy of War and Peace would suffice to print two hundred copies of one of Tolstoy’s short stories (28).” In undertaking

69 The back of the edition gives the address of GOZNAK as 17 Mytnaia Street. The printing, paper-making and bookbinding was completely done at the GOZNAK Press. According to GOZNAK’s webpage, the mint often managed the printing of such high quality materials during the first decades of Soviet rule (Ob’edinenie GOZNAK).
70 Pokrovskaija’s “L.N. Tolstoi: Bibliografija proizvedenii L. Tolstogo i literatura o nem 1917-1927” supports Friedberg’s assertion. In the first decade of Soviet rule, Anna Karenina and War and Peace were only published once, in 1919, by the Literary Publishing House of the Department of the People’s Commissariat of Enlightenment in Petrograd (Lit-Izdat. Otd. Nar. Komiss. Po Prosv.). Pokrovskaija was unable to provide the number of copies printed of each book (66).
to publish Anna Karenina for the LEC, the Soviet publishing sector was willing to commit a lot of its precious paper; however, the importance of paper for this edition was not simply a question of quantity, but also of quality. It was the first time a book in the USSR had been published on rag paper.

For this book, they needed a lot of paper indeed. They made it out of cotton rags and wood pulp, eighty percent of the content being rag. This is the first time that the Russians have succeeded, since that bloody October, in manufacturing a rag paper for a book. Their paper mill beat the rags too well; the sheet does not have the tensile strength to which we are accustomed in a rag paper. But it has a dulcet, delightful finish, a soft pleasant color; it is altogether a mighty successful book sheet. (Monthly Letter)

The high quality paper and other features of the book were not only a reflection of the new technical possibilities achieved as a result of the First Five-Year Plan; they were also a reflection of the prestige of the commission and the high expectations of the client.

**Piskarev—A Book Artist**

Nikolai Ivanovich Piskarev (1892-1959) (Fig. 46) first attracted the LEC’s attention at the International Book Exhibition in Leipzig in November of 1927 (Gorlenko 134). What followed was a year “of highly irritable correspondence to decide upon the title” (Monthly Letter). Initially the Club desired a limited edition of Chekhov’s Cherry Orchard, but Piskarev did not want to illustrate a dramatic text where gesture plays the leading role (Gorlenko 135). Piskarev proposed Pushkin’s Gypsies, feeling that it would better demonstrate the artistry of typesetting (138). The LEC declined this idea, since an adequate English translation of Pushkin’s text was unavailable (135).
Then the LEC proposed *Anna Karenina*. Piskarev resisted this proposal on the grounds that his illustrations would be entirely lost in such a large novel, even if he did many of them; he suggested Dostoevsky’s *White Nights*, *A Little Hero* or another short work of Tolstoy’s. The LEC stuck to its decision, however, and Piskarev accepted the commission and began work on the edition late in 1930 (138).

Piskarev was an excellent candidate for the LEC commission because he was knowledgeable and experienced in all aspects of book production, not just in the creation and layout of woodcut prints. As Gorlenko says, Piskarev knew the difference between being an artist in a book and being a book artist and always considered himself the latter (86). He received his foundational art education at the Stroganovsky Art College from 1904-1909, after which time he enrolled into the college’s Graphic Arts Department, then headed, auspiciously, by Sergei Sergeevich Goloushev (12-4). Often using his own resources, Goloushev strove tirelessly to make his program current by establishing sections in lithography, photomechanical transfer and zincography (11). Since these improvements to the Graphic Arts Department occurred between 1909 and 1912, Piskarev benefited from them. True, in many ways he arrived too early to feel their full impact, and he even acknowledges that there were several deficiencies in those early years, but the essential skills and lessons he learned reinforced the main goal Goloushev had for his students—that they take a comprehensive view of graphic arts and bookmaking. Piskarev echoes this in his own unpublished autobiography:

> Despite insufficient equipment, poor conditions and some disorganization in teaching (which is totally natural whenever something new is started), I

71 See, for example, Piskarev, “Rol’ iznachenie khudozhnika d sozdaniii shrift.” *Iskusstvo knigi*, vypusk 3 (Moskva, 1962): 131-44.

72 Sergei Sergeevich Goloushev (1855-1920) was trained to be a doctor and started teaching anatomy at the Stroganovsky Art School in 1903. Using the pseudonym Sergei Glagol’, he wrote art and theatre reviews. He also had some art shows under the pseudonym S. Sergeevich. Goloushev was “fanatical” about engraving and eager to pass on his love for the art form to his students (Gorlenko 228-9).
consider myself completely indebted to this Graphic Arts Department and its aim, which, in my opinion, is the only correct one—namely that the artist ought not be aloof to the printing trade and production, but, on the contrary, he should go there and work.

That’s why for all my subsequent life I have ceaselessly connected the artist’s work with material, with output, with production, and for me, as an artist, there is almost no section of the printing press where I don’t feel the need for art. (Gorlenko 12)

Goloushev’s students—Piskarev among them—were not just artists, but also professional book makers who had the skills required to excel in the publishing trade (Rozanova 92).

During the 1920s, Piskarev was a member of the faculty at VKhUTEMAS where he led the book production program. He continued the legacy Goloushev started by teaching his students to be artists and technically-skilled professionals in the industry.

During those years [i.e. the 1920s] students of the printing department of VKhUTEMAS made models of their little booklets under the direct guidance of N.I. Piskarev who imparted to them far-reaching professional skills. He addressed the problem of reducing the price of mass publication of artistic books. [...] He tried to create a new type of artist-typographer who would be familiar with production. Piskarev also took the trouble to see that students’ academic work received circulation, something which immediately forced them to take a serious approach to resolving an assignment as if it were an actual job... (Kholodovskaia 126)

Piskarev’s approach to instruction ensured that he would occupy a leading place in Soviet book design and illustration.

Piskarev worked extensively in illustration and graphic arts throughout the 1900s and 1910s. His first commission for an entire book came in 1922, when he did the layout, design and binding for Anatoly Lunacharsky’s Don Quixote Liberated (Osvobozhdennyi Don Kikhot) (Fig. 47). Perhaps surprisingly, this commission was also Piskarev’s first time to work professionally with woodcut printmaking (Gorlenko 74). Choosing the typeface, layout, size,

---

73 VKhUTEMAS – Vysshie gosudarstvennye khudozhestvenno-teknicheskie masterskie (Higher State Art and Technical School)

74 It turns out that, just like Mikhail Shcheglov, Piskarev got his first professional commission from Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin. His work at this point was limited mainly to designing dust-jackets, title-pages, vignettes and other ornamental designs (Gorlenko 14).
binding and cover—not to mention making all the woodcut illustrations—not only prepared Piskarev for his work on *Anna Karenina*; it ensured him an important place in what Natalia Rozanova calls the Moscow School of woodcut printmaking.\(^7\)

**THE MOSCOW SCHOOL OF WOODCUT PRINTMAKING**

The Moscow School of woodcut printmaking began during the years of War Communism and lasted until the late 1930s. During the difficult years of the Civil War, this art form provided the nascent Soviet publishing industry with a cheap and effective printing technology (Rozanova 11-3). More advanced printing methods became scarce after the Revolution, and woodcut printmaking filled the void, as the printmaker Ia. A. Tugendkhol’d describes.

> Only now woodcut printmaking raised its head—precisely because the duplicating industry had collapsed. A screen printing block left little more than a shapeless blot on the cheap paper of the time and only an artist’s line drawing ensured a decent result; moreover, at that time it was much harder to prepare the printer’s block than an engraved block of wood. So, as the German saying goes, “a shortcoming was turned into an advantage”; devastation and a poorly developed photomechanical technology opened the way for woodcut printing—this ancient and most democratic type of engraving. (Tugendkhol’d 54-5)

Woodcut printmaking helped the new state disseminate the new ideology to an illiterate or semiliterate population. From 1917 to 1920 Moscow woodcut prints accompanied newspapers. Their initial application was journalistic publicity and propaganda (Rozanova 13).

---

\(^{7}\) In Russian, this art form is called by its Greek name – *ksilografia* or xylography. Though this term can be used in English, I have chosen to use the more familiar sounding “woodcut printmaking.”
Even though Rozanova makes much of the propagandistic role the Moscow School of woodcut printmaking played during these first years of Revolution, I think she overstates the case. The movement’s primary activity was the creation of fine illustrated editions. Beginning during NEP, we see the Moscow woodcut printmakers take on fewer and fewer Revolutionary themes. Instead they worked exclusively with Russian and foreign literary classics. For example, the father of this artistic movement, Vladimir Andreevich Favorsky,\(^{76}\) did work on the following titles: *Ozornye skazki* by Honoré de Balzac (1920), *Egeriia* and *Kofeynia* by Pavel Pavlovich Muratov (1922), Pushkin’s *Little House in Kolomna* (1922-1925) (Fig. 48) and even works inspired by Biblical stories, such as *The Book of Ruth* (1924) and Andrei Pavlovich Globa’s play *Tamara* (1923). Aleksei Ilyich Kravchenko,\(^{77}\) another important Moscow woodcut printmaker, stayed away from Revolutionary themes as well. He did illustrations for the works of E.T.A. Hoffman, Leonid Maximovich Leonov’s *Wood Queen* (1923), Gogol’s *Portrait* (Fig. 49) (1923), and Dickens’ *Cricket on the Heath* (1923) (Fig. 50). Of course some woodcut printmakers did do

---

\(^{*}\) Vladimir Andreevich Favorsky (1886-1964) was a leading Moscow art instructor at VKhUTEMAS in addition to being an accomplished graphic artist.

\(^{77}\) Aleksei Ilyich Kravchenko (1889-1940).
works that were of Revolutionary significance, but they were very few and were attached to literary works that tended to reflect an ambivalent attitude toward the new regime; Andrei Dmitrievich Goncharov’s frontispiece to Blok’s *Twelve* is a case in point (Fig. 51).

Piskarev’s path follows that of his contemporaries very closely. First, he was not an active participant in the Revolution. True, in the years immediately after, he did get involved with a Cultural-Educational Organization and other propagandistic groups in Moscow in 1917-18 (Gorlenko 25). His participation in these groups must have been minimal, however, because he made continuous trips to the Crimea during this time for health reasons. Neither Gorlenko nor Rozanova reports that Piskarev actually did any work for these organizations, despite his membership in them. Indeed, shortly after 1917 he was considering going back to college in order to train to be a painter (Gorlenko 29-30), and revolutionary themes are rarely encountered in his private sketches and portfolios of the time (Kholodovskaia 124).

His work in the 1920s as a woodcut printmaker and bookmaker reflects that of his contemporaries as well. As mentioned earlier he illustrated Lunacharsky’s *Don Quixote Liberated* in 1922. In 1926 he did the typography and illustrations for the anonymous work of Spanish literature *Lazarillo de Tormes and His Fortunes and Adversities*. In 1927 he made an edition of Aleksandr Serafimovich’s *Iron Flood*, a work about the Civil War which indicates Piskarev may not have been as aloof from Revolutionary subject matter as some of his colleagues (Fig. 52). He also contributed woodcuts to a *History of the Civil War* published in

---

78 Andrei Dmitrievich Goncharov (1903-1979).
79 Gorlenko recounts how Piskarev made intermittent trips to Feodosia in 1917 and 1918: February 1917, June-August 1917, January-February 1918 and August-September 1918 (26).
1935 (Gorlenko 116-7). Other than this brief foray into the new Soviet culture, Piskarev limited his book art interests to western titles and subject matter, such as his illustrations for an «Academia» press edition of Rousseau’s *Confessions* published in 1935 (Fig. 53).

![Figure 52: Iron Flood (Gorlenko)](image1)

![Figure 53: Headpiece to Confessions (Gorlenko)](image2)

In the 1920s, the two primary schools of book art in the USSR were the constructivists and the remnants of the *Mir iskusstva* movement. Of these two, the Moscow school shared the least with the constructivists. Like *Mir iskusstva*, the Moscow School looked at the book as a unified work of art, laying equal emphasis on its function and its appearance. Both movements rejected the more passive illustrative style of the previous generation of illustrators, such as Kardovskii and Sokolov. Kasiniec and Davis’ comments about *Mir iskusstva* may just as easily be applied to the Moscow woodcut printmakers, and especially Piskarev.

The Mir iskusstviniki...saw their charge more boldly [than illustrators like Kardovskii]. Paraphrasing some of the major theorists of the World of art: it was the task of the artist to be sensitive to all elements in the construction of the book, including its type, color, binding, quality of paper, cover, format, and most importantly, its illustration. The illustrator thus became a co-author or co-creator of the text. This heightened sensitivity to what some called the “architectonics” of the book was in part a function of the great sensitivities of some of the Mir iskusstviniki to all other areas of the applied arts, such as theatrical design and even interior decoration. *(Slavic and Russian Books* 163)

Where *Mir iskusstva* and the Moscow woodcut printmakers differed was in their respective styles. *Mir iskusstva* transplanted many foreign motifs into their work, especially Italian and
classical ones (Rozanova 20). The Moscow School shied away from these sorts of ornaments and themes. Moreover, its attitude toward ornamentation differed. An ornament always had to have a symbolic or allegorical motivation. Art for its own sake, beauty and artistic virtuosity alone, were deemed insufficient by the Muscovite printmakers (Kholodovskaia 124).

Beyond having Moscow as its centre of activity and an identifiable style and medium, this movement had three other discernible features. One, it was always associated with publishing, bookmaking and typography (Rozanova 92). Two, most of its leading members were faculty at the Graphic Arts Department of VKhUTEMAS. Piskarev taught there from 1921-1930 as Professor of Typography and Graphic Arts—Book Publishing, and from 1925-1926 he managed the college’s academic press (Gorlenko 251-2). Favorsky was the President of VKhTEMAS from 1923-1926. Lastly, because it was an art form wedded to bookmaking, it also played a role in the fight against illiteracy during the 1920s (12-3).

This last point needs some clarification. Rozanova states that the Moscow School of printmaking had a direct connection to Soviet policies to eradicate illiteracy, initiatives like “Down with Illiteracy” (Doloi negramotnost’). True, the printmakers of Moscow were all involved in book production, but the publishing trade in the 1920s was much more fragmented, free and complicated than Rozanova suggests. Despite paper shortages and state-led policies to overcome illiteracy, much literature was published specifically to satisfy the needs of the intelligentsia. Judging from the titles the Muscovite printmakers worked with during the 1920s, discussed above, it is clear that their work was not intended for proletarian, peasant or child readers. Ultimately Rozanova contradicts herself and shows that these artists made books with very limited circulation and reserved for bibliophiles.

---

80 Doloi negramotnost’ was a voluntary society founded in 1923 as part of the nation’s broader program of likbez or “liquidation of illiteracy” (Likvidatsiia bezgramotnosti).
...the circulation of the editions [of the Muscovite woodcut printmakers’ books] was so small that like it or not they were offered for the consumption of a small and consequently highly-qualified circle of readers—above all bibliophiles. But if, under the influence of the ideas of the Revolution, artists addressed the new reader, then the opportunities for his [i.e. the reader’s] reception of literature and visual art was considered rather abstractly. (13)

Rather than there being a direct connection between the state’s policy on promoting literacy and the Moscow school of printmaking, it seems quite clear that these artists were members of the intelligentsia who made books for the consumption of some of its more select members. That of course does not preclude any sympathy they may have felt towards a more general literacy, but it does limit their direct involvement in actualizing it. Their activity was connected to the general drive to improve books in the USSR, but it was restricted to the most elite readers.

Piskarev’s first book commission—Lunacharsky’s *Don Quixote Liberated*—is a case in point. Sitting as the head of the Commissariat of Enlightenment, Lunacharsky was one of the key figures of the literacy campaign. This particular work was not part of it, however. It was polemical and its intended audience was the Party and the liberal intelligentsia. Its strong allegorical bent and allusions to classical literature make it anything but a work of the Proletkult persuasion, and by referring to Don Quixote, Lunacharsky continued Russia’s specific stance on the quixotic, an idea that is pre-Revolutionary and about which only the intelligentsia could have known.81 In her work on Lunacharsky, Sheila Fitzpatrick suggests that the Commissar used the play not only to criticize intellectuals like Maxim Gorky who put the intelligentsia before the Party, but also to attempt to demonstrate his allegiance to the Party rather than to the intelligentsia (130-1). *Don Quixote Liberated* had nothing to do with the average Soviet citizen. It addressed cultural issues facing the state at the time and the Party’s stance on the intelligentsia.

---

81 Turgenev’s 1859 essay “Hamlet and Don Quixote” forms the basis of the Russian stance on Cervantes’s hero. He juxtaposes the high ideals and activeness of Don Quixote to the cynicism and introspection of Hamlet in order to define two types of people in Russia at that time. He fears the Hamlets are too numerous and the Quixotes too few.
Piskarev’s work for Lunacharsky’s book had no role to play in the raising of literacy in the Soviet Union.

Rozanova’s mention of the small circulation of the Moscow printmakers’ books suggests that these works enjoyed a certain cachet and were thereby reflected the economic activity of NEP. The LEC’s interest in Piskarev is a further demonstration that this sort of work was always intended for collection and never for wide circulation. Indeed, Piskarev’s work for the edition was not officially released in the USSR until a limited run of his prints for *Anna Karenina* was published in 1978 as part of the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of Tolstoy’s birth (Chugunov; “Graviury Nikolaia Piskareva”; “K 150-letiiu L.N. Tolstogo”; Kirpichnikova 1977a; Kirpichnikova 1977b; Vasiliev); and even then only 500 copies were issued.\(^82\) There is no mention of it in the general literature advertising all the publications Soviet publishing houses were working on in preparation for the 150th anniversary in 1978 (Sheliapina).\(^83\) The Moscow school of woodcut-printmaking was therefore not especially ideological and played absolutely no role in the formation of mass culture that coincided with it in other art forms like cinema. Too literary and too expensive for mass-production, the movement did not find a firm foothold in the new regime and by the end of the 1930s it had more or less disappeared.

Piskarev’s placement in the Moscow School of woodcut printmaking means that we should not expect his *Anna Karenina* illustrations to be overly ideological. Likewise, we should not expect them to bear any traces of other art forms we might typically associate with the 1920s or 1930s, namely constructivism and socialist realism. Belonging within the Moscow School, his interpretation was confined to its specific forms, style and thematic approaches.

---

\(^82\) The woodcuts were reprinted using the original woodblocks which were held by the artist’s daughter and restored by V.I. Serkiukov (Vasiliev 72).

\(^83\) Incidentally, a high school edition of *Anna Karenina* with rather poor reproductions of Piskarev’s prints appeared in 2006, published by Detskaia literatura.
Piskarev’s Design and Illustrations

Piskarev’s work on *Anna Karenina* is regarded as his best, both in terms of overall book design and illustration. It is an elegant collector’s piece, made in an edition of 1500 copies, all signed and numbered by Piskarev. The LEC used Guerney’s translation, feeling that Constance Garnett had taken too many liberties with Tolstoy’s style (*Monthly Letter*). It is divided into two volumes, the first containing parts I-IV and the second parts V-VIII. Volume I includes a 44-page introduction written by Anatoly Lunacharsky. The total pagination of the edition is 1040 pages. The page size is large—7 ½ by 10 ½ inches (*Monthly Letter*). Tawny-coloured Russian linen covers the exterior of each volume. On the front and back covers, running from top to bottom along the book joint is an Ivy motif, stamped with real gold (*Monthly Letter*). At the base of the Ivy, Piskarev has included the plants’ roots (Fig. 54). The spine has “Leo Tolstoy *Anna Karenina*”, also imprinted in gold, on a burgundy/maroon field. The endpapers of

---

84 I wish to acknowledge the Art Collection of the Toronto Reference Library for giving me access to their edition of the LEC Piskarev *Anna Karenina*. They hold copy 1022. According to the *ex libris* label, this book used to belong to the personal library of H.L. Rovs.

85 There is some discrepancy on this point as the book’s front matter clearly indicates the translation is by Constance Garnett, as edited by Guilbert Guerney and Gustavus Spett.

86 Anatoly Vasilievich Lunacharsky (1875-1933) was the first Commissar of Education or Narkompros (The People’s Commissariat of Enlightenment). He was also an art critic and author.
each volume are verdigris-coloured with a white lace pattern.\textsuperscript{87} The “List of Illustrations” enumerates 19 illustrations.\textsuperscript{88} There is a headpiece for each of the novel’s eight parts, three tailpieces, five text illustrations, and three two-page plates. There are far more, however, if one includes the title page, the gold-imprinted motifs mentioned above as well as many other floral motifs which abound throughout the entire work. These always accompany the page number and the first letter of each of the novel’s eight parts and every chapter (Fig. 55). In addition to the eight headpiece illustrations, each of the novel’s parts has a title-page where these floral motifs form ornaments around the title. These floral motifs, though small, vary according to the season in which the story takes place. During winter chapters, the motif is bare branches. In spring chapters it is blossoms. Summer chapters are adorned with luscious vegetation. This system of ornamentation remains more or less intact throughout the book and establishes a rhythm that supports the story (Gorlenko 142). There are a few moments when Piskarev departs from this pattern in order to comment on thematic issues. So, for example, even though Parts II, V and VI all begin in winter, buds appear in the decorations around the title page of Part II in order to indicate Kitty and Anna’s awakening feelings and flowers accompany the title page of Parts V and VI in order to offer symbolic support to Kitty and Levin’s wedding and then the birth of their son (142).

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Tailpiece to Part VIII. Overlapping colours. (II.20)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{87} The LEC’s \textit{Monthly Letter} describes the endpaper thus: “[Piskarev] has made an end paper design of a lace such as Karenina herself must have worn.”

\textsuperscript{88} See Appendix Two
These woodcuts are Piskarev’s best illustrations. In addition to their pleasing quality is their virtuosity: all the prints are rich in fine detail and compositionally complex. Of particular note are the fifteen multi-coloured woodcut prints, five of them spanning two pages. In order to make these, Piskarev had to prepare two, sometimes three panels, one for each colour. The black is entirely opaque, of course, but Piskarev achieved interesting effects by overlapping the other colours which have varying degrees of translucency. For example, there is an appealing light and shade effect on the column in the book’s final tailpiece created by the overlapping of the blue and light grey inks (Fig. 56). The artist accomplished similar effects in the other three-colour prints. Apparently this was the first time a Soviet woodcut printmaker had the resources and skill to make multi-coloured woodcut prints (Gorlenko 143). They are a testament not only to Piskarev’s skill but his discipline too. He made the most of the distance separating him from the client and the freedom his own state gave him to determine the book’s final appearance, astounding considering its place and time of publication. The Anna Karenina commission from the LEC was an exceptional opportunity.

The work on Anna Karenina comes much closer to the artistic potential of Piskarev [than previous works] because, by a turn of fortuitous circumstances, one could say that he fell into the ideal conditions for a book illustrator: everything from the illustrations and to determining the location of the page numbers, everything was decided singlehandedly by artist. (Chugunov 7)

The LEC had some reservations about the book’s design and typography, but was happy with the illustrations.

If you feel some displeasure over the actual press-work, we feel that you can feel nothing but pleasure over the illustrations. They are done by Nicolaus Piskareff, who is a professor at the Graphic Arts Academy in Moscow and who is one of the leading lights in the artist’s soviet. For us he has done a remarkable job. [...] he has made twenty four sets of woodblocks to serve as illustrations in two and three colors.

These illustrations are downright Russian. To attempt to describe them to you would be madness. Like all Russian pictures, the component parts of these illustrations seem to be flying in all directions. Yet they are made to a pattern.
They are amusing, they are surely interesting, they are printed in pleasing colors indeed. (*Monthly Letter*)

The Soviet party organs seem to have been content with the illustrations too, despite their failure to convey propaganda. That is not to say that they are completely devoid of political significance. Two illustrations make subtle statements on the pre-Revolutionary period, and on the peasants in particular. The first is the peasant from Anna’s dream in the lower portion of the headpiece to Part IV (Fig. 57). In addition to having a death’s head, the peasant is surrounded by explosive lines. These lines might be the flying sparks of the smith’s trade, conjured up by the peasant’s incongruous muttering—“il faut le battre le fer, le broyer, le pétrir”; but they are too explosive to come from the smithy. The gaunt peasant with his death’s head is the source of an explosion. Quite literally a bomb, he is detonated beneath Anna and Vronsky as an act of terrorism against social inequality and in condemnation of a “frivolous” and “romantic” love affair. Likewise the headpiece to Part VI hints at the aristocracy’s exploitation of the peasantry with a rendering of Agafia Mikhailovna that makes the preparation of jam look like working in a steel mill (Fig. 58). Every other artist whom I have researched portrays her as a stereotypically healthy, happy and rotund Russian peasant woman. Piskarev has turned her into an emaciated and exhausted slave.
Though relatively silent on the political front, Piskarev’s illustrations nevertheless make a very clear interpretation of the novel.\(^9\) They visually develop and support its themes and moral issues by focusing on the juxtaposition of the Levin and Anna plots; they depend more on contrast than synthesis, however. Whereas Tolstoy envisaged his novel as a “network of linkages” and thereby saw the two narratives as fundamentally connected, Piskarev differentiates one from the other and does so to normative ends. In the Sytin & Co. edition we saw the illustrators treat *Anna Karenina* as two distinct novels by virtually ignoring Anna, especially in volume two; Piskarev does not shy away from her or how he interprets her significance. His division of the novel into two is deliberate.

I agree with Nina Gorlenko that Piskarev uses the representation of space in order to differentiate Anna’s story from Levin’s. In Anna’s case, space is tight, abstract and often highly allegorical and symbolic.

In illustrations of Anna and Vronsky, the heroes are weighed down by their feelings. They are isolated from all surroundings. It is as if they are cramped into a tight and limited space. (Gorlenko 149)

Anna and Vronsky’s world always appears cramped, not only because they must hide away from the world, but because that is how the world feels to them. Levin’s world, by contradistinction, is open, natural and vast. It is only moderately allegorical and symbolic (152). Piskarev understands how *Anna Karenina* foregrounds the relationship between a character’s subjective perception and his surroundings. Comparing Anna’s train ride home to Levin’s return to Pokrovskoe in Part I of the novel provides a nice demonstration of how this principle works. The narrator juxtaposes the divisive and chaotic perception of Anna on the train to the cohesive and

---

\(^9\) It needs to be noted that any ideological oversight Piskarev’s illustrations may have committed was corrected by Anatoly Lunacharsky’s introduction. In it he sets out to correct western readers’ ideas about Tolstoy. He is especially concerned about differentiating Tolstoy’s ideas from the principles of communism and the Soviet regime, something that had proven to be a problem in the 1920s. Whereas westerners tended to associate the radicalism of the late Tolstoy with communism, Lunacharsky was eager to demonstrate how Tolstoy’s aim was to move Russia backwards rather than forwards (Denner 234-8).
curative influence Levin’s return home has upon him. Piskarev is sensitive to this feature and works it into his illustrations.

Generally speaking this employment of space is consistent throughout the book and even extends beyond Levin and Anna and onto some of the secondary characters. Take, for instance, the Headpiece to Part I, a portrayal of the Oblonsky household (Fig. 59). The artist has created a realistic sense of space: the lines on the floor establish it through linear perspective and the view through the window and into the nursery adds to this impression through aerial perspective. This orderly representation of space imparts a certain authority and righteousness to the scene. For example, it shows less confusion than one may have expected, based on the novel’s presentation. True, a little doll lies on the floor to indicate the absence of order, but otherwise the home is impeccably tidy. The children do not appear distressed, nor does the nanny show any signs of wanting to quit the household; on the contrary, the children and the nanny are quite content, and the infant sleeps peacefully in the nanny’s arms. A cat snoozes tranquilly in the upholstered armchair on the left, and above it a clock ticks on indifferently. All signs indicate that life carries on uninterrupted by Stiva’s indiscretion and Dolly’s indignation. Yes, the oval portrait of the high-society lady in a wig suggests eros and vanity, and its placement between the two extremely small portraits of Stiva and Dolly is a sign for the threat these things pose to their marriage; but these are minor details in this print. Overall this first headpiece presents the Oblonsky home as a peaceful domain. No matter how embarrassed and distressed Stiva and Dolly feel, it is still a home. I agree with

90 Podobedova thinks the view into the nursery is in fact a reflection in a mirror (246).
Gorlenko that this headpiece establishes the importance Piskarev places on the family (149). I go a step further: by showing the power of the family to provide stability in the face of Stiva’s indiscretion, Piskarev demonstrates how it offers protection from passion. The orderly representation of space is Piskarev’s strategy of presenting the power of “the family” to withstand the threat of passion, at least for the Oblonskys.91

In addition to delineating an open and realistic space, this first headpiece establishes three motifs that Piskarev uses throughout his prints in order to develop the novel’s family theme. The first of these are rays of sunlight. In this print they fall upon the nanny and the children and emphasize them and even endorse their activity. Through the window we see the other two elements: though bare, branches fill the window, which remind us of the vegetation motif we discussed earlier in relation to the page numbers and other ornaments; above the branches we see a church cupola. These three motifs not only associate the family with nature, but also suggest spiritual and moral development. Whenever an illustration suggests the positive influence of the family as a check on passion, it will employ some or all of these elements—rays of light, vegetation and churches. For example, the illustration of Levin sighting Kitty on the road to Ergushovo in Part III, chapter xii, uses all three of these elements: the early morning rays of light shine over Levin’s head, lush vegetation abounds and a church steeple is visible at the end of the road.

The patterns and expectations established in the first headpiece at the Oblonskys’ continue to play an important role in “The Skating Ground” (Fig. 60). Again, spatial relations play a key role. This print draws our attention to Kitty and Levin’s failure to connect. It does so

---

91 Or at least before Stiva awakens. The clock indicates that it is ten minutes after seven. Stiva’s wondrous dream about the decanters who are women must be just coming to a close. Perhaps that confusion the narrator mentions will suddenly explode onto the scene. Even if this is true, Piskarev shows that when the family does not need to confront Stiva or his affair, stability returns. Stability is normalcy and it is far more powerful than Stiva’s little tryst, which time shows to be only a minor interruption.
most dramatically by physically separating one from then other by putting them on opposite pages. Despite their failure to connect at this early point, the print does intimate their attraction for one another quite well. Levin’s self-consciousness is apparent in his upright and gallant posture and his rather dapper attire, not to mention his concern over his glove. Kitty looks quite unsure of her step and removes her hand from her fur muff to reach for Levin’s hand. It is probably no accident that when the book is closed Levin and Kitty lie pressed together, Piskarev using the book’s material features to anticipate the couple’s imminent union. Even the skaters in the background appear to be more than incidental. Several figures move spryly and dexterously, echoing Levin’s former interest in mastering skating. The young skater directly to the right of Kitty is especially important in this regard. There is a young couple above Kitty’s head: the man lovingly pushes his sweetheart in a chair. Perhaps the most important background detail in this image is the mother and preschooer walking in the snow on the right side of the print which
foreshadows the maternal role Kitty will assume later in the novel. The rink is unusually large and open, a technique aimed not only to show us the characters more clearly, but also to suggest how they appear to one another. Perhaps most important of all is the space they have to move around. Unlike Anna and Vronsky who are always cramped into tight spaces, these two are free. Though there are no rays of light in this print, many trees fill the scene to emphasize that it takes place in nature and in deference to it. Likewise, a large church is visible behind Kitty and, significantly, it is the tallest object in the print.

When they finally do connect and Kitty kisses Levin at her parents’ house in “Levin at the Shcherbatzkys,” these elements continue (Fig. 61). The couple embraces in an immense and empty ballroom. Though they are now locked in one another’s arms (now on the very same page) it is a sign of intimacy, not confinement. Those rays of light bathe the entire room, underscoring that their union will be in harmony with nature and need not be hidden. A painting of a mother with two children foreshadows the maternal role Kitty will soon assume.

Figure 61: At the Shcherbatzkys (II.11)
Even though this use of space and motifs is mostly consistent throughout the illustrations, there are three instances that ignore the pattern. Characters we expect to find out in the open appear confined in tight spaces and characters we normally find locked up appear out in nature. The first case is the illustration of Nikolai’s death (Fig. 62). Levin, Kitty and Maria Nikolaevna crowd together in the dark corner as Nikolai’s body lies in agony. Bedridden and lying across the page, he not only offers Levin a disturbing reminder of mortality, but interrupts the flow of the narrative as well. Given its portrayal of death, such darkness and constraint are entirely congruent. Moreover, it accurately reflects Levin’s own state of mind during the scene. But Piskarev also uses it as an opportunity to establish visual echoes with two other prints—“Anna’s Fall” and “At Anna’s Bed” (Fig. 63 and 64). These not only foreshadow Anna’s suicide but encourage the reader to make a connection between Anna’s erotic force and Nikolai’s physical destruction.

The headpiece to Part III presents the second deviation from the pattern (Fig. 65). It is an illustration of the famous intellectual, Sergei Ivanovich Koznychev, as he rests and observes the
natural world he extols. This print connects him with Anna and 
Nikolai and underscores his separation from the world around 
him. It is as if the print were two illustrations in one, the 
background presenting the open space and active world of Levin’s 
estate and then Koznyshev confined to the foreground. This 
confined space resembles that of the illustrations of Nikolai’s 
death and “At Anna’s Bed.” Furthering this association is the 
supine position the characters all share. This rather literal 
interpretation of Koznyshev’s lack of life-force explains his 
inability to infiltrate the world he observes so enthusiastically. A great distance separates him 
from the peasants. Likewise, the arrangement of blank space underlines his distance and 
separation from the world. Surrounding him and the foreground is an un-inked whiteness. Part of 
this white is meant to be the river where he intends to go fishing, though we see no rod. We 
know this white area is water because we can see the grass’ reflection under the peasants at work 
and we can see ripples in the foreground just below Sergei Ivanovich’s figure. The white 
continues, however, where the water does not, thus creating two barriers between him and the 
world, one representational, the other compositional—both reinforce the figurative barrier 
between this man and the world around him, suggesting his distance from rural life is not only 
physical, it is also mental.

It is Koznyshev’s intellect that cuts him off from nature. Piskarev underscores his 
connection to the Russian intelligentsia. An open book lies face-down next to his left hand, he 
wears spectacles and his attire and tidy hat all point to his academic and urban origin. No matter
how comfortable he says he feels in the countryside, Koznyshev is a misfit, something his solitude emphasizes quite plainly.92

There are other markers that distinguish him from the rest of the scene and emphasize the theme of detachment. He lies in the shade. If there were any rays of light in this illustration, they would not be able to reach him. He is out in nature, but also protected from it. His presence there is not wholehearted, despite what he says or thinks. The strong use of the blue and black ink around him is important for underscoring this impression. Hiding in the shade also hints at the dichotomy between labour and rest, and thereby recalls the mowing scene which takes place in the distance; while he lies in the shade, a world of activity carries on without him, a world where one must stand under the sun in order to be useful.

Though Levin is not physically present, he is figuratively. Further back, stand Levin’s manor, the church and, to the right, the peasants’ huts. The manor and church are elevated higher than the huts, suggesting hierarchy, but all these buildings stand on the same plane: we can imagine them all being equally distant from Koznyshev’s point of view. Moreover, they are unified by the use of colour: each is black. This compositional choice reinforces Levin’s belief that he is a part of the narod.

Off in the extreme distance hangs the sky. Though the furthest away, it occupies a good third of the entire illustration. It also contains some of the illustration’s more appealing details. The clouds’ texture and the movement between rain and sunshine are more than an impressive display of Piskarev’s talent as a woodcut printmaker; they also represent the flux of nature, thereby flashing impermanence before Koznyshev’s idealizing eyes. There is an entire universe, diverse, alive and ever-changing, off in the distance. It represents the life-force Levin cannot find

92 Piskarev’s purpose may be to criticize the intelligentsia in more general terms. He already did so when he made his illustrations for Liberated Don Quixote in 1922.
in his brother’s intellectual endeavours. In a single illustration Piskarev summarizes the intellectual issues of Part III of the novel.

The third and final print that defies the pattern is the two-page “Dolly on the way to Anna” (Fig. 66). Instead of hiding in cramped and unnatural places, Anna, for once, appears out in the open space of nature. We see her riding side-saddle in her black riding habit. Veslovsky eagerly accompanies her and Vronsky quietly follows. Lush trees and grass surround her and the sun shines high in the sky, its rays beating down everywhere. All the elements of what Gorlenko calls the family-themed prints are present. There is even a church far off on the horizon line. To ensure that we understand that Anna is included in this world, Piskarev has made the rays of sunlight beat down upon her. She, too, can occupy her place in the natural order. There are signs, however, that she is at odds with this scene. No matter how much of nature’s life-force is present in this landscape, there are signs of death, signs that unmistakably refer to Anna: she rides
between a dead tree stump and a wooden grave marker. We know that the tree stump refers to Anna because the book associates her with a dead branch on the title-page of each volume which depicts a fruit bearing tree and its roots. On the title-page, a branch drops from the tree, falling onto the soil and into decay. The image’s placement beneath the novel’s title makes it clear that it is an allegory for Anna Karenina. She will be torn (or tear herself) away from the tree and die. “Dolly on the way to Anna” seems to build upon this motif. It may imply that even though Anna is out in nature, she defies it. She rides so confidently at the front of the group and all in black that she seems indifferent to the rays of light that fall upon her. By placing so much emphasis on the openness and light of nature and on Anna’s darkness, Piskarev presents her as hubristic at best, and, at worst, as an aberration. She defies nature’s laws and must suffer accordingly. The natural and sunlight imagery in Piskarev’s prints refer to something much larger than the family theme, as Gorlenko suggests; they are motifs for the Tolstoyan faith in the truth and the natural reason that underlies all of reality and imposes order upon it. To prove that Piskarev was sensitive to this feature of Tolstoy’s writing and was also aware of its source, his frontispiece to Rousseau’s Confessions (1935) resorts to the same celebration of nature through lush vegetation and rays of life-giving sunlight (Fig. 67). Piskarev thereby introduces the attitude toward nature in War and Peace unto Anna Karenina.93

As if to underscore her schism with nature, Piskarev associates Anna with more conventional and often occult signs. The headpiece to Part II demonstrates these tendencies well

---

93 I make this observation on the basis of Donna Tussing Orwin’s argument that by the time Tolstoy sat down to write Anna Karenina he had revised his idea on nature as natural reason. The impact of Schopenhauer’s ideas had changed his view on this forever and with painful results for the author. Piskarev appears to impose a conception of nature on his prints that is more in harmony with the earlier Tolstoy.
This illustration foreshadows Anna’s fall and resorts to strong allegorical elements in order to do so. The man’s gaze literally disrobes her. She looks down in shame, closing her fan, (a tool of coquetry) and a row of stairs appears beneath her feet to imply her trajectory. At the foot of the stairs we find her fan, the novel she reads in Part I, a powder puff, symbolizing vanity and deception, the opera glasses, foreshadowing Part V and a satyr’s head, a symbol for erotic and bestial sensuality.94 Behind her dances society, foreshadowing its condemnation of her.

The man and his gaze are the most ambiguous elements in the print. Gorlenko thinks this man is Karenin and Anna’s nudity—a sign of his penetrating and scrutinizing gaze and her inability to keep secrets from him (144).95 In this case, her downward glance would be an acknowledgement of her guilt before him. There are good reasons for accepting Gorlenko’s interpretation; and yet this man appears too physically powerful and vital to be Alexei Alexandrovich. His large genitals imply Vronsky’s virility which would make this not a scrutinizing gaze, but one of sexual attraction. Anna’s nudity is therefore not a sign of her nakedness before society’s judgment, but as an object of erotic attraction, the visual representation of a man undressing a woman with his eyes. Anna’s shame in this instance would imply that she does not reciprocate Vronsky’s advances, which would be Piskarev’s interpretation and one that the text does not support. The stairs beneath her feet are the consequence of Vronsky’s imperious and lady-killing gaze. It is possible that Piskarev intends us

---

94 Gorlenko says this is a mask of Mephistopheles, but does not explain why (144). Even if she is correct, it is an interpretation of Mephistopheles that employs iconography especially reminiscent of the satyr—horns, fur and maniacal laughter.

95 Gorlenko considers this scene to be a re-enactment of Anna’s confession after the steeplechase, despite the absence of a carriage (144).
to see both men in this figure and thereby see both readings of his gaze. This would make the
man an acknowledgement of Anna’s dream that she is married to both Alexeis at once. The dress
suit is undoubtedly Karenin’s and we discussed how this physique must be Vronsky’s. Facialy,
this figure resembles neither man (compare to Fig. 64 “At Anna’s Bed”). If this face resembles
anything, it is the mask below. If, as Gorlenko suggests, it is Mephistopheles, the association
underscores the destructive power of this gaze. If it is a satyr’s face, it underscores its unbridled
eroticism. Once again, both readings are possible. We cannot acceptably close these gaps. What
we can say for certain is that this headpiece establishes a strong symbolic and allegorical
tendency, something that appears in all the illustrations dealing with Anna, as the remainder of
my analysis will make clear.

The illustration entitled “Two of Vronsky’s Hobbies” resorts to some of the most peculiar
signs in the entire book—mathematical symbols (Fig. 69). Piskarev juxtaposes Vronsky’s
attitude towards Frou-Frou and Anna by placing a plus sign, a greater than sign, a lesser than
sign and an equals sign between them. He poses the question, *which sign best describes
Vronsky’s attitude?* That his gaze is fixed on Frou-Frou suggests where his priorities lie. Anna
turns away in shame and cries. She does not seem to notice the supplications of the infant.
The headpiece to Part IV resorts to some of the more occult symbols, which it associates with Petersburg (Fig. 57). In black in the upper portion of the print we see Vronsky and other men with his tourist, the foreign Prince, drinking the white-label champagne with Thérèse during their Athenian evening. Anna and Vronsky hold hands, but they do so in parting. The black ink forms a partition where their two hands meet to underscore their division. Anna, once again, is weeping with her head held in shame. Beneath them, in the print’s most striking and foregrounded feature, crouches the peasant from their dream, reaching into his sack. His death-head makes his significance more than clear and introduces the occult. A series of crescent shapes that appear, very oddly, in the architecture of the palace on the Neva embankment is echoed by the bulbous ends of the three colours above the palace. It seems like this aspect of the image might be better suited to a work like Gogol’s “Nevsky Prospect” or Bely’s Petersburg?

I agree with Gorlenko that this headpiece foreshadows the novel’s imminent tragedy (146); I think it goes further, however, because it actively associates the occult and death with Anna and Vronsky’s romance. It is worth pausing on Piskarev’s portrayal of Anna. I disagree with Gorlenko’s assertion that Piskarev wants us to pity Anna. She argues that the artist heightens our sympathy for her because he always shows Anna crying. The result is an Anna whose face we never see. We therefore never get to identify with her and never get the opportunity to truly feel sympathy for her.97

I think Piskarev judges Anna, and harshly too. We have already seen how Piskarev suggests that she defies nature. In the print of “Two of Vronsky’s Hobbies” he implies that she ignores her duties as a mother. Add to this the occult and dark iconography that always

---

96 Piskarev goes to extra lengths to tie Vronsky and Anna to the iconography of St. Petersburg and the old regime. For example, the tailpiece to Part I shows a drowsy Vronsky being carted by cab past the Peter and Paul Fortress. Likewise, he ties the city specifically to the problem of eros and vanity: in addition to the portrait of the society lady at the Oblonsky’s house in the headpiece to part one is a drawing of one of the embankments of St. Petersburg.

97 Of course, this is only true if we limit our interpretation to the illustrations.
accompanies her and it seems quite clear that Piskarev goes to extra lengths to condemn her. He deliberately divides the Anna plot from Levin’s in order emphasize how the former transgresses against nature and the latter adheres to it. He therefore overlooks any significance Anna’s experiences might hold for Levin and therefore sides with Korin and Shcheglov, revealing the affinities of the Soviet and pre-revolutionary middle classes.

CONCLUSION

This edition of *Anna Karenina* reflects the vision of one artist more than any of the other editions I discuss. Other than the decision about the title, he seems to have had the final say over every feature of the book’s appearance. The dual source of this commission gave Piskarev a considerable amount of leeway. On the Soviet front, since his task was to make the publishing sector look good, he could make vast demands as to the materials (such as gold and the rag paper), and he could justify experimenting with three-tone woodcut prints. His training as a book designer and illustrator qualified him to make these demands. The distance and language barriers ensured that he could work free from the influence of the LEC. 98 Between satisfying the LEC’s desire to satisfy the demand for conspicuous consumption and GIKhL’s hope to show off the power of the command economy, Piskarev managed to offer a reading of *Anna Karenina* that is distinctly his own.

Piskarev’s place within the Moscow School of woodcut printmaking best explains how he approached the task, stylistically and ideologically. First, it not only informs his choice of

98 There is indication that Piskarev may have abused the LEC’s distance. The contract stipulated that only 1500 copies were to be made and they all had to go to New York. It did allow for 20 un-numbered editions to be created in case any copies were damaged in transit. At least one copy in excess of this 1520 appeared for sale in a Moscow bookstore, however, and the contract was breached. It is unclear if Piskarev was to blame for this breach. In any case, he was never paid in full for his work, nor did the LEC give him his own copy of the book. GOZNAK never received its second payment (Gorlenko 159).
medium, but specifically the style. My brief survey of the other woodcut printmakers’ work reveals the recognizable look to all their work. Likewise, it was an art form that was tied to the highest quality bookmaking. Ideologically speaking, the Moscow School of artists tended to shy aware from political themes. Piskarev offers very little ideological comment in his work. An introduction by Lunacharsky ensured that the English readers of the edition would get the correct idea about the Soviet Union’s stance on Tolstoy and this particular novel. To return to the four points of my methodology, clearly Piskarev’s biography is the leading force underlying these illustrations.
CHAPTER FOUR: ALEKSANDR SAMOKHVALOV’S PAINTINGS FOR ANNA KARENINA FOR THE
STATE PUBLISHING HOUSE OF LITERATURE, MOSCOW, 1953

The Samokhvalov illustrated edition of Anna Karenina marks a significant departure
from the Sytin and Piskarev editions: first, it was not intended for the wealthy bibliophile, and,
second, ideological considerations completely determined its production. It emerged during a
period when the Soviet publishing sector had recovered from the losses sustained during the
Second World War and then surpassed pre-war levels (Walker “Soviet Publishing” 73). In
tandem with this was the post-war culturally conservative policy called the Zhdanovshchina,
when state intervention in publishing became so heavy-handed that it was second only to that of
the 1930s (69). Whereas there had been a brief softening on cultural policy during the war, now
the state was again imposing its Socialist Realist agenda. Literature was again valued mostly for
its ability to raise class consciousness, promote patriotic values and for its demonstration of the
benefit the CPSU had brought to the land since 1917.99

The Samokhvalov Anna Karenina is a product of its time. Its large format and
illustrations flaunt the publishing sector’s recovery and new potential. At the same time, it
reveals the state’s ideological agenda. The decision to publish the edition and commission

99 Zhdanovshchina (often called The Zhdanov Doctrine) takes its name after Central Committee Secretary Andrei
Aleksandrovich Zhdanov (1896-1948). Zhdanovshchina began to impact Soviet literature in early 1946 with the
Central Committee’s decree of 14 August which made specific reference to the two literary journals published in
Leningrad, Zvezda and Leningrad. This decree was published in an abridged form in Pravda on 21 August 1946 and
set the tone for the Soviet Union’s hard line on culture in the years immediately after the war (cf. O partiiinoi
pechati: sbornik dokumentov 566).
Samokhvalov most certainly came from the very top of the state apparatus. As a result, this book and its illustrations reveal a desire to influence how readers will interpret Tolstoy’s novel. In order to understand why the authorities wanted to exert this control we must discuss who the state envisaged as the intended reader of the book and understand the publication history of Tolstoy’s works in the first decades of Soviet rule. Before addressing these issues, however, I will briefly discuss the book’s format and specifications in order to demonstrate its importance in post-war publishing and to compare it to the editions of *Anna Karenina* I discuss in the other chapters.

**FORMAT AND SPECIFICATIONS**

The book is a remarkable demonstration of how quickly Soviet publishing had recovered from the losses it sustained during the Great Patriotic War. Its high quality fulfilled a propagandistic role and brought prestige to Goslitizdat (Walker “Re: Soviet Publishing Question”). The cultural importance of *Anna Karenina* lent additional weight to its propagandistic value. The book’s dimensions are large. The book’s page size is 220 X 270

---

100 “‘Seen from the viewpoint of the publishing-house, Party policy will impinge on it from several different points: as instructions from the Central Committee and consultations with its Department of Propaganda, either directly or through the State Committee for Publishing; through local Party organs (in the case of provincial publishing-houses); through Party representatives on the house’s editorial council; and through the constant interaction between the management and the house’s own organization of Party members” (Walker Soviet Book Publishing Policy 22). Walker’s observations are based on his research in the 1970s, which imposes limitations on their applicability to the post-war years. Nevertheless, the role of the Party in publishing was profound, especially during periods of conservatism, as the 1930s, post-war years and 1970s were. As he mentions elsewhere, the Party control of publishing during the *Zhdanovshchina* was second only to that of the 1930s (“Soviet Publishing” 69). While the particularities of how control was exerted may have varied from period to period, clearly the fact of control remained consistent throughout. The censor’s number that appears on the final page of each volume of this *Anna Karenina*—A-03660—indicates that this book was not spared this high level of scrutiny (Walker “Re: Soviet Publishing Question”).

101 I wish to thank the Library of the State Tolstoy Museum in Moscow for granting me access to the copy of this edition of *Anna Karenina* in its collection.

102 Friedberg observes that the Soviet Union published more literature after the 1917 revolution and the victory of the Great Patriotic War in an effort to impress “its own subjects and the entire world with its splendid cultural achievements” (46). Though there is no formal mention anywhere on the book, its publication may also have been a tacit acknowledgment of the 125th anniversary of Tolstoy’s birth.
mm, roughly the same height as the Sytin and Piskarev editions, but broader. It is divided into two volumes, with Parts I-IV in Volume I and Parts V-VIII in Volume II. Each volume has a red hardcover. The author’s name and the title are stamped in gold on the face. This information is stamped again on each spine along with a black motif which is repeated in red on the title page of each volume. This motif is highly stylized and abstract, but may be agricultural, perhaps ears of rye or another grain. The book’s dust jackets are of beige paper with “L.N. Tolstoy” written across the top in bold charcoal colour and “Anna Karenina” beneath in cursive red script. Beneath is a charcoal-coloured asterisk. On the back of the dust jacket a small white label is affixed to the upper right corner. The label contains the grain motif identified from the spine, the author’s name and the book’s title in smaller versions of the same font on the cover. N. Il’ina designed all these external features (Khudozhestvennaia literatura 102).103 In total Samokhvalov made twenty-seven paintings for the edition. They are painted on canvas in gouache (Barsheva 55). They are all reproduced in full colour on glossy paper that is inserted throughout each volume and not counted in the pagination. These include one frontispiece (a portrait of Tolstoy in Volume I, Fig. 70) and twenty-six full-page plates (55).104 There is no formal list of illustrations in the book’s front matter, and this leads to some confusion. For instance, there are eight unattributed colour headpieces pasted at the opening of each of the novel’s parts that Barsheva does not include in her catalogue of Samokhvalov’s work.

---

103 The copy of the Samokhvalov Anna Karenina did not have these dust jackets. They may be seen on the website of this Soviet illustration enthusiast http://da-zdra-per-m.livejournal.com/38030.html.
104 See Appendix Three for a complete breakdown.
After the hardships of the Great Patriotic War, this book must have appeared miraculous (Fig. 71). Nevertheless, it seems unlikely that it would have attracted the same type of collector the Sytin and Piskarev editions had. The materials are not as fine: for example, the red material used to cover each volume looks like leather, but feels more like plastic, and the paper is nowhere near the quality of the rag paper Piskarev used in his book. The gold used to impress the title and author’s name on the cover is probably not real. The Samokhvalov edition had a print run of 20,000 copies, significantly larger than the Piskarev edition and probably larger than the Sytin edition too. The size of this tirage would have imposed material constraints upon it. These questions of quality and circulation necessarily lead to questions about who the intended reader was, and, by extension, the state’s purpose in publishing this book.

**SAMOKHVALOV’S ANNA KARENINA AND SOVIET READERSHIP**

Soviet publishing policy always envisaged three tiers of readership: specialized, non-specialized and children. Specialized literature was aimed at the higher educational establishments and members of the Soviet intelligentsia. Scholarly editions of Soviet classic literature were “remarkably free of political bias both in the selection of their contents and in the commentaries appended to them,” because the regime rationalized that it was better to provide their intellectual citizens with potentially subversive books than to face its resentment for withholding them (Friedberg 59-60). It is true that in the 1920s and 1930s children’s exposure to

---

105 *The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia* of 1979 characterizes readership in precisely these terms in its article on “Books.” Maurice Friedberg discusses these three categories in his chapter “Types of Volumes” in *Russian Classics in Soviet Jackets* (42-80), the main points of which I summarize here.
literature was highly ideological; through the remainder of the Soviet period children have access to a relatively impartial selection of classic Russian literature. “Because of their youth and exclusively Soviet education,” children could be safely entrusted with reading ideologically objectionable authors. Likewise, it was reasoned, young readers would be more interested in the story than in the philosophical or intellectual overtones of a novel (Friedberg 69-71). While books destined for the intelligentsia and children made it to bookshelves more or less intact, the same cannot be said of books aimed at the nation’s least literate adults, the proletariat and agricultural workers—the so-called non-specialized or common readers. Because this group read the least, the state had fewer opportunities to reach it and for this reason was anxious to exploit contact with it (Friedberg 62). A book intended for this tier of reader was “to a much greater degree than those intended for other audiences a medium of political indoctrination” (Friedberg 62).

What type of reader did Goslitizdat have in mind when it created the large edition of Anna Karenina with Samokhvalov’s illustrations? It is normally easy to determine this information because of an index number included with the other publication data at the end of a Soviet book. “This is a code designation for the nature of the book and reader for whom it is intended, assigned in accordance with a prescribed table, and is important because it is a factor in setting the price” (Gorokhoff 10-1). There is no such index number at the end of the Samokhvalov Anna Karenina; nevertheless, we can determine some things about its intended audience. It was not a children’s edition. The most important illustrated children’s edition of Anna Karenina, originally published in 1939 and parts of which republished in 1950, contains the work of Nikolai Tyrsa (Konashevich 208-16; Bodnarskii 82). It precluded the need for another children’s edition of the novel since central planning could ill afford overlapping in
publication, and, in any case, very few resources were devoted to children’s literature at this time (Gorokhoff 46-7). Its publication at Goslitizdat suggests that the Samokhvalov’s edition was either aimed at the third tier of reader or at the intelligentsia. It was a large publisher, and, in addition to creating smaller academic editions, it produced mass circulation paperback publications that included works of classic literature (Gorokhoff 107). The higher production value of this edition of Anna Karenina suggests it was an exceptional book for the publisher. The book was probably published with the aim of raising the publisher’s profile in the eyes of the Ministry of Culture (Walker “Re: Soviet Publishing Question”). In other words, Goslitizdat’s place in the overall Soviet publishing agenda does not explain the sort of reader it wanted to reach with this particular book.

This lack of clarity may be a reflection of the publisher’s own confusion about who would have wanted to read the book. The Soviet Union ceased conducting studies of its readership at the end of the 1920s (Brooks “Studies of the Reader” 202), and such research did not resume until the early 1960s (Walker “Soviet Publishing” 70). The designation of three tiers of readers provided the state planners with the basic structure they needed in order to devise publishing quotas and policies, but without any solid research this meant they could not keep abreast of any demographic changes when it came to reading practices in the nation (Walker “Soviet Publishing” 70). By the early-mid 1950s the state took virtually no interest in reader demand and attempted to limit the reading choices of its citizens (Gorokhoff 46). Gorokhoff demonstrates this by looking at the statistics for unsold books from 1941 to 1956.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unsold Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>295 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1 490 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1 602 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1 981 000 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The growing productivity of the post-war publishing sector and the conservative cultural policy of the Zhdanovshchina would have collaborated to exacerbate this problem: the state had the power to publish more books than ever before, but many of the books it published were not popular with the public. The state did not appreciate just how much the Soviet people’s intellectual and cultural tastes had matured. That it was largely responsible for fostering its people’s literacy with its concerted education and library policies since the 1920s makes its lack of connection curious.

There is no doubt that there was a rapid increase in literacy between 1930 and 1950. Gorokhoff points to the momentum the Soviet educational system had gathered since the war: “There were 2 633 000 persons with higher education in the USSR in 1956 as contrasted with 908 000 in 1941” (Gorokhoff 3). This in turn led to a general increase in interest in literature. Though his data only pertain to the number of copies and not titles, Gorokhoff shows how the publication of literary works more than doubles over a ten-year period: in 1946 literature comprised 15% of all publication in the USSR, in 1954 23.3% and in 1957 32.3% (Gorokhoff 16). It is not possible to attribute all of this growth to the non-specialized reader. Nevertheless, some must be attributable to it, perhaps even a lot. After all, of all the classes of readers, this was the largest and it was undergoing the most dramatic changes.

Post-war library policies of the USSR provide another strong indication that this class of reader was changing dramatically. During this time, priority was given to increasing the

---

106 These data refer to all books published and not just works of literature (Gorokhoff 46).
107 Reader demand always played a minor role in Soviet publishing policy: “It has never been officially accepted since the October Revolution that Soviet publishing should respond exclusively to reader demand, whether expressed or anticipated” (Walker “Post-War Readership” 163).
collections of rural, district and regional libraries, the total number of libraries grew, and networks were established between the Lenin Library and other ones (Raymond 131-2). Naturally, this was a centralized process, and, given the social position of most rural and regional readers, its primary purpose was the inculcation of state ideology.

The Samokhvalov Anna Karenina may have been a tacit acknowledgement of this transformation and therefore would have been published with the hybrid intent of reaching both the specialized and non-specialized reader. Intellectuals may have been attracted to it because of its title and because they liked to acquire nice books. Samokhvalov’s participation may have been a draw as well: his name was familiar to many Soviet intellectuals because of his illustrations that appeared in the scholarly publications of «Academia» in the 1930s. Gregory Walker proposes that the Samokhvalov Anna Karenina may have ended up in the hands of non-specialized readers as well, either by means of libraries or direct ownership. For example, it may have been offered as a “presentation gift” to acknowledge a worker’s achievement (“Re: Soviet Publishing Question”). The book’s circulation of 20 000 copies, which, as noted above, was sizable for a large-format illustrated edition, suggests that its designation was not limited to an elite group of bibliophiles.

The obvious ideological message contained in Samokhvalov’s illustrations is the strongest indication that the book was intended for non-specialized readers. After all, the state was most anxious to influence their interpretation. In a following section of this chapter I will discuss how these illustrations fulfill a propagandistic role; but first I will examine why Goslitizdat thought it was necessary to foreground Anna Karenina in this way and to

---

108 Raymond notes that by 1956 a network of 50,000 rural public libraries was serving 16 million Soviet readers (132).
109 I will go into greater detail about Samokhvalov’s work for «Academia» when I discuss his career below.
demonstrate that the state’s attitude towards the novel was part of its long-term ideological agenda with regards to literature and specifically Tolstoy.

**NON-SPECIALIZED PUBLICATION OF TOLSTOY, 1929-1953**

Beginning with the First Five-Year Plan and ending with Stalin’s death, the publication of Tolstoy’s works designated for non-specialized readers went through three discernible phases: i) the early-mid 1930s, ii) the late 1930s and war years and iii) the Zhdanovshchina, 1946-1953. Ideology was always the primary motivation for publishing Tolstoy during each of these periods; what differed was the specific ideological role Tolstoy’s work was intended to fill.

In the early-mid 1930s the state published the author’s shorter and ideologically useful works in order to promote literacy and develop class consciousness. For example, *Polikushka* and *After the Ball* were the most widely published Tolstoy texts of the 1930s (Friedberg 34). This choice reflects the generally selective approach to Tolstoy publication in the first decades of the Soviet Union’s existence. It was important to present those aspects of Tolstoy’s writing that best suited the state’s needs. Tolstoy the Christian-anarchist, pacifist and vegetarian was to be suppressed at all costs (Nickell 22). *Polikushka* and *After the Ball* were ideologically safe works because they could be used as examples of the common man’s plight before 1917, thereby guiding him to acknowledge the beneficial role the Party’s leadership had played. *Polikushka*

---

110 The obvious exception to these data is the work on the Jubilee edition of the *Complete Works* which began in 1928. I do not include the Jubilee edition in this research because it was clearly aimed at the specialized reader.


112 The publishing house «Posrednik» continued to publish Tolstoy’s later radical works until the mid 1920s when the Soviet authorities shut it down (Friedberg 24-6).
ends with a peasant’s suicide, his life in tsarist Russia being too intolerable to bear. *After the Ball* shows the hypocrisy of the niceties of upper-class life by exposing the brutality that was necessary to sustain its comforts and pleasures. With access to the author’s work so limited, it was relatively easy to present a “red” Tolstoy to the new Soviet reader. These stories had the dual benefit of instilling the values of class consciousness in readers and of offering Tolstoy as a pre-revolutionary figure who was sympathetic to the core values of the new society.\(^{113}\)

By the eve of the Great Patriotic War, Tolstoy had become the most published author in the Soviet Union (Friedberg 37), and, just as in the pre-war years, the approach to publishing his work was selective and reflected ideological and civic needs. Now emphasis was placed on his war stories, the aim being to promote patriotism and war-readiness (Friedberg 35). Works like *War and Peace*, *Tales of Sevastopol* and *Khadzhi-Murat* were printed repeatedly during the late 1930s and early 1940s (Friedberg 37; cf. Bodnarskii). *War and Peace* was often published only in relevant fragments during the 1930s: for example, in 1938 selections of the novel were included in a book entitled *The Expulsion of Napoleon from Moscow* (*Izgnanie Napoleona iz Moskvy*) (Bodnarskii 74).

The German invasion affected the publishing sector just as destructively as it did every other aspect of Soviet life (Walker “Soviet Publishing since the October Revolution” 73).\(^{114}\) However, as a testament to its significance as propaganda, paper shortages and the general destruction did not prevent publishers from printing *War and Peace*: it appears in an edition of 100 000 copies in 1941 and 105 000 copies in 1944 (Bodnarskii 98). In addition to the entire

---

\(^{113}\) In addition to ideological considerations, there was a very practical reason for limiting publication of Tolstoy to short works such as these. As mentioned in the previous chapter, paper shortages made it inefficient to publish novels like *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*. One copy of *War and Peace* was the equivalent of hundreds of copies of *Polikushka*. In a nation desperate to increase its people’s literacy—and to do so along ideological lines—it made better sense to publish the shorter work (Friedberg 28).

\(^{114}\) For example, Walker notes that paper production fell from 730,000 tonnes in 1941 to 166,000 tonnes in 1942 and that book production fell from 39,800 titles (548 million copies) in 1941 to 17,300 titles (218 million copies) in 1944 (“Soviet Publishing since the October Revolution.” 73).
novel, sections of *War and Peace* appear in magazines, newspapers and pamphlets throughout the war years: in 1941, Volume IV, Part III, where the courage of the peasant guerrillas is described, was published in an edition of 150,000 in *Pravda* and a 56-page “Battle of Borodino” in 100,000 copies (Friedberg 37; Bodnarskii 94); in 1942 and 1943, selections of the novel appear in patriotic books with titles like *The Banner of Ancestors* (*Znamia predkov*) and *Motherland: A Collection of Statements about the Motherland by Russian Writers* (*Rodina: sbornik vyskazyvanii russkikh pisatelei o rodine*) (Bodnarskii 95, 97). *Khadzhi-Murat* and *Tales of Sevastopol* were published during the war as well: for example, when the war broke out in 1941, Voenizdat\(^{115}\) issued an edition of 150,000 copies of *Tales of Sevastopol* (Friedberg 37).\(^{116}\)

One result of these publishing practices is that *Anna Karenina* was not available to the average Soviet reader until after the Second World War. The following table is gleaned from Bodnarskii’s bibliography of Tolstoy’s works. It shows how publishing practice affected *Anna Karenina*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publishing House</th>
<th>No. of Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>20,000 (vol. one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>20,000 (vol. two)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Minsk Goslitizdat</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Lenizdat</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Goslitizdat</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kaunas Gosizdat kh. lit-y</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Kuybushev Oblgiz</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{115}\) Voenizdat was the publishing house of the Red Army.

\(^{116}\) These wartime publication practices were echoed by the libraries’ attempt to encourage readership of war literature. A few months after the invasion of the USSR by German forces, the Commissariat of Education, Narkompros, instructed libraries to inculcate patriotism in the civilian population. In response to this directive, many libraries created “war corners” in their reading rooms “where military literature, together with appropriate current newspaper clippings and war photographs, was displayed, and where independent learners’ circles studying military topics could gather” (Raymond 130).
Anna Karenina appeared in 1928, 1935, 1936-7 and 1939. The publication of these editions is relatively small and they have forewords written by the leading Tolstoy scholar and early leading editor of PSS Nikolai Kallinikovich Gudzii. These factors suggest that these editions were intended for the intelligentsia.\textsuperscript{118} This table is consistent with Friedberg’s presentation of Soviet publishing policy before the Great Patriotic War: there was little interest in publishing Anna Karenina and certainly no interest whatsoever in making it available to the non-specialized reader. Paper limitations meant it was too large to publish. Also, in the years leading up to the war, it did not have the ideological significance of other Tolstoy works.

Things changed dramatically after 1946. Anna Karenina is no longer published exclusively by the central publishing houses, but by regional publishing houses as well, some of them bearing the name Obshchee literaturnoe gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo (General State Publishing House), indicating their designation as non-intelligentsia publishers (Friedberg 63-4). The figures for 1953 are the most dramatic, with an edition of 200 000 copies published in

\textsuperscript{117} Source: Bodnarskii et al. These data only reflect editions published in the Russian language. Editions of Anna Karenina included with larger collected works like the 1928 Complete Works (PSS) are not included, nor are children’s editions. As mentioned earlier, the N.A. Tyrsa illustrations accompanied a children’s edition in 1939 in an edition of 50 000 copies. The penultimate entry on the list—20 000 copies in 1953—refers to the edition containing Aleksandr Samokhvalov’s illustrations.

\textsuperscript{118} The interest in Anna Karenina in the mid 1930s may be in anticipation of and response to the stage adaptation of the MKhAT Theatre of 1937. See Moskovskii khudozhestvennyi teatr Anna Karenina v postanovke Moskovskogo ordena Lenina Khudozhestvennogo akademicheskogo teatra Sovuza SSR imeni M. Gor’kogo. Moskva: Izdanie MKhAT, 1938. (Moscow Artistic Theatre. Anna Karenina in the Staging by the M. Gorky Moscow Artistic Theatre of the Order of Lenin of the USSR. Moscow: MKhAT, 1938).
Moscow, 100,000 copies in Ukraine and the 20,000 copies of Samokhvalov’s illustrated edition. If *Anna Karenina* had been considered an intellectual luxury prior to the war, it was now of more general interest. Indeed it must have become available to many readers for the first time, and surely this is why Samokhvalov’s illustrations are so blatantly propagandistic. If the Ministry of Culture was planning to increase reader access to *Anna Karenina*, it wanted to ensure it presented the novel from an official ‘party’ point of view.\(^{119}\)

**IDEOLOGICAL ANNA KARENINA**

While the propagandistic use of *Anna Karenina* might not be obvious, Aleksandr Samokhvalov paints scenes and characters that make it explicit. Peasants make several appearances, thus representing class consciousness; there are scenes of aristocratic decay and animosity, revealing the internal fragmentation and inevitable self-destruction of class enemies; Karenin is an inhuman bureaucrat\(^ {120}\) with a monstrous temper and a stereotypically Jewish appearance;\(^ {121}\) and Nikolai Levin is presented as a righteous, if physically damaged, pre-revolutionary radical.\(^ {122}\) Taken together, these illustrations are the visual equivalent of the Leninist interpretation of *Anna Karenina* in Lunacharsky’s introduction to the Piskarev edition. In the Samokhvalov book there is no verbal introduction. His illustrations are allowed to speak for themselves and just like Lunacharsky’s introduction to the earlier book, they make Tolstoy’s

---

\(^{119}\) *Partiinost’* was a euphemism used during the Soviet years to characterize the appropriateness of a given idea. If an idea displayed *partiinost’,* then it was deemed an expression that cohered well to the Communist Party’s doctrine.

\(^{120}\) Barsheva likes Samokhvalov’s portrayal of Karenin for all the correct ideological reasons: “Amongst the best pages in the series are the illustrations of the figure of Karenin. He has a dry character, a rational person, a cold-hearted official and a typical representative of the high-ranking bureaucracy” (44).

\(^{121}\) The years of Zhdanovshchina were not only an era of cultural conservatism, but also anti-Semitism. Between 1949 and 1953, accusations of “rootless cosmopolitanism” (*bezrodnyi kosmopolitizm*) were used to subdue the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee and its efforts to document the Holocaust atrocities. From the Party’s perspective, stereotypically Jewish features may have offered Samokhvalov the opportunity to present Karenin with the “correct” visual cues of villainy.

\(^{122}\) The Socialist Realist hero as the bearer of ideological righteousness and physical degradation is the thesis of Lilya Kaganovsky’s recent book, *How the Soviet Man was Unmade: Cultural Fantasy and Male Subjectivity under Stalin*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburg P, 2008.
novel appear less of a tragedy about moral agency than a demonstration of the Marxist principle of class struggle. *Anna Karenina* anticipates the self-destruction of class enemies and the emergence of the newly enfranchised social groups, the so-called “progressive” classes.

Boris Groys’ discussion of the “art of totality” in totalitarian painting offers a useful framework for identifying and articulating how Samokhvalov visually represents this class struggle. Groys argues that the underlying “totality” of Stalinist art means that Socialist Realism departs significantly from its expected course. Whereas critics often claim that “the most important goals of the totalitarianism of the 1930s were the creation of societal homogeneity and the exclusion of the other,” in fact, the so-called art of totality portrays its opposite—a world of total and permanent struggle (96). This art does not exclude or censor the enemy; on the contrary, opponents to the ideology are an important component of a painting’s iconography. They must be included. “Mere exclusion of the other would have left something outside the totality—even if that something were just nothingness—so that the totality would have ceased being a totality” (96).

The aim of totalitarian art is to fill the largest possible territory with specific signs that are identifiable as ‘our’ signs in contrast to ‘their’ signs...Thus, totalitarian art always makes itself present within the context of the total battle. (98)

With this characterization in mind, one should expect Samokhvalov’s illustrations to be filled with struggle where the heroes are transparent models of socialist virtue and the foes blatantly retrograde and full of animosity.

While Groys’ definition is useful, a few qualifications are necessary in the present case. Samokhvalov’s illustrations can only be considered under the rubric of “art of totality” when

---

123 Groys focuses on the 1930s in order to compare Soviet totalitarianism to its German counterpart; the aesthetic system he describes is equally applicable to the immediate post-war years (cf. Alexander Kamenski. “Art in the Twilight of Totalitarianism.” *Art of the Soviets: Painting, Sculpture and Architecture in a One-Party State, 1917-1992.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993. 154-60.)
taken together. They do depend on the iconography of “ours” and “theirs,” an ideological *svoi* and *chuzhoi*, but this conflict is rarely explicitly contained in any one illustration. For the most part each one either depicts the signs that support the ideology or those that oppose it. Taken collectively, these 27 illustrations do reveal two opposing worldviews and are absolutely transparent in which side they support.\(^{124}\) Conflict is an essential feature of many of these illustrations, but Samokhvalov never goes so far as to pit a peasant against his lord. Another necessary qualification is that there are certain illustrations that merely render important plot points in the novel. A good example is the painting of Kitty and Levin playing *secrétaire* in Part IV, chapter xiii. No Soviet schema underlies this image. These sorts of illustrations are few, however. Overall, Samokhvalov’s illustrations offer a rereading of Tolstoy’s novel from a Soviet and totalitarian point of view, something I will now demonstrate.

**Peasants**

When Lenin mentions Tolstoy’s interest in the “progressive” classes in his article “L.N. Tolstoy and his Epoch” he is referring mainly to the peasants. In the drive to make *Anna Karenina* an effective piece of propaganda it was therefore necessary to focus on the peasantry and their role in the class struggle. L.N. Uspenskii’s essay on *Anna Karenina* illustrates this approach.

The writer has almost all the central characters in the story make contact with people from the peasantry, surrounding the former with the latter, and therefore the pages in the novel give a clear impression of the existence of two opposing worlds: the closed circle of wealthy possessors of power on the one hand and, on

---

\(^{124}\) That is not to say that this struggle is completely antithetical to Tolstoy. To be sure, he aims his satire at the urban aristocracy and endorses the life of the peasantry. In both Soviet discourse and Tolstoyan aesthetics, the latter is valued more highly than the former. The difference is that Marxism looks at economics as the crux of a conflict that must end in the destruction of “wrong” party; in Tolstoy, lord is inferior to peasant primarily because he suffers from too much self-consciousness. The peasant is less self-conscious and therefore freer and more authentic. Whereas Samokhvalov wants us to consider the economic differences between classes, Tolstoy considered the cultural, behavioural and psychological differences between them.
the other, the broadest classes of the working people, labouring for their lord and thereby giving him the chance to live an idle and parasitic life.

The novel demonstrates both sharp contradictions and animosity between lords and peasants. (247-8)

The novel does express concern about the disparity between rich and poor, but it does not characterize this as a class conflict, nor does it propose a Marxist resolution to the problem. Nevertheless, Lenin, Uspensky and other Soviet critics have pointed to the portrayal of peasants in the novel as one of the clearest signs of its significance to Soviet discourse. Samokhvalov follows their lead. In all, there are seven paintings involving peasants in this edition, which amounts to almost a quarter of its illustrations: there are more paintings of peasants than of characters as important as Stiva and Karenin, for example. This emphasis aims to show that Tolstoy “identified internally with the upward-striving, progressive classes” (Groys 108).

---

125 Even Uspenskii must concede that there is no moment of blatant class struggle depicted anywhere in the novel: “Amongst the common characters in the novel there is not a single portrayal of a peasant who openly struggles against the landowners” (248). While it is true that the novel is not built around the principle of class struggle, it is curious that Uspenskii does not make more of moments in the novel such as the peasants’ refusal to accept Levin’s plans to rearrange the estate. Likewise, why did Samokhvalov not include an illustration of a scene like this in his collection? The most likely answer is that it was necessary to present Levin as a positive character and thereby overlook any conflicts he may have had with his peasants.
Often when peasants appear, the painting’s composition emphasizes them. Take for instance figures 72 and 73. The first depicts the moment when Dolly has bathed her children and starts conversing with the peasant women (III.viii). Technically, Dolly lies at the painting’s focal point, but she clearly is not its main focus. The peasant women engulf her and her children. Their animated features overshadow her serene expression of maternal pride, and the vibrant colours of their attire drown out her white dress. Though one cannot say that there is any of Groys’ conflict in this image, there nevertheless is a competition for space, and the peasants win. They are everywhere. Even Matryona Filiminovna may be seen in the shade on the left and the coachman Terenty is visible snoozing in the distant background. Dolly’s children almost get lost, immersed in the mass and embraced by the collective identity. Instead of her look of tranquil affirmation, one might expect Dolly to show signs of claustrophobic distress. In the second painting peasants watch from afar as Anna and Vronsky’s entourage greet Dolly on the way to Vozdvizhensk (VI.xvii). Again, the painting’s focuses on the peasants, offering an intimate look at their demeanours, tools and clothing. The main characters are virtually unidentifiable. Only Anna can be clearly detected in her black riding habit. Otherwise the aristocrats are little more than grey specks on the horizon.

As one might have expected, the illustration of the mowing scene is the most important painting of peasants in Samokhvalov’s collection (Fig. 74). It also emphasizes the peasants through composition. The older peasant stands prominently, confidently and powerfully at the top of the hill and in the foreground, with Levin and the young peasant
immediately behind him. A trail of mowers falls behind them, streaming down the hill, gradually growing fainter and smaller. Although this is precisely the order in which the mowers work in the novel, Samokhvalov’s composition imparts something heroic to the old peasant. He is not a classic hero like Achilles who is unique and supremely individual; he is a Socialist Realist ideal prototype and role model. Samokhvalov was accustomed to this approach to painting figures and used it repeatedly throughout the 1930s in his proletarian portraits.

The properties of model workers and peasants shown in portraits of the 1930s were not meant to be actual individual traits, but physical signifiers of their social identification and importance. Persons in Socialist Realism were thus carefully defined social bodies whose physical properties were to be typical ideals for one production-sector of Stalinist society or another.

All those ‘portraits’ of tractor-drivers, factory workers, sportsmen and women by Samokhvalov, Ryazhski, Deineka, Gerasimov and others were not supposed to carry individual values or personal traits of characters because their soul only exists—at least in representation—in the material emblems of their production class, such as hammer, pick-axe, headscarf or worker’s cap. (Holz 75)

This peasant in the foreground of Samokhvalov’s painting is one such representative of the agrarian production class. Vera Chaikovskaia calls this technique Samokhvalov’s “paradoxical ‘We’”: he uses a portrait to express the collective rather than an individual identity (146-9).

Samokhvalov increases the importance of collective identity by making Levin almost unidentifiable. Comparing this illustration to the narrator’s account in the novel, Levin must be the second man working to the left of the older peasant; if we compare this man to the other illustrations Samokhvalov made of Levin, however, it is hard to be sure. In other illustrations by Samokhvalov Levin looks exactly like Tolstoy; here he looks quite different. The individuality and identification of a major character like Levin is less important than a general scene depicting peasant labour. The net result is more important than any one of the participants, including the lord. The group’s diligence as they work towards a common goal unifies the whole image, and the bird’s eye view of the world behind them, the world they have mowed so far, suggests the
imperialistic impact of their work—this is the land they have conquered with their collective labour. If the peasants are not yet building socialism, they are certainly well on their way there.

By making the old man a model, the illustration transforms his relationship to Levin into that of the mentor to his apprentice. True, the old peasant does fulfill the role of teacher in the novel, but the presence of ideology makes the relationship reminiscent of Katerina Clark’s characterization of the prototypical plot that motivates Socialist Realist literature, whereby a younger, vital, but misguided character learns how to channel his energy to better help build socialism from an older, ideological master (Clark 167). The significance of Levin’s connection to the peasant is removed from its context in the novel and commandeered into the service of Socialist Realism itself. Levin continues to appear as the novice in all the remaining illustrations in the Samokhvalov edition where he appears with peasants. Again and again, Levin learns from the peasants, and, significantly, these lessons often taken on social and economic importance. Figure 75 is a painting of Levin’s stop at the wealthy peasant’s farm in Surov District on his way to visit Svyiazhsky (III.xxv). Again, the composition emphasizes the peasants: they are located in the foreground, while Levin, who here bears a remarkable resemblance to Tolstoy, is in the background. More important than the peasants are their ploughs and harrows, indicating that this chapter provides a valuable lesson in political economy and agriculture, and, most significantly, it is one that lord learns from peasant. Perhaps most readers recall this chapter for the peasant’s daughter in galoshes with the “comely face” who flusters Levin as she brings water, but she is
nowhere to be found. Samokhvalov deletes her because she might distract readers from the ideological aspect that he wants to foreground, and she might even suggest that her presence influences Levin’s favourable opinion of the wealthy peasant’s farm. The most striking illustration of Levin’s apprenticeship is Fig. 76 where a confused Fyodor has just revealed how Platon “lives for God.” We barely see Levin as he walks off the page. Fyodor, the source of wisdom and the seeming resolution to all of Levin’s doubts, stands at the very heart of the painting.

The Aristocracy and Karenin

It is tempting to interpret the opulent scenery of Samokhvalov’s portrayal of high society as his way of presenting the aristocracy in the ideologically correct manner. After all, if Stalinist art entails a battle of signs, then tsarist uniforms, ballroom gowns and jewelry and elegantly decorated interiors are bearers of negative meaning. While this is certainly an important way to read these paintings, Samokhvalov goes a step further by showing that, in contrast to the unity of the peasants, the aristocracy is marked by its internal discord and competition. If the paintings of the peasantry suggest an emergent class consciousness by showing the group’s sense of community and cohesion, then the paintings of the aristocracy present a fractured group always filled with internal enmity. Each image is composed around a confrontation. Kitty resists Anna at the ball, society judges Anna at the opera, Karenin avoids eye contact with his peers at court, and

126 Other illustrators emphasize the peasant girl when they draw this scene and pay no attention at all to the peasants’ tools. See Shcheglov’s illustration (30 In Appendix One) and Vereiskii’s (62 In Appendix Four)
the participants at the provincial election look like they are on the verge of pouncing on each other. If Groys sees the art of totality as always representing a struggle between positive and negative signs, Samokhvalov tends to confine conflict to this group. He suggests that the aristocracy’s self-destruction is imminent.

The aristocrats judge each other and laugh at each other’s misfortunes and Samokhvalov shows this with their eyes. This is clear not only in what they look at, but also from the expressions on their faces as they gaze. When Anna tries to talk to Kitty in figure 77 we can see a woman in the background taking no small degree of cruel delight in Kitty’s failure. In the illustration of the steeplechase, most viewers are keen to observe the accident; meanwhile there are several people who take a greater interest in Anna’s behaviour and Karenin’s desire to conceal it, the middle-aged couple behind Karenin seems particularly engrossed in it (Fig. 78). When Karenin receives the Order of Alexander Nevsky the animosity is palpable (Fig. 79). Of course the little old man, “his eyes glinting maliciously,” is most significant, but the lady-in-waiting behind Karenin seems to look at him with envy and hatred too. Without doubt the most
important illustration in this regard is the one depicting Anna’s visit to the theatre. All eyes view Anna in a predatory fashion. These aristocrats appear almost inhuman: Samokhvalov has made their pupils and irises extremely small, and in some cases their eyeballs are completely white (Fig. 80).

Perhaps the strongest indicator of the moral decay of the tsarist regime is Samokhvalov’s portrayal of Karenin. He paints Karenin as a solitary man who uses aggression and intimidation to maintain control over Anna: in the painting of the steeplechase he looms large over her in his black suit and coat and in figure 81 he almost appears bestial as he tears Vronsky’s letters to Anna from her desk. Though Karenin is not a Jew, Samokhvalov gives him stereotypically dark hair and olive complexion. The Zhdanovshchina was a period marked by state-sponsored anti-Semitism. In this political context, giving these Jewish features to Karenin helped Samokhvalov create the visual cues necessary to mark him as a villain (Fig. 82).

During Soviet times it was not unusual to make Karenin the villain. An important precursor to Samokhvalov’s illustrations was the Moscow Art Theatre production of *Anna*
Karenina of 1937 which made him particularly monstrous.\textsuperscript{127} This tradition continued with Aleksandr Grigorievich Zarkhi’s 1967 film adaptation of the novel with Nikolai Olimpievich Gritsenko playing an utterly unforgiving and unforgivable Karenin. Samokhvalov’s illustrations contribute to this Soviet tradition.\textsuperscript{128}

\textbf{Nikolai Levin}

The final way in which these illustrations reframe Anna Karenina in ideologically correct terms is by emphasizing the importance of Nikolai Levin. Normally when illustrators choose to draw Nikolai, they limit their choice to his deathbed (V.xx). Interestingly, Samokhvalov is the only illustrator discussed in this research to not include a drawing of this pivotal scene. Instead he creates two paintings, each rendering a moment in the novel that is of interest to anyone.

\textsuperscript{127} This stage adaptation was filmed in 1953 with an older Alla Konstantinovna Tarasova still playing the leading role (Anna Karenina Dir. Tatiana Lukashevich). It not only provides a look at a Stalinist adaptation of Anna Karenina, but also demonstrates Peter Kenez’s point that the USSR underwent a period of “film hunger” after WWII when the fear of reprisals during Zhdanovshchina made it unwise to propose new film scripts. It was safe to put old plays on screen because they had already passed the censor (Kenez 188).

\textsuperscript{128} Sergei Aleksandrovich Soloviev’s recent Russian film adaptation of Anna Karenina (2009) attempts to undo this tradition by, first, paying no regard at all to the peasants, and, two, rehabilitating Karenin. In fact, the film turns him into the hero by overlooking Lydia Ivanovna’s influence over him and by showing him to be a sensitive and caring father at that film’s end.
looking for Marxist leanings in *Anna Karenina*: these are Part I, chapter xxv (Fig. 83) and Part III, chapter xxxii (Fig. 84).

Figure 83 shows Nikolai’s first appearance in the novel when he discusses the metal-working association in the presence of Kritsky, Marya Nikolaevna and his brother, Konstantin. Here Nikolai reveals himself to be concerned with raising the class consciousness of the muzhik. The illustration follows shortly after Nikolai’s explanation of why he and Kritsky are organizing the association. He espouses some of the main ideas of Karl Marx.

You know that capital oppresses the worker—the workers in our country, the muzhiks, bear all the burden of labour, and their position is such that, however much they work, they can never get out of the brutish situation. All the profits earned by their work, with which they might improve their situation, give themselves some leisure and, consequently, education, all surplus earnings are taken from them by the capitalists. And society has developed so that the more they work, the more gain there will be for the merchants and landowners, and there will always remain working brutes. And this order must be changed. (AK 88)

Samokhvalov uses this kernel of ideology to create an allegory of ideological enlightenment. This is clear from how he employs light in the painting. Nikolai and Kritsky, as bearers of the ideology, are bathed in the light; Konstantin, as a lord, is an obstacle to progress and thereby he quite literally blocks it from the viewer and appears almost as a silhouette. Though Nikolai Levin looks emaciated and weak, he is bathed in the same light of righteousness as Kritsky. He even holds fire in his hand in the form of a cigarette, the smoke billowing out perhaps representative of the industrial labour force he wants to reform. He gesticulates towards Kritsky, thereby suggesting his endorsement and his belief that the nation’s future rests with this man, his ideas, and, most of all, his actions.
Another important feature of this allegory is the looming fight between these two sides. Kritsky’s confrontational attitude towards Levin is explicit. His hand clenches into a tight fist and he holds his hat as if it were a noose. Marya Nikolaevna looks on warily at Kritsky as if bracing for a fight. Levin meets Kritsky’s gaze, but he seems too out of place in this setting as he sits unprepared with arms resting on his lap in his fur-collared great coat. Levin might be one of the novel’s two principal characters, but he is not the hero of this painting. That role is reserved for Kritsky, an odd compositional choice given his minor role in the novel.

The second illustration of Nikolai Levin renders his visit to Pokrovskoe at the end of Part III and continues to extract the novel’s ideological potential (Fig. 84). This image is more ambiguous than the last, however, and, at first glance, Samokhvalov appears to balance the novel’s presentation of the scene with the ideological reading he has to offer. In the novel, Nikolai does raise the issue of communism when he accuses Konstantin of conflating it with his own ideas, thereby depriving it of “everything that gives it force” (350). A few lines later, Nikolai predicts that communism “has a future. It is premature, but reasonable” (350). The novel undercuts these statements when it presents the brothers’ argument as a subterfuge for their authentic feelings and what they would truly say.

Konstantin would have said only, ‘You’re going to die, to die, to die! And Nikolai would have answered only, ‘I know I’m going to die, but I’m afraid, afraid, afraid!’ And they would have said nothing else, if they had spoken from the heart. (349)
This underlying drama makes the novel’s stance towards Nikolai ironic, taking Nikolai’s significance in a direction Samokhvalov cannot follow. Nevertheless, he does manage to express some ambiguity by conflating the drama of his composition with Nikolai’s illness. Light is also important in this illustration, and provides the source of ambiguity. A fireplace outside the field of representation casts underlit shadows on Nikolai’s face and hands: are these intended to lend dramatic weight to his status as a revolutionary or are they grotesque reminders of his illness and imminent death? Both one and the other could be true. His knuckles and fingers are elongated, which lend equal emphasis to his physical decay and to the passion underlying his arguments as he gesticulates. His stance is as aggressive as it is defensive. The illustration’s iconography paints a picture of desperation just as strongly as it represents conviction.

Of all the illustrations, this one is the most clear example of Groys’ contest of signs and therefore is ultimately more notable for its ideological message than its potential ambiguity. More than a contest between brothers, it is a contest between landowner and revolutionary. It presents Konstantin as the passively seated landowner, too comfortable to get up and act. Agafia Mikhailovna and Laska lie adjacent to him, demonstrating, anachronistically, that he owns people and animals as well as land.\(^\text{129}\) If Konstantin is a major character in the novel, clearly the illustrations intimate that he must learn the right messages before he can attain “family happiness.” Above we saw how the illustrations highlight the ways he learns from the peasants; now we see him taking lessons from Nikolai too. Samokhvalov attempts to lead us to interpret Nikolai’s grotesque features and gesticulations as transparent signs of righteousness made urgent by the prophet’s looming death. The painting therefore takes seriously Nikolai’s censure of Levin for conflating communism with his own ideas. It underscores its critique by significantly

\(^{129}\text{Serfdom was abolished in Russia in 1861.}\)
positioning Nikolai’s hand in front of Levin’s desk and notebooks, the very spot where Levin
makes his problematic reappraisals of Marx.

**SUMMATION: VERBAL AND VISUAL DISCOURSES**

Mitchell observes that “our understanding of an image is predicated upon an appeal to
language” (*Iconology* 45), a point J. Hillis Miller echoes.

A picture presents something, but what that something is cannot be known for
sure unless the picture is labeled, placed back within the context of some
diachronic narrative. The interpretation of a picture is […] necessarily verbal.
Without some explicit indication in words of what frozen narrative moment the
picture represents, the spectator vibrates back and forth among contradictory
alternative stories. The picture might be illustrating any one of them. (Miller 61-2)

In the case of Samokhvalov’s illustrations, two different discourses vie for the reader’s attention
and understanding. The discourse we would expect to use for reading these images is the
narrative of *Anna Karenina*. As propaganda, we have seen how they introduce a supplementary,
ideological one as well. To put it in semiotic terms, a signifier in one of Samokhvalov’s paintings
has two signifieds: a peasant, for example, refers at once to what the novel tells us about the
peasantry and to how the Soviet state wanted to present *Anna Karenina* as an anticipation of its
priorities and social values. The second political discourse attempts to intercept the reader’s
interpretation by formalizing it within the appropriate context of Soviet ideology.

The image plays a fundamental role in bringing these two discourses side by side. Surely
it was hoped that the immediacy of the image would leave a bigger impression on the reader than
the novel itself, especially if the reader came from the non-specialized category. He would have
depended heavily upon the illustrations for his comprehension and interpretation, at least
initially. As mentioned above, the clarity of the illustrations make the inclusion of an explanatory
introduction unnecessary.
And yet, despite their obvious propagandistic intent, Samokhvalov’s illustrations resist a purely political reading. The Soviet Union is no more, its ideology and cultural policies discredited, and yet many of Samokhvalov’s paintings retain their appeal. They offer more than an object lesson for succeeding empires. Though tied to the failed Soviet Union, they are not “fossils” signifying extinction.130

**SAMOKHVALOV’S FEMALE ICONOGRAPHY AND ANNA KARENINA**

Above I mention that peasant illustrations in this edition have two signifieds, but this overlooks a third, more subjective one—Samokhvalov’s. Though they do serve an ideological agenda, their significance exceeds the purely political. Samokhvalov was born of peasant stock and recounts his boyhood in rural Russia and his father’s work on the land in his autobiography. Perhaps these formative experiences pale in comparison with the ideological requirements his illustrations were meant to fulfill. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to regard these works, as Barsheva does, as entirely ideological.131 In addition to fulfilling an ideological role, they reveal an intimate knowledge of the peasant world, their tools and attire. This is especially clear in the mowing scene—in addition to the men’s scythes the artist gives us a look at the old peasant’s whetting stone, bast holster and small satchel containing his lunch. It is also clear in figure 73 where we see the peasants’ tools and clothing. In addition to their attention to detail, these illustrations reveal empathy for the peasants, who always appear noble and enviable for their

---

130 W.J.T. Mitchell discusses the significance of images as fossils in his *What Do Pictures Want?* (168)
131 “It is with great interest that Samokhvalov depicts the life of the peasants, attempting to portray the difficult circumstances under which the people found themselves in tsarist Russia” (44).
good health and camaraderie. If *Anna Karenina* truly revealed the parasitic dependency the aristocracy had on its peasants, then one would expect Samokhvalov’s paintings to depict downtrodden and abused people. We know that Samokhvalov had resorted to this technique in the past when he illustrated Saltykov-Shchedrin’s *History of a Town* in 1933, to be discussed below. The peasants in that work appear ghoulish and worn out (Fig. 85); this is never the case in his illustrations for *Anna Karenina*.

Samokhvalov’s addition of his own subjective discourse is most apparent in his paintings of Anna, which need to be framed in the context of his unique portrayal of women throughout his entire career. Though in the post-Soviet period he is often dismissed as a leading example of socialist realism and therefore a cultural opportunist, Chaikovskaia suggests that his consistent interest in painting women reveals a complex relationship to the regime (151). Having formed most of his artistic views during the 1910s and 1920s, Samokhvalov had exposure to the values of the Russian Symbolists and the Soviet avant-garde. He was therefore initially enthusiastic about the revolution in his country and then found himself in uncertain waters with the sea changes that accompanied Stalin’s rise to power. Samokhvalov did conform to these new circumstances, creating his share of paintings of Lenin, Stalin and other male political figures. However, his participation in this exceedingly patriarchal and monolithic political machine led to anxieties that were expressed in his fear and resentment of these powerful men and his obsession with creating paintings of strong, heroic Soviet amazons—a panoply of ideological *bogatyrshi* painted in numerous series and projects throughout the 1930s (151-62). These paintings still served as propaganda, of course, but they also allowed the artist to focus on his personal response to totalitarianism. Before demonstrating how his illustrations of Anna continue his
theme of powerful women, I will discuss Samokhvalov’s biography and offer a periodization of
his long career as an illustrator.

ALEKSANDR NIKOLAEVICH SAMOKHALOV (1894-1971)

Samokhvalov had the correct pedigree to succeed in the Soviet cultural environment. He
was born in Tverskaia gubernia in 1894 in the town of Bezhetsk.132 His father was a former farm
labourer who managed to eke out a decent enough living to send Aleksandr to trade school in the
nearest town of Kaliazin, where he was trained in various skills such as machining,
cabinetmaking and blacksmithing. The school in Kaliazin closed down before Samokhvalov
graduated. Upon his return to Bezhetsk, he met a wandering artist who inspired him to try
painting (Zinger 3). Another important formative experience was a trip he took to Moscow with
his father. In his autobiography Moi tvorcheskii put’ he emphasizes the impression the Tretiakov
Gallery made on him, stressing the work of Mikhail Vrubel in particular (31-4). He subsequently
enrolled into the Real College in Bezhetsk and studied drawing under Ivan Makhalovich
Kostenko (34). Before graduation, he spent a year in Petrograd where he studied under Ia. S.
Gol’dblatt in preparation for his enrolment to the Academy of Arts. In addition to these formal
lessons, he paid regular visits to the Hermitage and the Russian Museum (Zinger 4). By 1917,
Samokhvalov had already had several exhibits and had even participated in a group exhibit with
Mir iskusstva. In the months between February and October 1917, Samokhvalov collaborated
with workers in the creation of placards and slogans in support of the revolution (Zinger 5).

132 The principal sources of information about Samokhvalov’s life and work are few: A. Samokhvalov. Moi
Interestingly, after initially taking a great interest in the revolution, Samokhvalov left Petrograd to return to his native Bezhetsk until the end of 1919 (Chaikovskaia 139).

His most important source of artistic training came from Kuz’ma Sergeevich Petrov-Vodkin, his professor at the Academy from 1919-1923. Petrov-Vodkin is probably most famous for his nude paintings, like Boys (Mal’chiki) 1911, Bathing of the Red Horse (Kupanie krasnogo konia) 1912, and Morning, Bathers (Utro, kupal’shchitsy) 1917 (Figures 86, 87, and 88 respectively). The most important influence Petrov-Vodkin exerted on Samokhvalov was an interest in medieval Russian art, a style the young artist continued to study intensively throughout the 1920s. For two summers he worked on the restoration of Georgievskii sobor in Staraia Ladoga and then spent an additional summer studying the frescoes at Navolok and other frescoes near Novgorod, such as the ones at Nereditsa, Volotovo pole and Kovalevo (Samokhvalov V gody bespokoinogo solntsa 193; Chaikovskaia 145).
These medieval frescoes, mostly destroyed during the Great Patriotic War, had a permanent impact on Samokhvalov’s approach to socialist realism (Chaikovskaia 145). According to Samokhvalov, one thing that drew him to them was their material connection to architecture, something that endowed them with what he called monumentalism or *monumental’nost*. Occupying entire walls and containing powerful religious imagery, they had the power to engulf the viewer and leave him awestruck.

I lived for the summer in the countryside around Novgorod, and the frescoes of those churches, the still intact church of Nereditsa and churches of Volotovo and Kovalevo, distinct in artistic expression, in the professional essence of that expression, in the level of national spirit and in the nature of its effect, taught me a lot. In many cases, as with Nereditsa, Volotovo and Kovalevo, these were not fragments but entire epic poems of wall paintings. The walls spoke, sang, inspired, convinced and engaged [the viewer] with the events depicted and the excitement with which the masters painted them. (*В годы* 193)

This art form’s ability to impress the viewer was important to an artist who wanted to succeed in the new regime. All his large, monumental paintings reflect the influence of these frescoes. Like them, they are huge canvases, displaying collective scenes that espouse Soviet values, despite taking their inspiration in Russia’s Christian past. It is for this type of work that Samokhvalov is
considered a cultural and political conformist. These works include *Kirov Welcomes the Parade of Athletes (S.M. Kirov prinimaet parad fizkul'turnikov 1935)*, *Militarized Komsomol (Voenizirovannyi komsomol 1933)* and *Repairing the Transport (Remont perevoza 1931)* (Figures. 89, 90 and 91).
Figure 90: Militarized Komsomol

Figure 91: Repairing the Transport
SAMOKHVALOV’S ILLUSTRATION CAREER

Though Samokhvalov is most famous for his paintings, he worked extensively in book illustration as well. This aspect of his career is obviously important for his paintings for Anna Karenina in 1953. His work on illustration is divided into three distinct periods that reflect dramatic changes in his approach to subject matter and style. Of course, political changes in Soviet cultural policy played an enormous role in establishing these periods in his work. In the first period in the late 1920s he illustrated children’s books published by the State Publishing House (Gosizdat) and the Children’s State Publishing House (Detizdat) (Zinger 8). He was also both author and illustrator of books like To Camp (V lager’, 1927), Our City (Nash gorod, 1927), The Diving Station (Vodolazhnaia baza, 1928) (Fig. 92), The Vengeful Khudzhar (Mstitel’nyi Khudzhar, 1928) and The Route to Syiab, or Khamed, Mamed and the Donkey (Put’ v Siab, ili Khamed, Mamed i osel, 1928). Other illustrations of note from this period include Mark Twain’s Adventures of Huckleberry Finn and Adventures of Tom Sawyer, both in 1927. As might be expected in children’s illustrations, these images are very colourful, playful and juvenile with fanciful portrayals of exotic peoples and locales, which are perhaps the product of the artist’s travels through Central Asia to Samarkand with Petrov-Vodkin in 1921.

133 Samokhvalov’s first period of illustration is by far his most prolific. The titles given here only indicate a portion of the work he did in the late 1920s.
In the 1930s, in Samokhvalov’s second period of book illustration, he worked for the publisher «Academia» (Samokhvalov *Moi tvorcheski put’* 230-56). No longer drawing for children’s books, he now did illustrations for editions of classical Russian literature intended for the intelligentsia. These included titles like Saltykov-Shchedrin’s *History of a Town* (1933), Gribedov’s *Woe from Wit* (1935), Pushkin’s *History of the Village of Goriukhin* (1936) and Gogol’s *Dead Souls* (1937). Some of these projects never made it to publication. The 1935 edition of *Woe from Wit* appeared without Samokhvalov’s lithographs and only sketches remain of the work he did for *Dead Souls* (251).

Some of the other illustrations Samokhvalov made for «Academia» during this period were for translated works. For example, he did a series of vermilion watercolour paintings for a Russian edition of Lion Feuchtwanger’s *False Nero* (1937) (Fig. 93) and a retelling of *The Twelve Feats of Heracles* by Lev Vasilievich Uspenskii (1938).

By far the most important work Samokhvalov did during this period was his illustrations for Saltykov-Shchedrin’s *History of a Town* (1933). These made him instantly renowned in Soviet lithography and book illustration and overshadowed his previous efforts in children’s illustration in the 1920s. *Vechernii Leningrad* called the edition “a masterpiece of print art” and it earned the Grand-Prix at the 1937 International Book Exhibition in Paris (Samokhvalov, *Moi...

---

134 “Academia began to publish single volumes of the classics during the First Five-Year Plan and remained in business until the eve of the Second World War. In the first years of its activity Academia—the name, incidentally, was printed in Latin script on all its publications, another indication of the firm’s ‘high-brow’ clientele—performed a valuable service by making available reprints of the Russian classics at a time when very few editions were being brought out by the State Publishing House, which at that period was concentrating its attention on the crudely propagandistic works produced by the members of the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers” (Friedberg 56). For a history of the publishing house «Academia» see Krylov and Kichatova, *Izdatel’stvo «Academia»: Liudi i knigi, 1921-1938-1991*. For a complete bibliography of books «Academia» published between 1922 and 1937, see Larina et al., «Academia» 1922-1937. *Vystavka izdani i knizhnoi grafi.*

135 Curiously, neither Krylov nor Larina make any mention of this 1935 publication of Gribedov’s play.
These illustrations to this edition are typical of all his work in the 1930s; contrary to the colourful and playful images of the 1920s, they are grim, monochromatic and grotesque. They are obviously propagandistic. We saw in figure 85 how the peasants look more like ghouls than men; the aristocrats look absurd with their exaggerated grins and bestial in their sensuality. These images present Saltykov-Shchedrin’s brutal satire as a transparent condemnation of tsarist Russia and a justification of communism. In his autobiography, Samokhvalov gives it the correct ideological spin. He had to look back at his own childhood to “resurrect the images of the people, the people of our former nation, the people in a state of oppression, which, like a persistent wound, like a dangerous illness, disfigured its character and deprived it of its strength” (230). His work on Feuchtwanger’s False Nero also had obvious importance as propaganda as the Soviet Union prepared for war with Germany. Feuchtwanger was a strong contemporary opponent of the Third Reich and his novel was a transparent and critical reference to Adolf Hitler.

The third and final period of Samokhvalov’s book illustration career, to which his work on Anna Karenina belongs, begins a few years after the end of World War II, including the Zhdanovshchina. His level of productivity during this period never matches that of the earlier ones. Including Anna Karenina, Samokhvalov only worked on three books: in 1949-1950 he did paintings for Aleksei Pavlovich Chapygin’s Stepan Razin and in 1956 he contributed paintings to an anthology called Russian Stories. There seems to be less interest in this last period of his illustration. It is rare to even find reproductions of these illustrations in books about Samokhvalov. There is no mention of Anna Karenina in the autobiography, though it does include two colour prints from it.
Perhaps one reason for the lack of critical interest in this final period is because the
illustrations are ideological and, formally speaking, they display the values of realism, an
aesthetic approach that Russian art has come to regard warily because of its perceived connection
to socialist realism. These paintings are a departure for the artist. Samokhvalov did not normally
work in such a representational style. As mentioned above, he had an exhibition with *Mir
iskusstva* and the Soviet avant-garde had influenced him during the 1920s. He was the product of
those times and formed his views during them. The realistic style of these illustrations is a
compromise, a concession to the dictates of their times—times that today have been completely
discredited. Maria Andreevna Chegodaeva recounts in great detail how the struggle for realism
and against formalism played out in book illustration at that time (64-72).

It was precisely the problem of realism that stood at the top of every artistic
definition, critical statement and denunciation. After all, it was precisely from
under the banner of realism that judgments were passed and mistakes were
exposed: the fight for realism, the feeling that there was constant danger
supposedly threatening realism from the “formalists” did not abate during this
entire period [i.e. 1947-1955]. (Chegodaeva 72)

Chegodaeva never mentions Samokhvalov’s *Anna Karenina* illustrations in her book.

Nevertheless, her general complaints about the period apply to his work very well: painters
pushed graphic artists out of book illustration, and illustration, in its new “realistic” form, was
reserved solely for works of classic Russian and Soviet literature (40). Presented in these terms,
the *Zhdanovshchina* was a dark age for book illustration, as it was for most other art forms.

Samokhvalov’s illustrations to *Anna Karenina* have been ignored because they so clearly are a
product of that time.

This periodization reveals the artist’s gradual withdrawal from illustration. As the state’s
intervention became more pronounced, his personal investment and involvement became less. In
the 1920s he was a prolific illustrator, often acting as the author as well; by the 1940s and 1950s
he produced very few illustrations and never mentions them in his autobiography. All this suggests that Samokhvalov may not have been as much as of an opportunist as he is generally presented to be. Had he truly been one, we might have expected more activity from him as the state’s control increased; instead the opposite is true.\footnote{This periodization of Samokhvalov touches on his most famous work. Though this section reveals that he was a prolific illustrator, in fact he worked on many more books. For example, Beliaev recounts how often Samokhvalov made illustrations for works by Pushkin in “Otrazhenie iubileia Pushkina v izobrazitel’nom iskusstve.”}

**The ‘Two Faces of Samokhvalov’**

I agree with Vera Chaikovskaia that it is possible to explain the incongruities in Samokhvalov’s career by considering him as a two-faceted artist. Chaikovskaia calls these facets the lyrical and the monumental-epic (129-36). Both of these are communist, but the lyrical one is grounded in the avant-garde culture of the 1920s. It shows itself whenever the artist could follow his personal inclinations.

When his inner voice gains the upper hand, the artist’s work manifests lightness and artistry. [He] listens to his intuition, ceases to restrain his impulses and he realizes his true inclinations. That is when Samokhvalov’s best work appears, often reminiscent of studies, sorts of lively improvisations. (136)

The monumental-epic side of Samokhvalov’s art is a response to totalitarianism and arises in “situations of desperate artistic subservience, [and] under the heavy burden of ideological ‘responsibility’” (135). As an example, Chaikovskaia discusses one of the illustrations Samokhvalov made for *Woe from Wit* where both faces appear in the same image (Fig. 94).

I recall one remarkable illustration Samokhvalov did for a series of lithographs for a 1935 [edition of] Griboedov’s *Woe from Wit*. It depicts a spry and completely ‘irresponsible’ Chatskii with his elbow against a pitched chair looking across his
shoulder at the constrained figure of the very ‘responsible’ Molchalin who opens his palms in the gesture of a mechanical doll. Before us stands a literal ‘portrait’ of the two faces of Samokhvalov. (135-6)

This lyrical interpretation of Chatskii was a form of wish fulfillment and his presentation of Molchalin a self-conscious acknowledgement of his capitulation, powerlessness and perhaps even obsequiousness.\(^{137}\) It is with an appreciation of these two facets of Samokhvalov’s art that we should interpret his work, according to Chaikovskaia. The body of large monumental works, for which the artist was most famous during the Soviet years, was the product of resentful subservience, a silent compromise with totalitarianism. At the same time, he was creating other smaller and lyrical works.

Chaikovskaia does not consider the artist’s vacillation between these modes as deliberate, but as an unconscious and neurotic movement between coping with the pressure to conform externally and his desire to follow his inclinations. She therefore does not see this bifurcation as an expression of open dissent on the one hand or complete surrender on the other, which would be a more typical strategy of the modernist artist during totalitarian times (Katsnelson 69). Alluding to the final stanza of Blok’s *Scythians*, she says Samokhvalov plays a “barbaric lyre.”\(^{138}\) He could not relinquish the avant-garde and modernist values he had acquired and expressed in the 1910s and 1920s even though he became one of the primary conforming artists of the 1930s.

The newness of the people’s life during the revolutionary epoch captivated Samokhvalov. He became a voice for the common man’s deep, subterranean aspirations which had been aroused during this time; but [he was also the voice] of the alien, the bureaucratic and the pompous which the murky stream of time had brought along with it. He was unable to detach one from the other. That’s why it is best to call his lyre ‘barbaric.’ (128)

---

\(^{137}\) The censors were not blind. As already mentioned, publication of the play went ahead without the lithographs. According to Samokhvalov, his take on Chatskii was too “ironic” (*Moi tvorcheskii put’* 251).

\(^{138}\) “Barbaric lyre” is an allusion to the last stanza of Aleksandr Blok’s «Skify». 
I believe there was a good deal more deliberation on Samokhvalov’s part than Chaikovskaia suggests. The artist reveals his self-consciousness about this duality when he apologizes for the fluid and rougher style of his feminine works by describing them as studies for monumental works to be completed later (Samokhvalov V gody 195). That most of these “studies” never made it to larger canvases indicates that, no matter what he said about them, he was unable or unwilling to bring them to their monumental completion. Unlike Blok’s Scythians, who show relentless enthusiasm for their destructive creativity and collective identity, Samokhvalov was a cautious man who chose expedient paths to survive during the worst years of Stalinism, but tried also to assert his independence at the same time. It was not in the name of devotion or naive idealism that he became a major player in Stalinist culture; he did it out of necessity.

I interpret what Chaikovskaia calls his lyrical face to be the continuation of his identification with the ethos of Modernism that had played such a crucial role in his formation in the 1910s and 1920s. His desire to capture the newness of life or novizna zhizni, its energy, vitality and power, made him sympathetic to the opportunities and transformations the revolution made possible. His lyrical face therefore does not oppose the Soviet regime. Like many Modernist and avant-garde figures of the 1920s, he was enthusiastic about the Revolution and made art that celebrated it. He shared the Modernist enthusiasm for all that is new and its embrace of anything that departs from the past (Calinescu 3).

In order to create art that kept pace with the construction of the new [order] it was necessary to thirstily scrutinize the features of its newness. And we went to new building sites, to factories and plants, to mines and all over this new land which had been liberated from the land-owners in order to meet in person these builders of the new, in order to absorb their features and preserve them forever, by the means of our art, as an example of heroic accomplishment. (Samokhvalov V gody 195)
More often than not, he focused on the women who were participating in these labour and construction projects. He could depict their “detachment from domestic life, their new and different work, different concerns, crowning them with the halo of the romantic of a completely new and unprecedented sort” (Samokhvalov Moi tvorcheskii put’ 116). If the large monumental works were opportunistic concessions to totalitarianism, Samokhvalov’s paintings of women express his sincere enthusiasm for the social change taking place in his country. He takes up labour and the military in works such as Woman with a File (Rabotnitsa s napil’nikom 1929) (Fig. 95), In Defence of the Motherland (Na strazhe rodiny 1930) (Fig. 96) and Young Woman Labourer (Molodaia rabotnitsa 1928) (Fig. 97). There is also a series of portraits of the Leninskii put’ Commune from the 1930s: Portrait of Maria Ivanovna Golubeva, Butter Manufacturer (Fig. 98), Portrait of Anna Ul’ianova, Field Worker (Fig. 99) and Shot Put Girl (Fig. 100).
Manufacturer (Maslodel Mariia Golubeva 1931-2) (Fig. 98), Portrait of Anna Ul’ianova, Field Worker (Portret polevoi rabotnitsy Anny Ul’ianovoi 1931-2) (Fig. 99) (Samokhvalov 144-63). He also has a series of paintings depicting female athletes, such as Shot Put Girl (Devushka siaadrom 1933) (Fig. 100). He returned to the theme of labour when he painted women involved in the building of the Moscow Metro, such as Hauler Women (Otkachitsy 1934), Woman with Shovels (Nesushchaia lopaty 1934), Woman with Reinforcement Rods (Nesushchaia armaturu
With a Jackhammer (So sverlom 1934), Metro Construction Worker with a Jackhammer (Metrostroevka so sverlom 1937) and Metro Construction Worker by a Concrete Mixer (Metrostroevka u beton’erki 1937) (Figs. 101, 102, 103, 105, 105 and 106). Perhaps Samokhvalov’s most famous painting is Girl in a Jersey (Devushka v futbolke 1932) (Fig. 107) for which he won the gold medal at the 1937 International Exhibition in Paris (Chaikovskaia 186). What this large body of work demonstrates is that Samokhvalov’s lyrical and modern face is undeniably feminine. It is a facet of his work that emerges again in his illustrations of Anna.

**Two Annas**

Samokhvalov’s two faces are detectable in his illustrations of Anna, which are of two kinds. The first Anna is strong, heroic and passionate. Illustrations of her develop what the novel calls Anna’s “life-force.” The second Anna is powerless. The two Annas appear at regular intervals and may be categorized according to their respective looks and the references underlying those looks.

At first glance, this duality seems to mirror the character’s own feeling that she is divided, something she expresses most memorably as she lies in a postpartum fever she and others consider to be fatal. The source of her division in the novel is internal: it is the conflict between her surfeit of life-force and restraint, her passion and her conscience (Jackson 318). Samokhvalov alters this division by emphasizing Anna’s conflict with society rather than with
herself. He values her life-force for how it distinguishes her from others, but takes little interest in her conscience; rather than depicting her with internal restraint he wants to show how she is outwardly restrained. Soviet critics also liked to emphasize society’s role in Anna’s demise; however. His double portrayal of Anna reveals that he was adept at outwardly conforming to the dictates of the state while simultaneously interpreting her significance in a way that was entirely personal.

Samokhvalov’s first Anna bears a striking resemblance to Mikhail Vrubel’s drawing *Svidanie Anny Kareninoi s synom*, an echo that may be conscious. In his autobiography, he discusses the early influence the Symbolist painter had upon him, especially as a result of his first adolescent visit to the Tretiakov Gallery and later during his years at the Academy when he did studies of the artist’s work (*Moi tvorcheskii put’* 35, 37-8). He never discusses Vrubel’s *Anna Karenina* illustration so it is impossible to confirm whether he deliberately alludes to it. Nevertheless, it is difficult not to see traces of the disturbing Vrubelesque Anna in some of

---

139 Kuleshov (1978) and Uspenskii (1954) offer good examples of the Soviet tendency to read Anna’s significance in primarily social terms. See Uspenskii 227 and Kuleshov 183 and 204.

140 Vrubel made his drawing of Anna in 1878.
Samokhvalov’s paintings. For example, Anna’s face in the illustration of the steeplechase seems to reflect it (Fig. 78). Likewise, the illustration of Anna’s suicide bears an undeniable resemblance (Fig. 108). On the other hand, Samokhvalov’s own painting of Anna’s reunion with Serezha does not refer only to Vrubel’s illustration (Fig. 109).

When Anna is shown to be passionate, Samokhvalov partakes in Vrubel’s emphasis on Anna’s intense life-force. Vrubel takes it to an extreme. His Anna is completely devoid of restraint, and, as a result, appears monstrous. As mentioned in the introduction, the drawing looks more like the scene of an abduction than a reunion. In his illustrations of first Anna, Samokhvalov follows Vrubel insofar as he also emphasizes her life-force over her restraint; he parts ways with his Symbolist role-model when it comes to how far he is willing to take this dynamic. For Vrubel, Anna’s passion leads to absolute rebellion. She affronts us, the viewer, just as much as Petersburg society and even her own son is terrified of her. Samokhvalov wants us to identify with Anna’s rebelliousness and recognize that there is something admirable in her passion and tragic in her inability to realize it. In other words, these paintings continue the tradition that regards Anna as a hero. Though an outlaw, she is righteous because the society she defies is false and discredited.

Samokhvalov zeroes in on Anna’s life-force and endorses it because it allows him to continue his project of associating women with the modernist ethos. Samokhvalov’s paintings of the heroic Anna should be considered a part of this broader female theme. His Anna is heroic for the same reason that his earlier paintings of women are bogatyrs. Just as those physical amazons allow him to celebrate the dawn of a new social era by presenting new gender roles, Anna’s rebellious life-force makes her an outlaw of the old world and therefore a pioneering

---

141 It is significant that this theme first appeared in his paintings of the 1930s. Here it is detectable in his work from the 1950s, albeit in a more subdued form. He turns to this theme during the most intense periods of political oppression.
heroine of the new. Instead of calling her heroic, we could just as easily have called this portrayal “modern,” an ironic rejection of the novel’s conclusion. Now the leader of a cause, her passion and lack of restraint are translated into enthusiasm and exuberance. Her eyes are large, intense and at times even alluring. Her posture and gestures express her alertness, engagement and a sensitive emotional life. Anna physically commands each of these illustrations. She stands in the focal point of each composition and is usually highlighted tonally. This not only draws our attention to her but also distinguishes her from the others in her group. It is a visual demonstration of how her life-force elevates her above society. Whereas a lack of restraint in Vrubel’s drawing makes Anna an anathema, here it gives her the halo of righteousness.

Most significant is the illustration of the steeplechase (Fig. 78). Anna is absolutely focused on Vronsky. Karenin, as her lawfully wedded husband, a bureaucrat and important force in grand society offers to take her away and thereby allow her to maintain appearances and expectations. No matter how imposing, threatening, dark or immense Karenin appears as he looms over her, Anna is impervious. Her intense and focused passion protects her from even noticing his presence. This intensity as a positive force continues in the painting where Anna, Vronsky and Golonishchev meet Mikhailov at his studio (Fig. 110 – repeat of Fig. 3). Golonishchev’s loquacity prevents him from even looking at Mikhailov’s painting and Vronsky looks at it vacuously. Only Anna gives it her complete attention. It is clear from her posture and gaze that she is absolutely engaged. Likewise, Samokhvalov emphasizes her

Figure 110: Viewing Pilate’s Admonition (III.15)
domineering role by painting her in the lightest tones and placing her more or less directly in the centre of the composition. Whereas the narrator undercuts Anna’s interpretation by telling us that it is calculated to please Mikhailov (even though Anna’s interpretation of the painting is correct), Samokhvalov seems to be suggesting that Anna is completely authentic when she views Mikhailov’s painting. Whenever Anna appears in this heroic and passionate version, Samokhvalov always endorses her completely.

Whereas the modernist/heroic illustrations present her as a noble outlaw, the remaining illustrations of Anna present her as society’s victim. No longer a character of great intensity or passion, this Anna is often expressionless, as at the theatre (Fig. 80). If we do see any emotion on her face, it is only fear, an acknowledgement of her powerlessness, as when Karenin tears Vronsky’s letters out of her desk (Fig. 81). If the first Anna reminds us of Vrubel’s drawing, this second Anna conjures up Alla Konstantinovna Tarasova’s portrayal of Anna Karenina in the 1937 MKhAT stage adaptation of the novel (Fig. 111). Like Tarasova, this Anna has a fuller figure and rounder face. More important than this physical similarity is the way these illustrations of Anna follow Tarasova’s interpretation. In Tarasova’s reading, there is no need to pose the question of whether or not to judge Anna; we are clearly supposed to empathize with her entirely. Society is cruel to her and pounces upon her at the first opportunity, Karenin tirelessly tyrannizes her and even her affair with Vronsky is unclear—is she Vronsky’s lover or is she just the victim of his advances? As Vrubel may have been the source for the heroic/lyrical/Modern Anna, the Soviet/Monumental Anna may be a conscious allusion to Tarasova. Alla Tarasova was largely considered the iconic Anna in the

\[\text{Figure 111: Alla Tarasova as Anna Karenina}\]

\[142\text{ The difficulty in deciding whether or not to judge Anna finds its treatment in Orwin, }\text{Tolstoy’s Art and Thought (183).}\]
Soviet Union. The MKhAT play was set to the screen in 1953, which would have reminded viewers of her stage portrayal and helped establish it as canonical (despite her being a little too old for the role by that time). In fact, a clear sign of just how definitive Tarasova’s portrayal had become are the illustrations Aram Vanetsian made for a Ukrainian language edition of *Anna Karenina*, also published in 1953 (Fig. 112). If some of Samokhvalov’s paintings are reminiscent of Tarasova, then Vanetsian’s are near perfect facsimiles.

Samokhvalov uses these two Annas to explore the character’s agency or lack thereof and in so doing projects his own predicament onto hers. The topics we normally associate with this novel hold little interest for him. He does not examine the moral nuances that might explain how Anna is responsible for her own situation. He does not even take a great interest in the love story or in comparing it to the Levin/Kitty plot. For Samokhvalov, *Anna Karenina* is primarily about a forward-looking individual’s struggle with a stagnating society and her tragic inability to realize her full potential. Faced with the cultural conservatism of the Zhdanovshchina and such a politically-motivated commission as illustrating *Anna Karenina* he must have taken vicarious pleasure in portraying this assertive character without suffering her fate.

**CONCLUSION**

In my section on “Ideological *Anna Karenina*” I show how Samokhvalov was able to use illustration in order to communicate the state’s official reading of the novel. Given the
immediacy of illustration, the Ministry of Culture could rest assured that Samokhvalov’s work would influence some readers. I have tried to show that in tandem with this Samokhvalov injected his own priorities into the illustrations by drawing on the visual lexicon he had already created in his other paintings. His heroic Anna and her victimized counterpart allowed him to create a more personal and subjective response to the novel; unlike in their reaction to his lithograph of Chatskii and Molchalin, the censors did not perceive these works as affronts to the regime. Perhaps it is not possible to claim that Samokhvalov’s accomplishment is the visual equivalent of Aesopian language. It might be too personal for that. Nevertheless, he does certainly manage to navigate the tricky waters of satisfying the censor at the same time as he injects his own subjective interpretation of the novel.

143 For a discussion of “visual” Aesopian in the work of Kazimir Malevich, see Katznelson.
With 159 gouache paintings, Orest Georgievich Vereiskii (1915-1993) illustrated *Anna Karenina* more thoroughly than any other artist. This allowed him to offer the most comprehensive exploration of Anna and to pay significant attention to all the other major characters and many of the secondary characters as well. Another important outcome of Vereiskii’s project is his presentation of Russia in the 1870s, its locations, its peoples, their homes and attires. Of all the illustrated editions discussed in this research, Vereiskii offers the most comprehensive and unified interpretation of *Anna Karenina*.

Vereiskii deliberately strove not to make his presence felt. He did not want to interfere with the reader’s appreciation of the novel. He nevertheless offers a very sensitive reading of it. If we were to analyze his work from the synthesizing angle of Podobedova mentioned in my introduction, we could say that Vereiskii follows the narrator’s cues more closely than the other illustrators. He also takes the most objective approach to portraying Anna. He is neither intimidated by her sexual power nor by the moral consequences of her choices. Lastly, the role of Tolstoy and the publisher’s aspirations for this publication cannot be understated. The book’s

---

144 Vereiskii says his purpose was to help readers gain an authentic impression of the times in which the story takes place (*Встречи* 161-2). Many of the promotional announcements for the book presented it in precisely this light. There was quite a lot of fanfare surrounding his work. See, for example, N. Ivanov, “Prekrasnyi oblik knigi”; and Vereiskii, “Vdokhnovliaushcie obrazy,” “Schast’e vstrechi s ego slovom,” “Khudozhnik i kniga,” and “Za daliu—novaia dal’: o tvorchestve O. Vereiskogo.”
appearance coincided with an enormous publishing drive to mark the 150th anniversary of the author’s birth.

Khudozhestvennaia literaturnaia published this edition of *Anna Karenina* in Moscow in 1982. It is an important book that came out of a very large publication initiative to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Tolstoy’s birth in 1978. Beginning in 1976, publishers across the USSR sought to mark this important cultural event (Sheliapina). Khudozhestvennaia literaturnaia, as a central, Moscow-based publishing house, assumed a leading role, as the table below demonstrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td><em>Anna Karenina</em></td>
<td>303 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Resurrection, Tales and Stories</em></td>
<td>303 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sevastopol Stories</em></td>
<td>500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Khadzhi-Murat. Stories</em></td>
<td>200 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td><em>Resurrection</em></td>
<td>1 200 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cossacks</em></td>
<td>300 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td><em>Collected Works in 22 Volumes</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Volume One: Childhood, Boyhood and Youth</em></td>
<td>300 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Anna Karenina in Two Volumes</em></td>
<td>100 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>War and Peace in Two Volumes</em></td>
<td>315 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Resurrection</em></td>
<td>900 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cossacks. Tales of the Caucasus</em></td>
<td>30 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

145 The following data only reflects publications from the Moscow location of Khudozhestvennaia literaturnaia, not its Leningrad location, though it published many books during this period too. I chose this limitation for reasons of manageability.
146 Sources: Sheliapina and *Ezhegodnik knigi 1976*.
147 This edition of *Anna Karenina* contains 17 of Vereiskii’s illustrations that would later appear in the 1982 edition. Eduard Grigorievich Babaev wrote the introduction.
148 With the illustrations of Leonid Osipovich Pasternak, Evgenii Evgenievich Lansere and A. Kokorina and an introduction by Konstantin Nikolaevich Lomunov.
149 With the illustrations of A. Pakhomov and introduction by Babaev.
150 Source: *Ezhegodnik knigi 1977* 484.
152 With the illustrations of Evgenii Evgenievich Lansere.
This data reveals that the Vereiskii illustrations were created during a flurry of Tolstoy publication activity at Khudozhestvennaia literatura, most notably the publication of its *Collected Works* in 22 volumes. Several other illustrated editions, such as the *Resurrection* and *Sevastopol*...
The fact that this *Anna Karenina* was not published until 1982 does not detract from its association with the anniversary of Tolstoy’s birth. Vereiskii began his commission in 1976, and some of his paintings were already published more than once during the late 1970s: there was the edition of *Anna Karenina* of 1976 that contained 17 of Vereiskii’s illustrations and a two-volume paperback edition that features four of his paintings on the covers. The book may have been published later than planned. Based on a discrepancy between the date of order and publication, Gregory Pierce Walker noted that it went late to press, an observation borne out by the issues of *Book Almanac* (*Ezhegodnik knigi*) and *Book Chronicle* (*Knizhnaia letopis’*) from that time. According to the latter, volume one appears in week 6 of 1983 and volume two in week 16 of 1983, despite their being dated 1982 (*Knizhnaia letopis’* 6/83 61; 16/83 80). It is unlikely that Vereiskii caused the delay since he had been working on the illustrations since the mid-1970s. He certainly makes no mention of it in his chapter about the book in his memoires. The most reasonable explanation was that some other feature of the book’s design caused the delay since the novel certainly could not have been a concern for the censors. In fact, Walker observed that the censor’s number is entirely absent (“Re: Soviet Publishing Question”).

It is not immediately clear why *Anna Karenina* was singled out for this special attention. The other illustrated editions published during this time were reprints: the work of Leonid Pasternak for *Resurrection* and of Evgenii Lansere for *Cossacks* had long been considered classic. Vereiskii’s illustrations were entirely new, which suggests that despite the quantity of *Anna Karenina* illustrations already discussed in this research, none had emerged as definitive.

---

160 Some interesting publications of illustrations include two art books that were not published by Khudozhestvennaia literatura—*Iliustratsii k proizvedeniiam L.N. Tolstogo*. Moskva: «Izobrazitel’noe iskusstvo», 1978; and *Iliustratsii sovetskih khudozhnikov k proizvedeniam L.N. Tolstogo*. Moskva: «Sovetskih khudozhnik», 1978. Of course, the official release of the Piskarev prints, discussed in a preceding chapter, is another example (Chungunov).
Vereiskii may have been hired with the aim of addressing this issue, which would explain the ambitious quantity of illustrations.

Another possibility is that they were commissioned in order to mark the 100th anniversary of the novel’s publication. Published serially in The Russian Messenger (Russkii Vestnik) from 1875 to 1877 (Bem 11), Katkov famously refused to publish the eighth part of the novel for its critique of Russia’s participation in the war in Serbia (Wilson 288). The complete Anna Karenina appeared in three volumes in 1878. Though there is no mention of this anniversary on the 1982 book, Soviet publishers tended to mark these sorts of occasions and it is reasonable to think that it is somehow connected to Vereiskii’s commission. For example, that would explain why Khudozhestvennaia literatura chose to emphasize Anna Karenina instead of War and Peace.

The book may have been intended to showcase the talents of Orest Vereiskii and thereby raising the publisher’s profile in the USSR as a producer of high quality books. Whether or not this was an intended goal, it certainly was the result. The 17 illustrations that appeared in the 1976 edition of Anna Karenina received the Silver Medal at the Leipzig International Exhibition of Book Art in 1977, along with some other illustrations he made for an edition of Hemingway’s For Whom the Bell Tolls (“Vereiskii” 88). The 1982 book with the complete collection of 159 illustrations received special mention as one of the “best publications of 1982” in the XXIV All-Union Book Art Competition (Bykov) and the Academy of Arts awarded Vereiskii the Gold Medal for the complete body of illustrations in 1984 (“Vereiskii” 88).

Walker also notes in correspondence that the book was somewhat subsidized, which lends further credence to the book’s aim of showcasing the publisher’s capabilities because it shows that it did not intend to make much money from the publication. Walker also raises the possibility that the book was intended for sale abroad. His evidence is the lack of the Glavlit censor’s stamp. Only in rare cases would a book go to press without this stamp, unless it was intended for sale outside of the USSR (“Re: Question about Soviet Publishing, illustrated Anna Karenina.”).
Orest Vereiskii’s success should not have come as a surprise. He was an excellent choice for the commission. Born in the village of Anosovo in Smolenskaia gubernia in 1915, he had family ties that proved auspicious for his career in illustration. He was the son of Georgii Semenovich Vereiskii (1886-1962), an artist and member of the Academy of Arts who was awarded People’s Artist of the RSFSR in 1962 (Khudozniki 236). Georgii Semenovich was the Director of the Lithography Studio at the Leningrad Union of Artists and he amassed a large personal collection of prints and drawings (Vstrechi 11). Equally important was his father’s work as a conservator at the State Hermitage Museum at the Graphic Art Department and his permanent membership on the Academic Council of the Hermitage (14). This granted his father enviable access to the museum’s art collection and he would often take his son with him (14).162

From 1936-38 Vereiskii studied painting at the Institute of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture163 under Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Osmërkin in Leningrad (Khudozniki 237).164 Even though he ultimately moved into illustration and graphic arts and never completed his degree in painting, Vereiskii always regarded his time with Osmërkin to be seminal, calling it “his university” (Vstrechi 30). Starting as early as 1937, he began working as an illustrator with Leningrad’s Detgiz publishing house and “Sovetskii pisatel’” (Khudozniki 237). His time at Detgiz introduced him to important influences like Vladimir Vasilievich Lebedev (1891-1967), the famous illustrator of children’s books, most notably the poems of Samuil Marshak, and Nikolai Andreevich Tyrsa, who did children’s illustrations of Anna Karenina in 1939. In addition to illustrating children’s books and adult novels, Vereiskii was a journalistic illustrator

162 Orest Vereiskii recounts how his father would adjust paintings that had been hanged crookedly and take small paintings from the wall in order to inspect them under better light (14).
163 IZhSA—Institut zhivopisi, skulptury i arkhitektury.
164 Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Osmëkin (1892-1953) was a member of the Knave of Diamonds (Bubnovyi valet) art movement during the 1910s and 1920s. From 1918-1948 he was a professor of art, serving at VKhUTEMAS, IZhSA, the Leningrad Art Academy and the Surikov Moscow Art Academy. In 1947, Osmiokin was forced to resign from his teaching duties because of accusations of “formalism.” Vereiskii had Osmiokin as an instructor at IZhSA from 1936-38. Osmiokin was more of a spiritual and professional role-model for Vereiskii than a stylistic one.
for the literary journal *Smena* and the children’s journal *Koster* from 1935-1940 and for the magazine *Ogonek* starting in 1946. He produced attractive books of illustrations he made during cultural exchanges in Czechoslovakia, Iceland, Egypt and the USA. As a result of these achievements, by the time he received the commission to illustrate *Anna Karenina* in 1976, Vereiskii was already a highly renowned and respected illustrator.

**FORMAT AND SPECIFICATIONS**

The book’s format and design suggest that it was designed to showcase Vereiskii’s work. Its dimensions are large (84 X 108 1/16 or 20.5 cm X 29 cm), the largest discussed in this research. The page approaches the quadratic, a significant departure from the rectangular shape normally associated with a novel’s page dimensions. The resulting margins are very wide, a feature that makes the novel’s pagination quite short, remarkable considering the quantity of illustrations: Volume I has 328 pages and Volume II has 288. An additional consequence of the wide margins is that they make reading the text difficult. One often gets lost mid-sentence, especially when there are so many illustrations vying for attention, and one wonders if readers would have read Tolstoy’s novel at all as they flipped through the pages of this edition. Indeed, there was no need for it to appeal to a reading audience. As the table above shows, there were many other publications of *Anna Karenina* during this time and many of those other editions were

---

165 These books are *Around Czechoslovakia* (*Po Chekhoslovakii*), *Ancient and Young. Diary of an Artist* (*Drevnee i molodoe. Dnevnik khudozhnika*) (about the Middle East), *Iceland: A Travel Album* (*Islandiia* Putevoi al’bom), and *In America* (*V Amerike*).
scholarly and authoritative. The 1982 illustrated edition did not need to address the same concerns. As a result, no Tolstoy scholars participated on the book’s editorial board, nor is there any introduction or notes section.

The most important indications that this edition aimed to showcase Vereiskii’s work are the quantity of illustrations it contains and the thought that has gone into their placement and function. Vereiskii and the printer clearly collaborated very closely, designing many different types of illustrations. There are eight headpieces (e.g. Fig. 113) and eight tailpieces, two frontispieces, forty-two text illustrations found in the margins, fifty-five text illustrations found across one page, either at its bottom or the top, fifteen two-page text illustrations and ten quadratic text illustrations located in the very centre of the page. There are the sixteen full-colour plates (e.g. Fig. 114). Rounding off the total to 159, Volume one ends with a little vignette drawing of Italy and the dust-jacket of each volume is covered with a large illustration. In addition to this variety of types of illustrations is a variety of approaches to colour. Most of the illustrations are black and white, the sixteen plates and two frontispieces are full colour and many of the illustrations use three colours. Normally the third colour is a cool grey, as in the case of the ten quadratic text illustrations. Often, however, the third colour stands out a little more: the headpiece to Part III uses yellow, black and white; the headpiece to Part IV uses robin’s egg blue, black and white; the two-page text illustration of Palace Square uses a brown-grey which is similar to the cool grey of most three-colour illustrations but warmer; some illustrations use a greenish-grey as the third colour, as in the case of the illustration of the mowing scene (Fig. 115).
One remarkable thing about Vereiskii’s work is its lack of ideology. Whereas Samokhvalov’s paintings of 1953 focus on the past in order to highlight the accomplishments of the CPSU, there is nothing to suggest that Vereiskii tried to frame the 1870s in the correct Leninist light. His work may be seen as a more objective re-evaluation of the 1870s and a rejection of the high Stalinism found in Samokhvalov’s paintings. This seems surprising given that Vereiskii’s illustrations appear in the Brezhnev era, yet another culturally conservative period in Soviet history. One may have reasonably expected a more ideological series of paintings.

If Samokhvalov’s paintings may be regarded as an intervention between the reader and the text, Vereiskii perceived his task in precisely the opposite terms. Speaking about his work on Anna Karenina, the artist says he wanted to remain as unobtrusive as possible out of respect for the reader’s experience of the novel. He notes in particular how he deliberately chose not to offer a picture of the steeplechase itself. He wanted readers to concentrate on Tolstoy’s handling of
that scene and their own experiences of it. He opts, instead, to illustrate the scenes leading up to it and around it, avoiding the race itself.

I decided to refrain from depicting the steeplechase, so attractive for its dynamism, that is, the immediate competition of Frou-Frou and Gladiator, because it seemed tactless in relation to the reader to draw him away from the gripping pages of Tolstoy’s text. To me it seemed that here I must not interrupt the reading process under any circumstances. (Vereiskii Vstrechi 162)

Considering the large quantity of illustrations he made for the book, it is surprising that he regarded his work in such humble terms. He did not acknowledge what many consider to be the necessarily disruptive nature of illustration in a verbal text.

The impressive planning that went into the quantity, colour and arrangement of the illustrations indicates that even though Vereiskii’s work is less ideological than Samokhvalov’s, and he declares his intention to facilitate the reader’s appreciation of the novel (rather than intervene), it would be a mistake to consider this edition to be a throwback to the older illustration style of Kardovskii. He may not have wanted to put any obstacles between the reader and the text, but his illustrations nevertheless do act as a guide. They offer one of the most sensitive interpretations of the characters in the novel and often employ visual analogies for its numerous narrative devices.

**Life-Force**

Vereiskii’s other illustration work is noteworthy for the dynamism and mobility it imparts to the human figure. He is very skilled at capturing people engaged in activities, in transit and in action. His illustrations of the US in the early 1960s are particularly appealing in this regard. They do an excellent job of capturing that nation’s diversity, vitality and activity during a period of intense social and economic change (Fig. 116, Fig. 117 and Fig. 118). Whether this is the
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166 I discuss Kardovskii’s importance as a pre-revolutionary realist illustrator in my introduction.
result of his tendency to draw en plein aire (V Amerike 5) or just reflects his empathetic nature, it serves him very well in his illustrations of Anna Karenina.

His skill at imparting movement to his drawings allows him to portray what the novel refers to as the life-force of Anna and Levin. Whether instinctively or deliberately, he correctly senses the importance of motion in the novel and represents it in a way that does not seem contrived. Take for instance his first illustration of Levin which shows him bounding up the stairs to greet Stiva in Part I, chapter v (Fig. 119), the illustration of the Zoological Gardens, where Vereiskii makes Levin appear the most mobile in what is a very active scene (Fig. 120) and then the illustration of Levin and Kitty skating together (Fig. 121). Not only has the artist managed to capture Levin’s
life-force, but he has shown this very self-conscious character during surprising moments of spontaneity.

It is in his drawings of Anna, however, where Vereiskii does a superb job of suggesting motion as a means of conveying life-force. First he does so by emphasizing her physical presence. Vereiskii’s Anna is particularly proud and physically expressive. Her height, posture and proud bearing all give her a powerful presence in the world. Her dark hair and attire lend extra weight to her impressive physical presence, but give it a touch of the demonic as well. Vereiskii often shows Anna in transit. Figure 122 shows her leaving Betsy’s to enter her carriage just before she has her first argument with Karenin regarding Vronsky. Figure 123 has her climb into a carriage with Dolly on the way to Vozdvizhensk and Fig. 124 shows her carriage ride through Moscow just before her suicide. Though there is an illustration of Anna and Vronsky at Bologoe station on the way back to Petersburg, there are no depictions of her on board, boarding or disembarking from a train. In addition to showing Anna in transit, Vereiskii presents her as a very physically mobile person. Sometimes we see her making dramatic exits from rooms as in Fig. 125 when she leaves Karenin at the end of their first meeting after the steeplechase in Part III chapter xxiii and in Fig. 126 when she tells Vronsky that he will live to regret saying his patience has limits. If Anna is not moving between rooms or being conveyed by carriage, Vereiskii shows her to be a highly agitated character as during her “fall” (Fig. 127), when she is dressing before the steeplechase (Fig. 128), telling Dolly about her use of birth control (Fig. 129) and when she is unable to recognize her face in the mirror (Fig. 130). One final way Vereiskii suggests Anna’s energy is by placing her at the centre of chaotic
Figure 120: Levin arrives at the Zoological Gardens (walking on left) (IV.7)

Figure 121: Kitty and Levin skating (IV.8)

Figure 122: Anna departs from Princess Betsy’s late at night (IV.28)

Figure 123: Anna climbs into the carriage with Dolly (IV.120)
compositions as in Fig. 131 when she plays with Dolly’s children, Fig. 132 at the ball in Part I and Fig. 133 at the steeplechase. If we follow the artist’s portrayal of Anna chronologically through the novel, we notice that her movement between locations becomes less important and her agitation increases. In other words, as the novel progresses, her presence in the world diminishes and her physical expression of inner discomfort and turmoil becomes more noticeable. Her movement eventually becomes more confined to her body, rather than her body moving between places. This is not only an expression of how Anna’s choices gradually confine
her to a smaller and more secretive sphere; it also expresses the moral consequences her choices have for her conscience.

The book’s frontispieces are two separate portraits of Anna and they anticipate the theme of movement and its moral relevance. The first frontispiece shows Anna in winter dress, perhaps portraying her at Princess Betsy’s party in Part 2, Chapters 6 through 8 (Fig. 134). This image portrays a very positive figure, a person aware of her inner fire and emboldened by the thrill of romantic love. She looks directly into the reader’s eyes; but this is not effrontery—she looks at us with a gentle, but confident, smile. Here we see Anna’s energy as an attractive force. Though
the Nikolaevskii Train Station is not the setting for this painting, it is reasonable to consider this to be the Anna that Vronsky initially sees and with whom he immediately becomes infatuated.

This first portrait is not unequivocally positive; there are intimations of Anna’s demise. First, it is not clear whether Anna is arriving or leaving. She walks out of a dark space and enters a light one. If she is leaving Betsy’s and entering the night chill, then Betsy’s domain is coloured in dark tones and the night is unnaturally bright. If she is coming from the street and entering her own home, then the Karenin household is unusually bright. This uncertainty is heightened by the fact that Anna stands exactly in the doorway, on the threshold of two spaces. It is a common Russian superstition to never shake hands or embrace in a doorway, because this space of transit deemed is unfit for displays of affection, esteem and love. Vereiskii invites the reader to admire Anna, but positions her in such a way that we should be wary. Though it is not possible to explain the precise location Vereiskii ascribes to the light and dark space in this frontispiece, what is clear is that Anna leaves the dark and enters the light. As she does so, however, she looks back into the dark, at us. She does not look ahead and so cannot see where she is going. Her face is almost completely black. Her attire is such that we cannot see her feet.
The second frontispiece depicts Anna from 6.17 wearing her riding attire (Fig. 135). This portrait is impressionistic, and thereby more difficult to characterize than the first one. Most striking of all are Anna’s eyes which are virtually undetectable. Anna’s gaze, so important in the first frontispiece, is now absent. If we meet her eyes in the first frontispiece and are invited to feel empathy and attraction for her, this second creates the sense of alienation. If we compare Vereiskii’s portrayal here to Dolly’s perception of Anna at this point in the novel, there is a clear discrepancy. Upon seeing Anna on the highroad to Vozdvizhensk, Dolly feels fascination. Anna seduces her.

Darya Alexandrovna stared wide-eyed at that elegant equipage, the like of which she had never seen before, at those superb horses, at the elegant, shining faces
that surrounded her. But she was stuck most of all by the change that had taken place in her familiar and beloved Anna. Another less attentive woman, one who had not known Anna before, and above all one who had not been thinking what Darya Alexandrovna had been thinking on the way, would not have noticed anything special about Anna. But Dolly was struck by that temporary beauty which women have in moments of love and which she now found in Anna’s face. Everything in her face – the distinctness of the dimples on her cheeks and chin, the set of her lips, the smile that seemed to flit about her face, her shining eyes, the gracefulness and quickness of her movements, the fullness of the sound of her voice, even the manner in which she replied with angry indulgence to Veslovsky, who asked permission to ride her cob in order to teach him to gallop on the right leg – everything was especially attractive, and it seemed that she herself knew it and rejoiced in it. (612)

Later Dolly is struck by Anna’s maid’s attire when she realizes that the servants at Vronsky’s estate dress better than she does. Of course, Dolly quickly grows tired of the impressive, yet superficial, circumstances at Vozdvizhensk. Because she has difficulty grasping the unfamiliar (Alexandrov 213), and because her resentment towards Stiva makes her more receptive to Anna’s circumstances, it takes Dolly time to see its artificiality. This illustration attempts to show us Anna from a more omniscient perspective, cutting through the gloss that makes such an impression on Dolly and drawing our attention to the consequences Anna’s choices have for her conscience. Rather than paying attention to Anna’s face, her dimples, her chin, lips and smile and the sparkle in her eyes (as the narrator and Dolly do in 6.17), Vereiskii conceals her face. In the first frontispiece he uses the darkness in order to emphasize the sparkle in Anna’s eyes; in the second frontispiece he makes her face vague, leaving its details murky and impressionistic. Just as in the first frontispiece, Anna’s body language is important. In the first case, Anna moves between locations, suggesting her agency. Here Anna stands on the spot, but her body is somewhat twisted. Again we do not see Anna’s feet, but they appear to be moving to the left as her shoulders turn to the right in order to face our direction. Anna’s hands are particularly strange in this illustration and highlight the character’s chief concerns with her beauty and her awareness of its power to control others. Her right hand plays coquettishly with the lace bow that
adorns her riding hat; her left hand—which is remarkably small and dainty—brandishes the riding strap used to whip and coerce her horse, thereby suggesting that Anna is aware of the power her allure holds to control and influence others.

**Stiva**

Reader’s often underestimate the complexity of Stiva Oblonsky. Either they regard him as a selfish and insensitive cad or they take him to be the novel’s most appealing character. Vereiskii is able to capture both aspects, thereby offering a balanced view.

He emphasizes Stiva’s role of providing amusement. He also helps readers identify with Stiva. He accomplishes this by making Stiva look out directly at the reader, breaking the so-called “fourth wall.” This happens four times: Fig. 136, Fig. 137, Fig. 138 and Fig. 139. There are many illustrations of Stiva in this edition and he does not meet the reader’s eyes in every case; nevertheless, he does break the fourth wall in each of these instances and such an open acknowledgement of the reader is Vereiskii’s means of reinforcing a bond, empathy and attraction for this character.\(^{167}\) Moreover, these addresses to the audience tend to be comedic. In depicting Stiva indulge in sensual pleasures like eating and smoking, Vereiskii encourages us to identify with him.

\(^{167}\) Note that Anna is the only other character in this collection of illustrations to break the fourth wall. As discussed, she does so in the first frontispiece.
Vereiskii shows Stiva during some of the novel’s more humorous moments, which tends to make us empathize with him. Take Fig. 140, for instance. Comparing this plate to the text illustration of Fig. 138, we almost get a before and after presentation of the results of Stiva and Veslovsky’s arrival at Pokrovskoe: we see these two propose the hunt, and then three pages later we see them at the crack of dawn and on their way to the hunting grounds. Vereiskii has chosen the specific moment where Stiva and Veslovsky size up each other’s hunting outfits and where Stiva also has a good deal of fun at Levin’s expense.

By portraying Stiva is such exclusively positive terms, Vereiskii’s illustrations increase the character’s “allure” (Fawell). They gloss over the novel’s strategies that aim to make readers have “second thoughts about their own enchantment [to Stiva]” (Orwin “Strakhov” 485). There is another side to Stiva, one which these illustrations tend to overlook. The emblem for Stiva’s allure is his smile, but we should not forget that his smile is not only an emblem of his

Figure 136: Stiva dresses for work (IV.5)
Figure 137: Stiva waves goodbye to Karenin (IV.70)
Figure 138: Stiva and Vasenka propose hunting (IV.112)
Figure 139: Stiva at the elections (IV.126)

Figure 140: The morning of the hunt (IV.113)
affability; it is as effective at facilitating friendship as it is at seducing younger women. The combination suggests that he takes his gregariousness beyond the boundaries of his union with his wife and the obligations that union entails.

Kitty sees this aspect of Stiva most clearly. She has insights that strip him of his charm and reveal the more sordid side of his hedonism. Though she always keeps her judgments to herself, she is able to see her brother-in-law in a way that Dolly would rather not. After Vronsky betrays Kitty, for example, she confesses to her sister that she holds intense misanthropic feelings towards others, but keeps silent about her particular disdain for Stiva.

Kitty faltered; she wanted to go on to say that ever since this change had taken place in her, Stepan Arkadyich had become unbearably disagreeable to her, and that she could not see him without picturing the most coarse and ugly things. (126)

Later, when she and Levin move to Moscow in Part VII, she wonders what there is for her husband to do there, and, again, thinks of her brother-in-law in an unflattering light.

Indeed, what was there for him [Levin] to do? He did not like to play cards. He did not go to the club. To keep company with merry men like Oblonsky – she now knew what that meant… it meant drinking and going somewhere afterwards. She could not think without horror of where men went on such occasions. (672)

Her observations are important because they highlight the side of Stiva the narrator does not comment upon. Her mental imagery, the way she associates Stiva with “the most coarse and ugly things,” raises the problem of vision and empathy. What she sees, or what she can imagine, influences how she judges him. As Bayley notes, we never actually see Stiva’s romantic adventures (207). If we did, we would be less well-disposed, if not, like Kitty, outright intolerant of him. It is only enjoyable to observe the consummation of his sensual pleasure when it involves oysters; we do not want to be there when he sates his appetite on women’s bodies.

Kitty’s judgments aside, there is little else in the novel that casts aspersion on Stiva’s adventures with younger women (Alexandrov 208). Unlike his sister, he emerges from his
adulterous intrigues relatively unscathed. In fact, many scholars argue that we are intended to love him and identify with him as a means of entering *Anna Karenina*, a dense novel with morally challenging characters preoccupied with their mortality (Bayley 206, Bloom 237, Fawell 50, Kovarsky 62-6). This body of work reinforces the popular reception of Stiva as an alluring character. They do not, however, indicate that Kitty is wrong.

This research deals mainly with Russian and Soviet illustrations; it is useful to depart from this focus for a moment, however, because the Romanian illustrator O. Adler portrays Stiva from a point of view similar to Kitty’s (*Ana Carenina* 1953). His illustration emphasizes what Tolstoy’s narrator only suggests (Bayley 207): Adler shows Stiva giving the young ballerina Masha Chibisova a bouquet of flowers and some coral jewelry (Fig. 141). Whereas Vereiskii uses Stiva’s sensuality to humorous ends, Adler’s portrayal is unappealing: Stiva is fat, even piggish, with a double chin. Beyond the flowers and jewelry are other indications of profligacy: for example, with his cane, top hat and tuxedo, he is dressed as a dandy. The drawing suggests something indecent: his contact with the ballerina is secretive, taking place in a darkened corner. He looks at her as if she were a tantalizing morsel. She is somewhat embarrassed, looking at his gift coyly and not meeting his glance. In Tynianov’s terms, Adler limits his illustration to details inferred from the *fabula* (511). Kitty suspects that this type of scene happens, but the novel’s *siuzhet* does not show it in quite this light. Adler could only infer this type of scene from the “logic” of the novel, that is, from its *fabula* (Bal 7). This is Adler’s only illustration of Stiva and thereby lays extra stress upon what
Indeed, the episode with Masha Chibisova is too short to be taken as representative of Stiva’s role in the novel:

The next day was Sunday. Stepan Arkadyich called in on the ballet rehearsal at the Bolshoi Theatre and gave Masha Chibisova, a pretty dance, newly signed on through his patronage, the coral necklace he had promised her the day before and, backstage, in the theatre’s daytime darkness, managed to kiss her pretty face, brightened by the gift. Besides giving her the coral necklace, he had to arrange to meet her after the performance. (373)

The meeting with Masha Chibisova is an important detail the narrator shares with the reader, one that shows that Kitty is correct in her evaluation of her brother-in-law’s character. However, by limiting his one illustration of Stiva to this moment, Adler makes this conduct appear more important than some of Stiva’s other characteristics. If Vereiskii takes too much delight in drawing Stiva, Adler is too severe with his censure.

Vereiskii’s first illustration of Stiva tempers his generally very positive presentation of that character. A look at how that illustration actually appears on the page shows that Vereiskii
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168 The 1953 Romanian edition Ana Karenina includes 11 illustrations by O. Adler. Though these illustrations are less propagandistic than Samokhvalov’s of the same year, they are nevertheless ideological. For example, Adler also emphasizes the peasants and portrays Karenin as a villain. By presenting Stiva’s infidelity as profligacy, Adler may be attempting to position his connection to the aristocracy. When compared to the other illustrations, it stands out. Most of them offer portraits of characters or depict scenes directly from the novel.
juxtaposes his appealing portrait of Stiva with an empathetic one of Dolly (Fig. 142). She stands weeping, her back turned to the reader as she hopelessly takes her belongings from her chiffonier. Unlike Shcheglov’s illustrations, which unambiguously endorse Stiva’s worldview, here Vereiskii portrays the complexity of the situation already present in the book. Adler, the Romanian illustrator, shows the seamier side of Stiva, and in doing so extends the novel beyond the narrator’s explicit representation. Some readers may suspect that Adler is correct, but many may not be willing to imagine Stiva in this way. Vereiskii does not suggest anything sordid about Stiva, but he does not allow the reader to identify with Stiva without also acknowledging the cost of his happiness. While drama in the life of a man like him might be comedic (Orwin Art and Thought), Dolly is not laughing, and Vereiskii is sensitive to that fact.

**PORTRAYAL OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SPACES**

A clear extension of Anna’s lack of physical mobility is her initial presence in public spaces and her gradual confinement to intimate and private ones. Vereiskii pays a great deal of attention to this tendency in his illustrations. He initially shows her at the ball and playing with Dolly’s children but very quickly starts confining her to enclosed and secretive settings. The novel follows the same trajectory, of course, and so Vereiskii does not add anything new; but he does underscore the solitude and secrecy of certain scenes, as in the case Anna’s fall (Fig. 127), the Vrede Garden (Fig. 143), her recounting of her dream of the peasant (Fig. 144) and her
reunion with Serezha (Fig. 145). In addition to portraying these private scenes, Vereiskii often shows Anna’s isolation from others even as she is present in society. This clearly is the case in the illustration of her during steeplechase where her posture and tone distinguish her from the crowd (Fig. 133).

At first glance, Vereiskii juxtaposes the privacy of Anna’s world to the very public nature of Kitty’s. Of course, the painting of Levin and Kitty’s wedding is the most important case in this regard (Fig. 146), but even the paintings of Kitty in intimate settings tend to underscore her connection with other people. Vereiskii portrays the “ointment” that unites the sisters Dolly and Kitty in Part II of the novel (Fig. 147), he shows her pivotal role in comforting Nikolai in Part V (Fig. 114), and presents her at Pokrovskoe at the opening of Part VI comfortably assuming her role as manager of the household, despite conflicts with Agafia Mikhailovna over the preparation of jam (Fig. 148). There are many illustrations of her and Levin during pivotal moments in their courtship and after marriage. Fig. 149 shows them playing secretaire and Fig. 150, portraying their kiss at the Shcherbatskys’, is the tail piece to Part IV. Fig. 151 shows their reconciliation and a confused gardener after the upset caused by Veslovsky’s presence at Pokrovskoe and Fig. 152 offers a look at the relations between husband and wife during her confinement in Moscow.
Once again, Vereiskii’s strategy of juxtaposition follows the novel very closely and underscores his commitment to maintaining an unobtrusive position for his illustrations in the text.

Figure 146: The wedding ceremony (IV.89)

Figure 147: Dolly comforts Kitty (IV.25)

Figure 148: The Shcherbatskys descend upon Pokrovskoe (IV.110)

Figure 149: Levin and Kitty play secrétaire (IV.73)

Figure 150: Levin proposes (IV.74)

Figure 151: Levin and Kitty (IV.117)

Figure 152: Levin and Kitty in Moscow (IV.132)
CONCLUSION

Of all the illustrated editions of Anna Karenina in this research, Vereiskii’s fits best into the “synthesis” methodology Podobedova in her On the Nature of Book Illustration. If it is hard to locate his particular mental image of the novel’s themes and characters it is because he is conscientious about not interfering with the reader, and, more importantly, he so adeptly follows the cues of the narrator. Whether it is in capturing the life-force of his characters, the allure of Stiva or in the use of public and private spaces, Vereiskii makes it clear from his illustrations that he has read Anna Karenina closely. That said, I demonstrate that Vereiskii’s influence is felt in the following ways. First, he is sensitive to Anna’s sexuality and life-force. He is also cognizant of the moral consequences of her choices. His Anna is not a hero, but nor is she a victim or a villain. This may be an extension of his fidelity to the novel. It may also suggest a more moderate view of women than the one encountered by each of the proceeding artists. I also demonstrate how important Tolstoy’s 150th anniversary was to this overall publishing venture. If Sytin envisaged his illustrated Anna Karenina as a sideshow, Khudozhestvennaia literatura clearly regarded this book as a special feature, if not the main event. Likewise, it is clear that the publisher hoped to use Vereiskii’s award-winning illustrations to show off its capabilities for reproducing colour images and placing them in a variety of layouts in a large and high-quality book.

One might reasonably ask if Vereiskii’s illustrations are considered definitive. Despite their number and the thought put into them, they do not enjoy the status of Leonid Pasternak’s illustrations for Resurrection or Evgenii Lansere’s work for Cossacks or Khadzhi-Murat. Vereiskii died in 1993 and it is possible that copyright is preventing republication. Another factor is that the sheer number of illustrations makes them too unwieldy to reissue.
CONCLUSION

In presenting the work of the illustrators in this research I take into account their respective biographies and the historical, cultural and even political contexts from which their work emerged. The backgrounds and educations of Shcheglov, Korin and Moravov influenced their appreciation of Anna Karenina as did the entrepreneurial spirit of Ivan Sytin who clearly saw his book as an opportunity to cash in on the growing interest in high quality and illustrated books that arose in the years before the 1917 Revolution. Though it falls far short of it, the Sytin & Co. Anna Karenina looks and feels like an attempt to compete with the books associated with Mir iskusstva and other high quality publishers from that time. Piskarev’s pre-revolutionary education, technical skill and interest in book arts and belles-lettres made him a perfect Soviet candidate for the Limited Editions Club of New York with its goal of publishing high-quality collectible books abroad. Aleksandr Samokhvalov, as an artist who openly conformed to the Soviet regime, was a natural choice for the most ideological illustrations in this research. At the same time, his internal resentment of the regime shows up in his illustrations of Anna, something shown in this study by comparing his 1953 work with his other paintings of women from the 1920s and 1930s. Lastly, Vereiskii offers the most complete collection of illustrations. That book reflects a Soviet society with a significantly larger reading public than had existed when the other editions were published. It is also a testament to how advance Soviet publishing had advanced by the end of the Brezhnev years, at least with regard to image reproduction and
layout. Its quantity of illustrations fomented renewed interest and their subtlety and thoughtful interaction with the novel would have not irritated the novel’s more devoted readers. Likewise, its high quality would have fulfilled the dual goal of raising the profile of Khudozhestvennaia literatura as a publisher of quality art books and of providing appealing collectible books for a growing Soviet middle class to collect and enjoy.

Chronologically speaking, my survey of books reveals that Russian and Soviet readers gradually gained more opportunities to read Anna Karenina. Each edition envisages a larger readership and was cheaper to purchase. Though we lack the circulation data for the Sytin & Co. book, given the economics and literacy of the time, it is safe to assume that it was a very small edition. Piskarev’s book for the LEC was exceptionally exclusive, being published in only 1500 copies and reserved only for wealthy collectors. Samokhvalov’s book emerged along with many other editions of Anna Karenina in the post-war years, making that book widely available for the first time since the Bolsheviks’ rise to power. It had a circulation of 20 000 copies. Vereiskii’s book had a circulation of 30 000 copies and appears during an even larger flurry of Tolstoy publication activity to mark the author’s 150th anniversary which would have taken the Soviet reader’s familiarity and interest in him to new and deeper levels.

In addition to the demographic and economic transformations these discoveries demonstrate, my survey of illustrated editions of Anna Karenina shows continuities and changes in the commentaries and interpretations of the novel. Most significant of all are how they treat Anna and what they reveal about her reception and representation by the artists. The artists in the first two books censured her by barely representing her at all or, as in the case of Piskarev, by representing her within a larger iconographic system of macabre and supernatural signs. Samokhvalov shows Anna more closely and completely and with less censure than any other
artist. I demonstrate that his dependence on revolutionary feminine iconography granted him a means of self-assertion and wish-fulfillment during periods of intense political repression. Anna as a rebel offered him an especially appealing proxy. In other words, his paintings of Anna are so subjective that they pertain more to himself than to the novel. Vereiskii offers more images of Anna than any other artist. In his work he takes a more balanced view than the glowing endorsement of Samokhvalov or the censure of Shcheglov and Piskarev. He shows the moral cost of her choices without fearing or overlooking the powerful and potentially positive source of those choices.

At the North American premiere of his 2009 adaptation of Anna Karenina Sergei Soloviev remarked that film adaptations of the novel fail to capture the complexity of Tolstoy’s character because the role is normally used to cash in on the star power of a particular actress (Soloviev). Looking back at the roster of stars that have played this role on the silver screen and the stage, Soloviev certainly has a point. He is mistaken, however, in assuming that the sexually-charged and overwrought performances of Greta Garbo and others are flawed. These actresses capture an important facet of Tolstoy’s heroine; they tap into one potential source of Vronsky’s attraction for her.

One consequence of using stars to play Anna Karenina is that it necessarily places more emphasis on her physical presence, beauty and sexuality than on her internal features, namely her conscience. With the various illustrated editions produced in Russia and the USSR over the course of the twentieth century, we have seen that artists have taken as much interest in showing Anna’s physical beauty as in delineating her moral dilemma. In fact, Shcheglov and Piskarev take this route because their comprehension of the novel reveals that they feel threatened by Anna or at least that they understand that Tolstoy, by juxtaposing the Levin and Anna plots,
wants us to embrace the former and ignore the latter. This is not an uncommon interpretation, but it diminishes Anna’s power as a character because it overlooks the ways in which she is tragically heroic and the ways in which the author was drawn to her himself.¹⁶⁹

One important finding of my research is illustration’s relationship to Soviet ideology. Introductions in Soviet novels reveal how the regime sought to superimpose a new discourse on top of Tolstoy’s novel in order to ensure the correct interpretation. This emerges most clearly in the Limited Editions Club Anna Karenina of 1933. It sought to ensure that American readers would not confuse Tolstoy’s ideas with the goals of the Soviet government, something which had proven to be a problem in the 1920s (Denner). That book did not really envisage a meaningful role for illustration in conveying or supporting the ideological message. Piskarev’s woodcut prints are virtually devoid of propaganda. The same may not be said of Samokhvalov’s paintings. I show how he uses Anna as a form of dissent, but I also demonstrate how much more blatantly he toes the Party line. This work had absolute faith in the power of the image to convey the required meaning. This finding reveals illustration’s place in discussions of image and text. Not only do illustrations have a direct relationship to the text of a novel, but they can introduce and formalize particular readings.

My study also reveals Russia and the Soviet Union’s strong book art and graphic art culture. Repeatedly the legacy of Mir iskusstva was felt, especially in the case of the Sytin & Co. and LEC books. Likewise, the importance of the publishing houses «Academia» and Khudozhestvennaia literatura in the book and graphic arts is clear. «Academia» was crucial to the development of Piskarev and Samokhvalov’s careers (Larina). Khudozhestvennaia literatura

¹⁶⁹ Early drafts reveal how badly Tolstoy wanted to make Anna into a sensual caricature; the final draft departs significantly from that initial intention to show that he could not judge her for her passion without also acknowledging its power over her and therefore himself and all of us (Bayley; Jones).
(and its various precursors)\textsuperscript{170} was at the very heart of the publication of the LEC, Samokhvalov and Vereiskii books. My findings therefore address the concerns Kasiniec and Davis Jr. raise in their essay “The Rise and Decline of Book Studies in the Soviet Union” (\textit{Slavic and Russian Books and Libraries} 66-76).

By exploring how visual artists have responded to Tolstoy’s great novel and how the cultural, social and political issues of their time influenced their work, I have shown that \textit{Anna Karenina} has continuously occupied an enormous place in the Russian and Soviet imagination. As book production improved over the course of the last century, Tolstoy’s novel was continuously republished with the latest printing and image reproduction technology. In tandem with this, I have shown the various ways visual artists have interpreted Anna’s significance for their respective generations. Her heroism, vitality, adultery and her culpability have confronted Russian society with inexhaustible moral questions. The illustrations I examine comprise one component of this rich emotional and ethical engagement with Tolstoy’s novel.

\textsuperscript{170} For a history of the Khudozhestvennaia literatura publishing house, see the introduction to \textit{Katalog knig izdatel’stva «Khudozhestvennaia literatura». Tom pervyi: 1946-1966}, (Khudozhestvennaia literatura 3-21).
### APPENDIX ONE: THE SYTIN & CO. ANNA KARENINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Part, Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PART ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frontispiece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Karenin at court?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.i</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Headpiece</td>
<td>Stiva awakens with a smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.ii</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Stiva shaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.v</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Text ill.</td>
<td>Stiva at the office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1.ix</td>
<td>24-5</td>
<td>Korin</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Levin and Kitty skating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1.xi</td>
<td>32-3</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Levin and Stiva dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1.xiii</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Text ill.</td>
<td>Kitty rejects Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1.xviii</td>
<td>48-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Anna and Dolly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1.xxii</td>
<td>60-1</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Anna at the ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1.xxx</td>
<td>78-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Anna and Vronsky at Bogolovo Station en route back to Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1.xxxiv</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Text ill.</td>
<td>Vronsky shaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1.xxxiv</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Tailpiece</td>
<td>Frou-Frou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.i</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Tailpiece</td>
<td>Kitty with famous doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.v</td>
<td>98-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Anna and Vronsky in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.ix</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Text ill.</td>
<td>Karenin and Anna – the warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.xvii</td>
<td>128-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Ryabinin merchant buys from Stiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.xix</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Text ill.</td>
<td>Vronsky reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.xxiv</td>
<td>148-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Steeplechase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.xxix</td>
<td>160-1</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Karenin removes Anna from steeplechase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.xxxii</td>
<td>168-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Kitty and Varenka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>2.xxxiv</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Text ill.</td>
<td>Shcherbatskii and the old invalid greet one another reluctantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>2.xxxv</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Tailpiece</td>
<td>Kitty and Varenka say farewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Beginning vignette</td>
<td>Mowing scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>3.iii</td>
<td>188-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Levin and Koznyshev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>3.viii</td>
<td>200-1</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Dolly in church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>3.xi</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>Levin and old Parmenov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>3.xx</td>
<td>232-3</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Vronsky and Anna over Karenin’s letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>3.xxii</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>Serpukhovskoy – revelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>3.xxxv</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>The comely peasant daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>3.xxxv</td>
<td>248-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Levin drinking tea with a peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>3.xxx</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>Levin on horseback in the rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>3.xxxi</td>
<td>264-5</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Levin and Nikolai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART FOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Beginning vignette</td>
<td>Cart through a muddy trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>4.ii</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>Vronsky and Karenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>4.v</td>
<td>280-1</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Karenin and Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>288-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Karenin and Oblonsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>Karenin and Dolly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>300-1</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>320-1</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Karenin and baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Ending vignette</td>
<td>Vronsky and Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUME TWO</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>Cover</td>
<td>Anna and Serezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART FIVE</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Korin</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Levin at confession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.v</td>
<td>14-5</td>
<td>Moravov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.vi</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Moravov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.ix</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.xi</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.xiii</td>
<td>32-3</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.xx</td>
<td>48-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.xxv</td>
<td>64-5</td>
<td>Moravov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.xxiv</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Image</td>
<td>p.</td>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td><img src="114x670.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.xxxii 80-1</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Viewing of the painting with Mikhailov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td><img src="118x618.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>5.xxxiii 85</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>Anna at the theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td><img src="117x478.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>6.iv 96-7</td>
<td>Morav?</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Levin and Kitty – jealousy of Charsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td><img src="127x389.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>6.v 99</td>
<td>Korin</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>Koznychev and Varenka – mushrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td><img src="127x299.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>6.x 112-3</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Kitty and Levin – letter from Maryia Nikolaevna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td><img src="127x118.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>6.xvi 128-9</td>
<td>Korin</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Death of Nikolai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td><img src="127x207.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>6.xix 139</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Vignette</td>
<td>Princess Varvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td><img src="127x118.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>6.xxxi 144-5</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Anna with Serezha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Page No.</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.xxvii</td>
<td>160-1</td>
<td>Korin</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Agafia Mikhailovna – varenie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.i</td>
<td>176-7</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>Levin wakens the others before the hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>7.viii</td>
<td>192-3</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>A pregnant Kitty meets Vronsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>7.xv</td>
<td>208-9</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Colour plate (conté)</td>
<td>Katavasov, Metrov and Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>7.xxii</td>
<td>224-5</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>Stiva, Levin and Vronsky at club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.xxviii</td>
<td>240-1</td>
<td>Korin</td>
<td>BW plate</td>
<td>At the pharmacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART EIGHT

<p>| 66  | 8.iv    | 256-7| Shcheglov| BW plate | Departure of Vronsky                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>8.xii</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Moravov</td>
<td>BW – full page, not plate</td>
<td>Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>8.xiv</td>
<td>274-5</td>
<td>Korin</td>
<td>Colour plate</td>
<td>On the country road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>8.xix</td>
<td>2887</td>
<td>Shcheglov</td>
<td>Ending vignette</td>
<td>Levin portrait</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX TWO: PISKAREV’S **Anna Karenina** ILLUSTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Part &amp; Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title in “List of Illustrations”</th>
<th>Location in the text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOLUME ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Title page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two colours: title is teal and the rest of text is black (title page appears in both volumes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.i</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>“Head-piece to part the first”</td>
<td>Two colours (teal/grey and black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I.ix</td>
<td>36-7</td>
<td>“The Skating-ground”</td>
<td>Three colours (verdigris, green and black)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I meant to come and see you,” he said; and then recollecting what his intention was in seeking her, he was promptly... [illustration] ... overcome with confusion”
4. I.xxxiv 128 “Tail-piece to part the first” Two colours (grey and black)

5. II.i 131 “Head-piece to part the second” Two colours (teal/grey and black)

6. II.xi 165 “Anna’s fall” Recto, text illustration, third/quarter down the page, on the right margin

[ Illustration appears alongside the moment depicted ] Black

7. II.xxiv 212 “Two of Vronsky’s hobbies” Verso, text illustration, top of page, margin to margin

“Vronsky once more took in at one glance the beautiful lines of this favorite mare, who was quivering all over, and with an effort he tore himself from the sight of her, and went out of the stable. He went.... [ illustration ] ...towards the pavilions at the most

8. III.i 261 “Head-piece to part the third” Three colours: verdigris, teal/grey, black
“Kitty and Levin meeting”

“She did not look out again. The sound of the carriage-springs was no longer audible, the bells could scarcely be heard. The barking of the dogs showed the carriage had reached the village, and all that was left was the empty fields all round, the village in front, and he himself isolated and apart from it all, wandering lonely along the deserted highroad.

He glanced at the sky, expecting to find there the cloud shell....

“Head-piece to part the fourth”

“You’ve not been long settling things,” said the old Prince, trying to seem unmoved; but Levin noticed that his eyes were wet when he turned to him.
12. IV.xvii 453 “At Anna’s bed”

Alexei Alexandrovich took Vronsky’s hands and drew them away from his face, which was awful with the expression of agony and shame upon it.

[illustration]

“Give him your hand. Forgive him.”

13. V.i 3 “Head-piece to part the fifth” Two colours: teal/grey and black

VOLUME TWO

14. V.xx Death 68 “Nikolai’s death” Verso, text illustration, right margin, Nikolai’s body crosses the entire page (full stop!), page centre

Levin knew that this passionate prayer... [illustration] and hope would only make him feel more bitterly the parting from the life he so loved.

15. VI.i 125 “Head-piece to part the sixth” Two colours: Yellowish-green and black
16. VI.xvii 188-9  “Dolly on the way to Anna”

Vronsky, taking off his tall gray hat, went up to Dolly.
[illustration]
“You wouldn’t believe how glad we are to see you,” he said, giving peculiar significance to the words...

Three colours: Yellow, light green and black

17. VII.i 251  “Head-piece to part the seventh”

Three colours: canary yellow, teal/grey, black (the yellow and grey blend so well in this illustration that it gives the illusion that there is a fourth colour)

18. VII.xxxi 351  “Tail-piece to part the seventh”

Black

19. VIII.i 354-5  “Head-piece to part the eighth”

Two colours: Grey and black

20. VIII.xix 404-5  “Tail-piece to part the eighth”

Three colours: light grey, blue and dark grey.
**APPENDIX THREE: SAMOKHVALOV’S ANNA KARENINA PAINTINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Part &amp; Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Frontispiece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I.xxiii</td>
<td>86-7</td>
<td>Ballroom: Нет, я не останусь, - ответила Анна улыбаясь; но, несмотря на улыбку, и Корсунский и хозяин поняли по решительному тону, с каким она ответила, что она не останется. [plate] - Нет, я и так в Москве танцовала больше на вашем одном бале, чем всю зиму в П.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I.xxv</td>
<td>92-3</td>
<td>Nikolai Levin, Kritsky, Maria Nikolaevna and Levin: Расскажи, что ты делаешь? – продолжал он, жадно пережевывая кусок хлеба и наливая другую рюмку. – Как ты живешь? [plate] - Живу один в деревне, как жил прежде, занимаюсь хозяйством...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. I.xxx 104-5 Train platform: -Ни одного слова вашего, ни одного движения вашего я не забуду никогда и не могу...

[plate]
- Довольно, довольно! – вскрикнула она...

5. II.xvi 166-7 Riabinin [as kulak], Stiva and Levin: - Это можно, сказал Рябинин, садясь и самым мучительным для [plate]
себя образом облокачиваясь на спинку кресла….

6. II.xxix 206-7 Karenin offers to lead Anna away: - Я еще раз предлагаю вам свою руку, если вы хотите итти [sic], - сказал Алексей Александрович, дотрагиваясь до ее руки.
[plate]
Она с отвращением отстранилась от него

[plate]
Левин отдал косу Титу и с мужиками....
8. III.viii 260-1 Dolly with the peasant women: Кучер Терентий, привязав к дереву отмахивающихся-
[plate]
ся от оводов лошадей, лег....

9. III.xiv 278-9 Karenin composes a letter to his wife: Решение [plate]
мое следующее: каковы бы ни были...
[письмо Каренина]

10. III.xxv 316-7 Старик снял [plate]
девят лет тому назад у...

11. III.xxxii 340-1 Nikolai and Konstantin: Эта сила сама находит, по степени [plate]
своего развития, известный образ действительности.

12. IV.iv 354-5 Karenin seizes Anna’s letters: Она хотела вырвать портфель, но он оттолкнул ее. [plate]
- Сядьте! мне нужно говорить с вами...
13. IV.v 360-1 Discussion about divorce: и блестя и глазами и лаковыми сапожками. [plate] - Через неделю...

14. IV.xiv 388-9 Kitty and Levin and the Oblonsky party: не должна была сметь упоминать об этом. [plate] Левин простился с ними, но, чтобы не ...

VOLUME 2

15. V.xi 40-1 Mikhailov’s studio: Михайлову казалось, что картина и на них произвела впечатление. Он подошел к ним. [plate] ¶ - Как удивительно выражение Христа! – сказала Анна.

16. V.xxiv 80-1 Karenin receives Order of Alexander Nevsky: затянутого в мундире князя, мимо которых [plate] ему надо было пройти. – Справедливо сказано, что все в мире есть зло»

17. V.xxix 96-7 Anna reunites with Serezha: сказал швейцар, опять выходя из двери. [plate] ¶ И в ту минуту, как швейцар говорил это
| 18. | V.xxxiii | 110-1 | - Граф, ваша maman зовет вас, сказала княжна Сорокина, выглядывая из двери ложи. [plate]  
¶ - А я тебя все жду... |
| 19. | VI.xi  | 148-9 | Peasant awakens Levin, Stiva and Veslovsky: как прежде наши откупщики, наживают деньги так, что при наживе [plate] заслуживают презрение людей... |
| 20. | VI.xvii | 170-1 | спокойная грандиозная посадка поразили Долли. [plate]  
¶ В первую минуту ей показалось неприлично, что Анна ездит верхом. |
| 21. | VI.xxviii | 208-9 | Provincial elections: … о значении слов: находившегося под следствием. [plate]  
¶ Толпа раздалась, чтобы дать дорогу.... |
22. VII.xxii 292-3 Landau: и там стал рассказывать ему про то, как он провел вечер, и тут же заснул. [plate]
¶ Степан Аркадьевич был в упадке духа....

23. VII.xxv 302-3 “You will live to regret this!”: …чтобы он и не думал о возможности примирения. [plate]
¶ - Неужели же вам не жалко этого несчастного Певцова?

24. VII.xxxi 318-9 Suicide: «Избавиться от того что беспокоит», - повторяла Анна. И, взглянув [plate]
на краснощекого мужа и худую жену, она поняла, что ....

25. VIII.v 334-5 Vronsky and Koznishev: они разошлись по своим вагонам после второго звонка. [plate]
¶ VI
¶ Не зная, когда ему можно будет выехать из Москвы....
VIII.ix

346-7


Известно как, по правде, по-божью. Ведь люди разные.

VIII.xvii

362-3

Levin finds Kitty and Mitya under the linden in Kolok: Румяное и мокрое лицо Кити было обращено к нему и робко улыбалось из-под изменившей форму шляпы.

Ну, как тебе не совестно! Я не понимаю, как можно быть такой неосторожной....
### APPENDIX FOUR: VEREISKII’S *ANNIA KARENINA* ILLUSTRATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>Part, Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description on Page</th>
<th>Description of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOLUME ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dust jacket for Volume I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p.2</td>
<td>Frontispiece, verso</td>
<td>Portrait of Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PART ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>p.9</td>
<td>Headpiece, recto Two-tone: cool grey and black,</td>
<td>City scene from Moscow: Каланчёвская площадь и Николаевский вокзал (Комсомольская пл. и Ленинградский). Omniscient POV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. p.16 Dolly packing.
“Дарья Александровна, в кофточке и с пришпиленными на затылке косами уже редких, когда-то густых и прекрасных волоса с осушившимся, худым лицом и большими, выдававшимися от худобы лица, испуганными глазами, стояла среди разбросанных по комнате вещей пред открытою шифоньеркой, из которой она выбирала что-то.”

5. p.17 Stiva donning his fur coat with Matvei’s assistance
“Степан Аркадьевич надел шубу и вышел на крыльцо.”
This comes after he recalls his joke about the German and the clock and he decides that things just might образоваться

6. p.20 “Этот самый, - сказал сторож, указывая на сильно сложенного широкоплечего человека с курчавою бородой, который, не снимая бараньею шапки, быстро и легко взбегал наверх по стертым ступенькам каменной лестницы. Один из сходивших вниз с портфелем худощавый чиновник, приостановившись, неодобрительно посмотрел на ноги бегущего и потом вопросительно взглянул на Облонского.”
Зоологический сад

Note Levin in the foreground on the right panel.

“В четыре часа, чувствуя свое бьющееся сердце, Левин слез с извозчика у Зоологического сада и пошел дорожкой к горам и катку, наверное зная, что найдет ее там, потому что видел карету Щербацких у подъезда.

— Был ясный морозный день. У подъезда рядами стояли кареты, сани, ваньки, жандармы. Чистый народ, блестя на ярком солнце шляпами, кишел у входа и по расчищенным дорожкам, между русскими домиками с резными князьями; старые кудрявые березы сада, обвисшие ветвями от снега, казалось, были разубраны в новые торжественные ризы.

— Он шел по дорожке к катку и говорил себе: "Надо не волноваться, надо успокоиться. О чем ты? Чего ты? Молчи, глупое", - обращался он к своему сердцу. И чем больше он старался себя успокоить, тем все хуже захватывало ему дыхание.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Text illustration, recto, bottom</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Levin and Stiva dining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>The feeling a youth has before a fight.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
“Взойдя наверх одеться для вечера и взглянув в зеркало, она с радостью заметила, что она в одном из своих хороших дней и в полном обладании всеми своими силами, а это ей так нужно было для предстоящего: она чувствовала в себе внешнюю тишину и свободную грацию движений.”
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Text illustration, recto, lower margin (2/3 page)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Refers to 1.14 when Levin talks with Prince Shcherbatskii, despite his strong urge to depart.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Colour plate, recto</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Stiva and Vronsky at Nikolaevskii (Leningradskii) vokzal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
“- Ах, это Каренину? – сказал Вронский. [plate] - Ты, ее, верно знаешь?”
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Two-tone, two</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td>52-3</td>
<td>Arrival at Nikolaevskii vokzal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(error – images in incorrect order)
14. 1.19 p. 57 Text illustration, recto, bottom
Dolly and Anna:
Note that Dolly is not gazing “мимо золовки” in this illustration, though text location suggests otherwise:

“Долли задумчиво смотрела мимо золовки, слушая ее слова.
“ - Да, я понимаю, что положение его ужасно; виноватому хуже, чем невинному, - сказала она, - если он чувствует, что от вины его все несчастье. Но как же простить, как мне опять быть его женою после нее? Мне жить с ним теперь будет мученье...”

15. 1.20 p. 60 Text illustration, verso, top
Anna with the children and talking to Kitty:

“- Нет, душа моя, для меня уж нет таких балов, где весело, - сказала Анна, и Кити увидела в ее глазах тот особенный мир, который ей не был открыт.
“- Для меня есть такие, на которых менее трудно и скучно...”

16. 1.23 p. 67 Colour plate, recto
The ball.
Kitty in the foreground.
Anna and Vronsky in the background.

“Когда Вронский [plate] увидел ее, столкнувшись с ней в мазурке, он не вдруг не узнал ее.”
18. p. 74 "но когда он надел привезенный ему тулуп, сел, закутавшись, в сани и поехал, раздумывая о предстоящих распоряжениях в деревне и поглядывая на пристяжную, бывшую верховою, донскую, надорванную, но лихую лошадь, он совершенно иначе стал понимать то, что с ним случилось. Он чувствовал себя собой и другим не хотел быть."

19. p. 77 "Левин пристально смотрел на нее [Ласка], удивляясь тому, как она поняла его мысли."

20. p. 81 "Она оглянулась и в ту же минуту узнала лицо Вронского. Приложив руку к козырьку, он наклонился пред ней и спросил, не нужно ли ей чего-нибудь, не может ли он служить ей? Она довольно долго, ничего не отвечая, вглядывалась в него и, несмотря на тень, в которой он стоял, видела, или ей казалось, что видела, и выражение его лица и глаз."
“Узнав все новости, Вронский с помощью лакея оделся в мундир и поехал являться. Явившись, он намерен был съездить к брату, к Бетси и сделать несколько визитов с тем, чтоб начать ездить в тот свет, где бы он мог встречать Каренину. Как и всегда в Петербурге, он выехал из дома с тем, чтобы не возвращаться до поздней ночи.”

Society gathers before the steeplechase, the environs of Petergof. Omniscient POV. Note that we see as if we are seated in the pavilion.

“Она не ожидала такой жестокости от сестры и сердилась на нее. Но вдруг она услышала шум платья и вместе звук разразившегося..."
сдержанного рыданья, и чьи-то руки снизу обняли ее шею. Кити на коленях стояла пред ней.”

“Никакой, - смеясь и выставляя свои сплошные зубы, сказал Вронский. - Виноват, - прибавил он, взяв из ее руки бинокль и принявшись оглядывать чрез ее обнаженное плечно противоположный ряд лож. - Я боюсь, что становлюсь смешон.”

“Да, но женщины с тенью обычно дурно кончают.”

Illustration depicts the following, but is located on the following page:

“No чем громче он говорил, тем ниже она опускала свою когда-то гордую, веселую, теперь же постыдную голову, и она вся стибала и падала с дивана, на котором сидела, на пол, к его ногам; она упала бы на ковер, если бы он не держал ее.”
30. Colour plate, recto

2.13 p. 121

Levin and Vasily the worker

“- Ничего, сударь, затянет,
- отвечал Василий.
[plate]
¶ Пожалуйста, не рассуждай,
- сказал Левин,
а делай, что говорят.”

31. Two-tone, two-page text illustration, across centre of both pages

2.15 p. 126-7

“Фигура Степана Аркадьича опять зашла за куст, и Левин видел только яркий огонек спички, вслед за тем заменившийся красным углем папиросы и синим дымком.”

32. Text illustration, verso, upper margin (1/2 page)

2.16 p. 130

“Рябинин... был одет в длиннополый синий сюртук с пуговицами ниже зада и в высоких, сморщенных на щиколотках и прямых на икрах сапогах, сверх которых были надеты большие калоши. Он округло вытер платком свое лицо и, запахнув сюртук, который и без того держался очень хорошо,...”

33. Text illustration, recto, lower margin (1/2 page)

2.16 p. 131

Agafia Mikhailovna with травничка
“Одетая в белое с ширким шитьем платье, она сидела в углу террасы за цветами и не слыхала его. Склонив свою чернокурчавую голову, она прижала лоб к холодной лейке, стоящей на перилах, и обеими своими прекрасными руками, со столь знакомым ему кольцами, придерживала лейку. Красота всей ее фигуры, головы, шеи, рук каждый раз, как неожиданностью, поражала Бронского.”

Illustration of Vronsky’s POV.
“Анна стояла наверху пред зеркалом, прикалывая с помощью Аннушки последний бант на платье, когда она услышала у подъезда звуки давящих щебень колес. "Для Бетси еще рано", - подумала она и, взглянув в окно, увидела карету и высовывающуюся из нее черную шляпу и столь знакомые ей уши Алексея Александровича.”


“Это были: очень высокий сутуловатый мужчина с огромными руками, в коротком, не по росту, и старом пальто, с черными, наивными и вместе страшными глазами, и рябоватая миловидная женщина, очень дурно и безвкусно одетая.”

Portrait of Varenka. Arrives at the moment when she dismisses oskorable. She looks at her watch: time to get back to Stal.
Shchebatskii meets Stal’. Kitty notices the traces of a smirk on her father’s face.

“- Куда же вы? Посидите еще, - обратился он к Вареньке. “- Мне надо домой, - сказала Варенька, вставая, и опять залилась смехом.”

Kitty and Varenka bid each other farewell.

Peasants returning from the harvest of hay. Refers ahead to 3.12. Levin’s POV?

Levin and Koznyshev in the cabriolet to go fishing.

“Левин подошел к брату. Ничего не ловилось, но Сергей Иванович не скучал и казался в самом веселом расположении духа. Левин видел, что, раззадоренный разговором с доктором, он хотел поговорить. Левину же, напротив, хотелось скорее домой...”
50. Mowing scene. Note how Levin’s scythe is on a different stroke than all the other mowers.

3.4 p. 190-1 Two-tone, two-page text illustration, across the centre of the page

51. Ergushovo, Dolly thinks of how proud she is of her children.

3.7 p. 198 Text illustration, verso, top

52. Though located in 3.9, it is actually better suited to 3.8 where Dolly converses with the peasant women. By putting it in 3.9, Vereiskii implies this is Levin’s POV:

“- Барин какой-то идет, кажется, покровский,
“ Дарья Александровна выглянула вперед и обрадовалась, увидав в серой шляпе и сером пальто знакомую фигуру Левина, шедшего им навстречу. Она и всегда рада ему была, но теперь особенно рада была, что он видит ее во всей ее славе. Никто лучше Левина не мог понять ее величия.”

3.9 p. 201 Text illustration, recto, bottom

53. 3.11: Levin discusses with old Parmenov about Ivan Parmenov and his wife. He’s just returned from haggling.

3.12 p. 207 Colour plate, recto

Note that this action is from 3.11 but the illustration is located in 3.12:
“...все заходило и заколыхалось под размеры этой дикой развеселой песни с вскриками....”

54. 3.12 p. 209 Text illustration, recto, top Levin’s POV. Kitty on the way to Ergushovo.

55. 3.13 p. 211 Text illustration, recto, upper margin (1/2 page) Karenin alone in the carriage. It could be the POV of Anna—выражение мертвенности, but I think it’s probably him entirely alone experiencing the relief of someone who has had his tooth pulled.

56. 3.15 p. 217 Text illustration, recto, top Anna contemplating the two sides of her brain

“Девушка [Аннушка], уже давно прислушивавшаяся у ее двери, вошла сама к ней в комнату. Анна вопросительно взглянула ей в глаза и испуганно покраснела. Девушка извинилась, что вошла, сказав, что ей показалось, что позвонили. Она принесла платье и записку. Записка была от Бетси.”

57. 3.18 p. 224-5 Two-page, one-tone text illustration, across the top Liza Merkalova enters to greet Anna (sitting here with Sappho Stolz)
Полковой командир Демин занимал большой помещичий дом. Все общество было на просторном нижнем балконе. На дворе первое, что бросилось в глаза Вронскому, были песенники в кителях, стоявшие подле бочонка с водкой, и здорова веселая фигура полкового командира, окруженного офицерами; выйдя на первую ступень балкона, он, громко перекрикивая музыку, игравшую оффенбаховскую кадриль, что-то приказывал и махал стоявшим в стороне солдатам. Кучка солдат, вахмистр и несколько унтер-офицеров подошли вместе с Вронским к балкону. Вернувшись к столу, полковой командир опять вышел с бокалом на крыльцо и провозгласил тост: "За здоровье нашего бывшего товарища и храброго генерала князя Серпуховского. Ура!"

“Он встал и направился к двери. Анна встала тоже. Он, молча поклонившись, пропустил ее.”

The illustration precedes the text somewhat.

“Он засмеялся злым и холодным смехом.

¶- Должно быть, тот род жизни, который вы избрали....”
61. 3.25 p. 242 Text illustration, verso, lower margin (1/2 page), facing next page (see below) Wealthy peasant.

“Лысый свежий старик, с широкою рыжею бородой, седою у щек, отворил ворота, прижавшись к верее, чтобы пропустить тройку.”

62. 3.25 p. 243 Text illustration, recto, upper margin (1/2 page), facing previous page His daughter.

“Чисто одетая молодайка, в калошках на босу ногу, согнувшись, подтирала пол в новых сенях. Она испугалась вбежавшей за Левиным собаки и вскрикнула, но тотчас же засмеялась своему испугу, узнав, что собака не тронет. Показав Левину засученною рукой на дверь в горницу, она спрятала, опять согнувшись, свое красивое лицо и продолжала мыть.”

63. 3.27 p. 248 Two-tone quadratic text illustration, verso, centre At Sviyazhsky’s. Discussion of the Russian peasantry. Sviyazhsky, Levin, the Old Landowner with grey whiskers.

64. 3.28 p. 251 Text illustration, recto, bottom “Свижский достал книги и сел в качающееся кресло.... “Несмотря на то, что Левина занимала тепер больше всего мысль о хозяйстве, он, слушая хозяина, спрашивал себя: "Что там в нем сидит? И почему, почему ему интересен раздел Польши?"" 

POV Levin
PART IV

65. Text illustration, recto, top
   Levin at the end of September.
   “Непогода к вечеру разошлась еще хуже...”

66. Tailpiece, verso
   Levin meets Kitty’s cousin in Europe:
   “Мне умирать пора.”

67. Headpiece, recto,
    Two-tone: Light blue and black
    Nevsky Prospect at the Fontanka. Omniscient POV.
    We see as if we were a pedestrian on the street.

68. Colour plate, recto
    Anna recounts her dream to Vronsky
    “Да подожди, теперь не долго я ...
    [plate]
    Но вдруг она остановилась. Выражение ее....”

69. Text illustration, verso, bottom
    “Приемная комната знаменитого петербургского адвоката была полна, когда Алексей Александрович вошел в нее. Три дамы: старушка, молодая и купчиха, три господина: один - банкир-немец с перстнем на пальце, другой - купец с бородой, и третий - сердитый чиновник в вицмундире, с крестом на шее, очевидно, давно уже...”
ждали. Два помощника писали на столах, скрипя перьями.”

“Я завтра заеду!- прокричал ему Степан Аркадыч.”

Московский переулок.

Иллюстрация окружена текстом, где группа друзей Стивы собирается (без него)
73. 4.13 p. 296 Two-tone quadratic text illustration, verso, centre Secretaire.

74. 4.15 p. 301 Text illustration, recto, upper margin (1/2 page) Levin and Kitty kissing “Она сделала все, что могла, - она подбежала к нему и отдалась вся, робея и радуясь. Он обнял ее и прижал губы к ее рту, искавшему его поцелуя.”

75. 4.17 p. 305 Two-tone quadratic text illustration, recto, centre Nevsky. Across from Gostinyi dvor. Karenin on the way home.

76. 4.17 p. 307 Colour plate “Алексей Александрович прошел в ее кабинет. У ее стола боком к спинке на низком стуле сидел Вронский и, закрыв лицо руками, плакал. Он вскочил на голос доктора, отнял руки от лица и увидел Алексея Александровича. Увидав мужа, он так смутился, что опять сел, втягивая голову в плечи, как бы желая исчезнуть куда-нибудь; но он сделал усилие над собой, поднялся и сказал: “ - Она умирает. Доктора сказали, что нет надежды. Я весь в вашей власти, но позвольте мне быть тут... впрочем, я в вашей воле, я при... “ Алексей Александрович, увидав слезы Вронского,
почувствовал прилив того душевного расстройства, которое производил в нем вид страданий других людей, и, отворачивая лицо, он, не дослушав его слов, поспешно пошел к двери."

“мне осталось жить немного, [plate] сейчас начнется жар, и я ничего уж не пойму. Теперь я понимаю....”

77. 4.18 p. 311 Text illustration, recto, top Vronsky contemplates suicide.

On page: ““Честолюбие? Серпуховской? Свет? Двор?” Ни на чем он не мог остановиться. Все это имело смысл прежде, но теперь ничего этого уже не было.”

78. 4.18 p. 312 Text illustration, verso, upper margin (2/3 page) “Элегантный слуга с бакенбардами, неоднократно жаловавшийся своим знакомым на слабость своих нерв, так испугался, увидав лежавшего на полу господина, что оставил его истекать кровью и убежал за помощью.”

79. 4.19 p. 315 Text illustration, recto, upper margin (2/3 page) Prince Betsy Is this the POV of Karenin or of Anna?

80. 4.20 p. 317 Text illustration, recto, top “ - Нет, вы упрекаете! Боже мой! зачем я не умерла! - И она зарыдала. - Прости меня, я раздражена, я несправедлива, - сказала она, опоминаясь. – Но уйди...”

Omniscient POV

“И он, отвернувшись от шурина, так чтобы тот не мог видеть его, сел на стул у окна. Ему было горько, ему было стыдно; но вместе с этим горем и стыдом он испытывал радость и умиление пред высотой своего смирения.”

82.  4.23  p. 324  Tailpiece, verso  Vronsky and Anna reunited.

83.  p. 325  Tailpiece, recto  Italy

END OF VOLUME I
PART V

86. 5.1 p. 7 Headpiece, recto, Two-tone: cool grey and black Vasilievsky Ostrov, facing south. Omniscient POV, as if from a first story window. Anticipates what? Part V begins in Moscow?

87. 5.1 p. 9 Text illustration, recto, upper margin (1/2 page) Portrait of priest who takes Levin’s confession. Levin’s POV

88. 5.2 p. 14-5 Two-tone, two-page text illustration, across the centre “Толпа народа, в особенности женщин, окружала освещенную для свадьбы церковь. Те, которые не успели проникнуть в средину, толпились около окон, толкаясь, споря и заглядывая сквозь решетки.”
Wedding ceremony.

"- Нет, парочка хороша. [plate]
- А вот вы спорили, Марья Власевна, что карналины..."

Anna and Vronsky traveling through Europe.

Mikhailov painting Anna’s portrait. Note that this scene does not take place in 5.9. Vronsky proposes that he do her portrait. It is in 5.9 where we learn about Vronsky’s painting of the Italian wet-nurse (opposing page).

“Лучше Ани (так она звала свою девочку). Вот и она, - прибавила она, взглянув в окно на красавицу итальянку-кормилицу, которая вынесла ребенка в сад, и тотчас же незаметно оглянувшись на Вронского. Красавица кормилица, с которой Вронский писал голову для своей картины, была единственное тайное горе в жизни Анны. Вронский, писав с нее, любовался ее красотой и средневековостью, и Анна не смела себе признаться, что она боится ревновать эту кормилицу, и поэтому особенно ласкала и баловала и ее и ее маленького сына.”
93. Two-tone quadratic text illustration, recto, centre
The viewing of Mikhailov’s painting of Jesus and Pilate.

94. Text illustration, recto, top
Kitty ordering what she wants from cook and Agafia Mikhailovna
Disappointments and enchantments of early marriage.

95. Dolly gazing at the back of Levin’s neck.

96. Text illustration, recto, across the bottom
Trip to provincial town to get Nikolai.

97. Colour plate, recto
“О господи! – проговорил он и тяжело вздохнул. [plate]
¶Марья Николаевна пощупала его ноги.”
This chapter provides the background on Karenin, Anna, their relationship and the impact their separation has on Karenin: “Та привязанность, которую он испытывал к Анне, исключила в его душе последние потребности сердечных отношений к людям. И теперь изо всех его знакомых у него не было никого близкого. Много было того, что называется связями; но дружеских отношений не было.”

Lydia Ivanovna:
“Надо благодарить Его и просить Его о помощи. В Нем одном мы найдем спокойствие, утешение, спасение и любовь, - сказала она и, подняв глаза к небу, начала молиться, как понял Алексей Александрович по ее молчанию.”

“И как они все сильны и здоровы физически, - подумал Алексей Александрович, глядя на могучего с расчесанными душностями бакенбардами камергера и на красивую шею затянутого в мундире князя, мимо которых ему надо было пройти. - Справедливо сказано, что все в мире есть зло”, - подумал он, косясь еще раз на икры камергера.”
101. 5.26 p. 69 Text illustration, recto, upper margin (1/2 page) “- Ну что, Капитоныч? - сказал Сережа, румяный и веселый возвратившись с гулянья накануне дня своего рождения и отдавая свою сборчатую поддевку высокому, улыбающемуся на маленького человека с высоты своего роста, старому швейцару. - Что, был сегодня подвязанный чиновник? Принял папа?” Omniscient POV.

102. 5.28 p. 72 Text illustration, recto, lower margin (2/3 page) This is probably an illustration of Betsy. It could be an illustration of Varia, the wife of Vronsky’s brother.

103. 5.29-30 p. 77 Colour plate, recto Anna’s brief reunion with Serezha. “...но больше она не могла говорить.

104. 5.31 p. 82 Text illustration, verso, upper margin (1/2 page) “- Очень рад, - сказал Яшин с улыбкой, по которой Вронский видел, что Анна очень понравилась ему.”

105. 5.33 p. 85 Text illustration, recto, bottom “Камердинер, чувствуя себя невиноватым, хотел оправдываться, но, взглянув на барина, понял по его лицу, что надо только молчать, и, поспешно извиваясь, опустился на ковер и стал разбирать целые и разбитые рюмки и бутылки.”
Two-tone: cool grey and black

PART VI

On the way to Levin’s estate.

Omniscient.

Varenie
111. 6.4-5 p. 102 Text illustration, verso, top, ½ page (NB. Comes between two chapters)

Koznyshev approaching Varenka

“Он почувствовал, что решился. Варенька, только что присевшая, чтобы поднять гриб, гибким движением поднялась и оглянулась. Бросив сигару, Сергей Иванович решительными шагами направился к ней.”

112. 6.7 p. 107 Text illustration, recto, lower margin (1/2 page)


113. 6.8 p.110 Colour plate, recto

Leaving for the hunt.

“- Под потолок и в стену она придет.
[plate]
¶- Помилуйте. Ведь снизу пойдешь, пойдешь и придет.”

114. 6.9 p. 114 Text illustration, verso, top

“Левин боялся немного, что он замучает лошадей, особенно левого, рыжего, которого он не умел держать; но невольно он подчинялся его веселью, слушал романсы, которые Весловский, сидя на козлах, распевал всю дорогу, или рассказы и представления в лицах, как надо править по-английски four in hand; и они все после завтрака в самом веселом расположении духа доехали до Гвоздевского болота.”

115. 6.10 p. 117 Text illustration, recto, top

The peasants with whom Veslovsky shares vodka and bread.
Levin and Laska. Inside the dog’s mind.

“Садовник с удивлением видел, несмотря на то, что ничего не гнало за ними и что бежать не от чего было, и что ничего они особенно радостного не могли найти на лавочке, - садовник видел, что они вернулись домой мимо него с успокоенными, сияющими лицами.”

““Это что еще?” - подумал Левин, когда лакей, выбежав из дома, остановил тарантас. Это был машинист, про которого совсем забыл Левин. Машинист, раскланиваясь, что-то говорил Весловскому; потом влез в тарантас, и они вместе уехали.”

Anna meets Dolly on the highway on the way to Vozdvizhensk.

“…предложил дамам ехать в шарабане.
[plate]
¶ - А я поеду в этом вегикуле, - сказал он….”

Anna getting into the carriage with Dolly, Veslovsky riding sidesaddle. Peasants’ POV, as the chapter indeed ends from their POV.
Пришедшая предложить свои услуги франтиха-горничная, в прическе и платье моднее, чем у Долли, была такая же новая и дорогая, как и вся комната. Дарье Александровне были приятны ее учтивость, опрятность и услужливость, но было неловко с ней; было совестно пред ней за свою, как на беду, по ошибке уложенную ей заплатанную кофточку.”

“Двумя парами пошли по дорожке, Анна с Свияжским и Долли с Вронским. Долли была несколько смущена и озабочена тою совершенно новою для нее средой, в которой она очутилась.”

Vronsky asks for Dolly’s help.

Playing tennis. Veslovsky with shirt removed.

Anna and Dolly discussing divorce before bed.
“Степан Аркадьевич, только что закусивший и выпивший, обтирая душистым батистовым с каемками платком рот, подошел к ним в своем камергерском мундире.”

Elections, zemstvo, POV of Levin

Provincial elections. The meeting room where Levin briefly gets reacquainted with the old landowner from Sviyazhsky’s in 3.27

Vronsky’s valet.

POV?

“Уже пред выходом из-за стола, когда все закурили, камердинер Вронского подошел к нему с письмом на подносе.”

Princess Varvara playing patience and Anna reading Taine as she waits for Vronsky to return from elections.

Anna and Vronsky departing for Moscow.
Headpiece, recto
Two-tone: warm grey and black

Moscow. Looks like it might be Kitai gorod and Gostinnyi dvor. Definitely Kremlin in the background. Omniscient.

Colour plate, recto

Kitty asks Levin about their finances and how the city has increased their expenses

Plate comes after the scene

"— Слушаю-с.
[plate]
И, так просто и легко разрешив благодаря городским условиям затруднение..."

Arsenii and Natalia Lvov. Kitty's older sister and her husband.

At the Countess Bol’s.

Levin and Stiva on the way to Anna.

“...но как только карета выехала на улицу и он почувствовал качку экипажа по неровной дороге, услышал сердитый крик встречного извозчика, увидел при неярком освещении красную вывеску кабака и лавочки, впечатление это разрушилось, и он начал обдумывать свои поступки и спросил себя, хорошо ли
он делает, что едет к Анне.”

POV Levin.

Though this illustration is located in 7.10, the portrait is located at the very end of 7.9 just before Levin and Anna’s discussion.

Levin tells Kitty that he spent evening at Anna’s

“Вернувшись, он застал Кити на том же кресле. Когда он подошел к ней, она взглянула на него и зарыдала.”

“Левин, увидав свою выезжавшую из ворот лошадь. Вскочив в сани рядом с Кузьмой, он велел ехать к доктору.”

“Но, что б они ни говорили, он знал, что теперь все погибло. Приложившись головой к притолоке, он стоял в соседней комнате и слышал чей-то никогда не слыханный им визг, рев, и он знал, что это кричало то, что было прежде Кити.”

Levin sees Kitty after delivery. He is about to see son, Dmitry for first time.
“- Я не хочу
протекционной системы не
для выгоды частных лиц,
но для общего блага - и для
нищих и для высших
классов одинаково, -
gоворил он, поверх пинс-
неаз глядя на Облонского. -
Но они не могут понять
это, они заняты только
личными интересами и
увлекаются фразами.”

Степан Аркадьяч, как и
всегда, не праздно
проводил время в
Петербург.

Landau:

“Француз спал или
притворялся, что спит,
прислонив голову к спинке
кресла, и плотною рукой,
лежавщею на колене,
делал слабые движения,
как будто ловя что-то.
Алексей Александрович
встал, хотел осторожно,
но, зацепив за стол,
подошел и положил свою
руку в руку француза.
Степан Аркадьяч встал
тоже и, широко отворяя
глаза, желая разбудить
себя, если он спит, смотрел
то на того, то на другого.
Все это было наяву.
Степан Аркадьяч
чувствоовал, что у него в
голове становится все
более и более нехорошо.”
“Камердинер Вронского пришел спросить расписку на телеграмму из Петербурга. Ничего не было особенного в получении Вронским депеш, но он, как бы желая скрыть что-то от нее, сказал, что расписка в кабинете, и поспешно обратился к ней.”

Anna, waiting for Vronsky.

Anna checks to see if she’s done her hair; she does not recognize herself in the mirror.

“- На Знаменку, к Облонским. [plate – closes the chapter.]”

Anna on her way through the Moscow streets to the train station.

“Две горничные, ходившие по платформе, загнули назад головы, глядя на нее, что-то соображая вслух о ее туалете: "Настоящие", - сказали они о кружеве, которое было на ней. Молодые люди не оставляли ее в покое. Они опять, заглядывая ей в
лицо и со смехом крича что-то ненатуральным голосом, прошли мимо. Начальник станции, проходя, спросил, едет ли она. Мальчик, родавец квасу, не спускал с нее глаз. "Боже мой, куда мне?" - все дальше и дальше уходя по платформе, думала она. У конца она остановилась. Дамы и дети, встретившие господина в очках и громко смеяющиеся и говорившие, замолкли, оглядывая ее, когда она поравнялась с ними. Она ускорила шаг и отошла от них к краю платформы. Подходил товарный поезд. Платформа затрясась, и ей показалось, что она едет опять."

PART VIII

8.1 p. 251 Headpiece, recto
Two-tone: cool grey and black
Levin’s estate. POV omniscient.

151. 8.2 p. 255 Text illustration, recto, bottom
“Едва Сергей Иванович с Катавасовым успели подъехать к особенно оживленной нынче народом станции Курской железной дороги и, выйдя из кареты, осмотреть подъезжающего сзади с
вещами лакея, как подъехали и добровольцы на четырех извозчиках. Дамы с букетами встретили их и в сопровождении хлынувшей за ними толпы вошли в станцию.”

“В косой вечерней тени кулей, наваленных на платформе, Вронский в своем длинном пальто и надвинутой шляпе, с руками в карманах, ходил, как зверь в клетке, на двадцати шагах быстро поворачиваясь.”

Omniscient POV

One of the general ясенполяновские виды Vereiskii discusses.

“Цена дорога, Платону не выручить, Константин Дмитрич, - отвечал мужик, выбирая колосья из потной пазухи.”

“Левин смотрел перед собой и видел стадо, потом увидел свою тележку, запряженную Вороным, и кучера, который, подъехав к стаду, поговорил что-то с пастухом; потом он уже вблизи от себя услышал звук колес и фырканье
сытой лошади; но он так был поглощен своими мыслями, что он и не подумал о том, зачем едет к нему кучер.”

Illustration follows depicted scene.

“Он хотел сказать, что напрас- ...
но Иван высоко подтянул чересчурно, но это было похоже на упрек....”

Красивый старик с черной с проседью бородой и густыми серебряными волосами неподвижно стоял, держа чашку с медом, ласково и спокойно с высоты своего роста глядя на господ, очевидно ничего не понимая и не желая понимать.

156. 8.15 p. 278 Text illustration, verso, top Located at end of chapter. Discussion of war.

157. 8.17 p. 280 Text illustration, verso, top Levin running into Kolok.

158. 8.18 p. 283 Text illustration, recto, top “ Как только Левин подошел к ванне, ему тотчас же был представлен опыт, и опыт вполне удался. Кухарка, нарочно для этого призванная, нагнулась к ребенку. Он нахмурился и отрицательно замотал головой. Кити нагнулась к нему, - он просиял улыбкой, уперся ручками в губку и запрукал губами, производя такой довольный и странный звук, что не только Кити и няня, но и Левин пришел в не-
Вместо того чтобы идти в гостиную, из которой слышны были голоса, он остановился на террасе и, облокотившись на перила, стал смотреть на небо.”

Vereiskii’s choice of depiction here is curious. Is this a terrace?
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