UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Narrative Re/Styling:

Text and Fashion in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature and Culture

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Slavic Languages and Literatures

by

Sanja Lacan

2018

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Narrative Re/Styling:

Text and Fashion in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature and Culture

by

Sanja Lacan

Doctor of Philosophy in Slavic Languages and Literatures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2018

Professor Stephen Frank, Co-Chair

Professor Ronald W. Vroon, Co-Chair

This dissertation examines the symbolic role the fashion system played in the process of modernization of nineteenth-century Russian society, and in the articulation of that process in literary texts of the period. Because of its infinite potential for the creation of new and ambiguous meanings, as well as its formal similarity with literature, which requires constant innovation in order to sustain marketability, writing about fashion offered a rich context for debates about the nature of aesthetics, society, and modernity.

Each chapter focuses on a unique moment in the cultivation of fashion, taste, and consumer habits in the latter half of the nineteenth century, beginning with Nikolai Nekrasov and Ivan Panaev's commodification of literature in their journalistic and literary texts of the 1840s, through Ivan Goncharov's narratives of self-fashioning and Nikolai Chernyshevsky's

examination of commerce and ideology mid-century, to Leo Tolstoy's commodification of the female subject in *Anna Karenina* during the 1870s, and its subsequent echoes in our contemporary cinematic experience of the novel. Rather than focusing on fashion per se, this dissertation instead examines fashion culture, which involves new social roles, new forms of communication, and ultimately new values and attitudes. My project thus considers the implications of fashion not only for the development of the Russian literary sphere in the nineteenth century, but also for our contemporary cultural processes.

The dissertation of Sanja Lacan is approved.

Olga Kagan

Stephen Frank, Committee Co-Chair

Ronald W. Vroon, Committee Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2018

Table of Contents

Note on Translation and Transliteration

Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own. When available, I cite from published translations of Russian and French works into English, and provide the bibliographic information in the corresponding footnote. All Russian names, titles, and short quotations have been transliterated into the Roman alphabet using the Library of Congress system. Personal names have been rendered according to the Library of Congress transliteration of the Russian spelling, with the exception of popular Anglophone forms, such as “Fyodor Dostoevsky” or “Leo Tolstoy.” All Russian terms and phrases that exceed one line of text have been preserved in the original Cyrillic script, and are accompanied by their English equivalent in the corresponding footnote. All block quotes include the original Cyrillic and the accompanying translation in the body text of the chapter.

Vita

EDUCATION

2006 M.A. in Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of California, Los Angeles

2001 B.A. in Molecular and Cell Biology, emphasis in Neurobiology, University of California, Berkeley
B.A. in Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of California, Berkeley

PUBLICATIONS

Peer-reviewed articles

2015 "Concealing, Revealing, and Coming Out: Lesbian Visibility in Dalibor Matanić's 'Fine Dead Girls' and Dana Budisavljević's 'Family Meals'." *Studies in European Cinema*, 12.3: 229-245.
* Republished 2017 in monograph Queer European Cinema: Queering Cinematic Time and Space. Ed. Leanne Dawson. London: Routledge.
* Included in 2016 digital collection Global Approach to LGBTQ. <http://explore.tandfonline.com/page/ah/global-approach-to/global-approach-to...lgbtq/lgbtq-communication-studies>

2004 "Variable effects of chronic subcutaneous administration of rotenone on striatal histology." Journal of Comparative Neurology, 478.4:418-26 (with Chunni Zhu, Patrick Vourc'h, Pierre-Olivier Fernagut, Sheila M. Fleming, C.D. Dicarlo, Ronald L. Seaman, Marie-Françoise Chesselet).

2003 "Proryv *Soprano* (*Sopranos'* Breakthrough)." *Kriticheskaia massa*, 2003:3. <http://magazines.russ.ru/km/2003/3/kluch.html> (with Konstantine Klioutchkine).

Other publications

2017 Translator. "On the Other Side" (an interview with Croatian film director Zrinko Ogresta). <http://www.independent.com/news/2017/jan/26/on-the-other-side/>

2010 "On Feeling, Filling, and Flying (*Mad Men*, Season 4.9)." *Mad World on Kritik*. <http://unitcrit.blogspot.com/2010/09/mad-world-on-kritik-mad-men-season-49_21.html> (with Konstantine Klioutchkine).

CONFERENCES

2016 "Postsocialist Nostalchic: Yugoslav Pop-Culture in Contemporary Croatian Television." Upcoming ASEEES National Convention, Washington DC, November 19.

2015 "Men without Moustaches: Transitional Masculinities in the Croatian Romantic Comedy." ASEEES National Convention, Philadelphia, November 21.

2014 "Dressing Up the Russian Literary Journal: Fashion, Fiction, and Textual Fluidity in 'The Contemporary'." ASEEES National Convention, San Antonio, November 20.

2008 "National Identity in Croatian Television Drama." AAASS National Convention, Philadelphia, November 20.

2007 "Constructions of Male Identity in Croatian Men's Magazines." 2007 Summer Research Lab at University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, June 29.

2007 "Our People, Their Programming: The Croatian Sitcom in the Context of Media Globalization." 2007 California Slavic Colloquium, Stanford University, April 15.

2006 "Girls Behaving Badly: Representing the Lesbian in Dalibor Matanić's *Fine Dead Girls*." 2006 California Slavic Colloquium, University of Southern California, April 8.

2006 "Girls Behaving Badly: Representing the Lesbian in Dalibor Matanić's *Fine Dead Girls*." 15th Biennial Balkan and South Slavic Studies Conference, UC Berkeley, March 31.

Introduction

Что ни говорите, а даже и фрак с сюртуком - предметы, кажется, совершенно *внешние,* не мало действуют на *внутреннее* благообразие человека.

No matter if people say that a jacket and a tailcoat are items that seem to be completely *external*, these items nonetheless influence the *internal* beauty of the individual.

Vissarion Belinsky[1]

The affinity between literature and fashion is inevitable, since the notion of "style" and its attendant implications apply simultaneously to literary expression and fashionable clothing.[2] Cultural theorists and semioticians have suggested that fashion is a visible language that refers not only to clothing, but clothes in relation to the self and to society. In literature, the sartorial frame enhances characterization and functions as a site of aesthetic and social inscription by simultaneously revealing and concealing cultural conventions. Thus, the deployment of the written clothed body, as well as disembodied attire serves not only as an image or a metaphor, but also as a narrative element that reaches far beyond the literary dimension.

This dissertation examines the symbolic role fashion played in the process of modernization of nineteenth-century Russian society, and in the articulation of that process in literary texts of the period. The emergence of the modern fashion industry and the development of mass production, marketing, and retailing in the mid-nineteenth century transformed the ways

[1] Vissarion Belinsky, "Peterburg i Moskva," *Fiziologiia Peterburga* (Moskva: Nauka, 1991), 22. Translation from Thomas Gaiton Marullo, *Petersburg: The Physiology of a City* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2009), 33. Italics are in the original.

[2] Dress historian Aileen Ribeiro notes in her study of the Stuart culture of dress, *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England*, "Literature conveys emotions and feelings about clothes that can highlight character and further the plot of a play or novel. […] Fashion itself can be said to produce fiction." Aileen Ribeiro, *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England* (New Haven: Yale UP, 2005), 1.

in which Russian writers conceptualized clothing, its relationship to literature, and to society as a whole. Cultural signification, with the production of commodities as its constituent element, replaced traditional social categories, demanding new forms of production of subjects and their experiences. Because of its infinite potential for the creation of new and ambiguous meanings, as well as its formal similarity with literature, which requires constant innovation in order to sustain marketability, writing about fashion offered a rich context for debates about the nature of aesthetics, society, and modernity. Moreover, the topic of fashion was at the center of realism as a worldview that was defined, in large measure, by the special attention paid to the material aspects of everyday life. As a material practice that mediates cultural experience and meaning, fashion not only creates and constitutes change, but also codifies new modes of appearance and being in the context of existing social and cultural practices. The systems and structures engendered by fashion interpolate symbolic meaning into the experience of material objects, creating new taxonomies of historical or socio-cultural identity and of human existence in the material world more generally. While some realist writers used the classificatory nature of fashion to inform their readers about problems in the social and literary spheres that required intervention, others seized upon its commercial features in order to increase readership and restyle themselves on the literary market. An examination of this uneasy union between the high aesthetic values of literature and its commodification through the motif of fashion provides core material traditionally sidestepped by historians and literary scholars that is essential for enriching our understanding of the nature of the Russian cultural process at a watershed moment in the country's history.

The potential for a multiplicity of interpretations generated by a fashion object, whether material or written, recalls Karl Marx's comments on the magical nature of commodity. A

product, such as a table, writes Marx, "continues to be a common everyday thing, wood. But so soon as it steps forth as a commodity […] it not only stands with its feet on the ground, but, in relation to all other commodities, it stands on its head, and evolves out of its wooden brain grotesque ideas…"[3] Two elements in these comments are of special value. First, Marx emphasizes the relational nature of the commodity, precisely in the way the language of fashion, much like any textual phenomenon, emphasizes the relational nature of the sign. Secondly, by turning the table on its head, Marx signals the non-pragmatic, or what he calls "magical" and "enigmatical" aspect of signification inherent in commodity form, the aspect one would call symbolic when transferring Marx's economic language to the domain of culture. The symbolic aspect of fashion involves the mechanism of revelation and concealment as the ability to evoke multiple relations to other linguistic, aesthetic and social domains, and especially those relations that contravene conventional logic, referentiality, and pragmatism of expression. The fashion system engages the symbolic potential of language, thriving on the ambiguities of cultural signification and the associated ambivalence of human experience. To trace the mechanisms of fashion as essential to the symbolic operation of culture is to decipher the patterns of ambivalence involved in the production of commodities, including literature and the self.

Marx's theorization of the commodity as a "mysterious thing" that symbolizes to the producers and consumers a certain set of structural relations in society reflected the transformations in mid-nineteenth century Europe as growing industrial production altered the social fabric of modernizing societies.[4] The speed of change engendered confusion in social and

[3] Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, Trans. Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1912), 1:83.

[4] The source for my discussion of signification inherent in commodity form is Kevin McLaughlin, *Writing in Parts: Imitation and Exchange in Nineteenth-Century Literature* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995), 1-21.

aesthetic signification, a confusion that T.J. Clark describes by drawing on the concept of the blur. In *The Painting of Modern Life*, he argues that a key problem of modernity is that the categories of class are rendered increasingly obscure or debatable, the differences in social orders blurred, and that the social system finds it increasingly difficult to decipher the status of people who no longer fit traditional categories in the new order of things.[5] Clark's conclusions about the ambiguous nature of social categories emerges out of his observations of early Impressionist paintings, which, while purporting to clearly render the new bourgeois reality, offer the viewer blurred images that are either indecipherable or that invite a multiplicity of interpretations. Clark views modernity not merely as an aesthetic phenomenon (that is, as modern art), but as art caught in a complex set of transactions (at once metaphorical and literal) with modern existence, which is presented as a set of increasingly ambiguous forms of being. Working with Clark's point, Christopher Prendergast explains: "[M]odernity produces a new culture within which class relations and identities, at least in certain spaces and under certain conditions," become "blurred," and are no longer amenable to clear demarcation or interpretation.[6]

As a system of practices and material objects that blur the lines of representation, fashion functions as the ultimate harbinger of modernity in alternately reinforcing and reshaping normative identities and structures. Fashion's key feature is the rapid and continual changing of styles; fashion not only communicates change, it *is* change, continually inviting the breach of conventional boundaries of style and taste, and the consequent establishment of new parameters of what is proper and socially sanctioned. As the embodiment of the transitory and the

[5] T.J. Clark, *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999), 6-10.

[6] Christopher Prendergast, *The Triangle of Representation* (New York: Columbia UP, 2000), 20.

transhistorical, fashion reveals the elemental dialectics that determine modernity: "the coexistence of the ephemeral and the sublime, the fugitive and the profound."[7] The translation of fashion into language, that is, into a system of signification provides additional mechanisms in the creation and communication of meanings on a symbolic level. In examining the translation of clothing into semiotic code, my dissertation project broadly explores the translation of literature, ideology, and the subject into their semiotic equivalents, that is, into discourses of and about fashion. Attesting to the constitutive nature of this process in nineteenth-century Russian culture, the literary critic Vissarion Belinsky wrote about clothing (specifically the jacket and the tailcoat) of his era as generative of the individual self, which in his view reflected and had the potential to transform the broader social fabric. Although the written clothed body and the system of meanings it engenders thus emerge out of ostensibly frivolous, "external" objects as Belinsky called them, their role in shaping and reflecting the mechanisms of signification renders them appropriate not only for contemporary critical reflection but also for scholarly study. Pursuing the notion that the fashion system played a crucial role in the culture and society of nineteenth-century Russia, my dissertation project traces its importance in transforming the literary economy (Chapter One); the articulation of the self among provincial gentry and the middling classes (Chapter Two); mechanisms by which ideology is disseminated and performed (Chapter Three); and female subjectivity and its commodification (Chapter Four).

* * *

[7] Ulrich Lehmann, *Tigersprung: Fashion in Modernity* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000), 8.

In assessing the impact of writing about and through fashion on the nineteenth-century literary process, my project draws from and expands upon historical, literary, and theoretical studies of the fashion system's influence on culture and society. Scholars have extensively studied the objective and symbolic implications of fashion in the European and American literary and cultural spheres, often investigating clothing's historical significance. Histories of fashion in the nineteenth century have focused predominantly on the French context, with Paris emerging as a locus of fashion trends, innovations, and revolutions.[8] These studies reveal that fashion and its attendant categories provide a useful critical lens for the changing conceptions of a range of categories, including social organization, political participation, gender relations, and economic development. However, sartorial metaphors and their deployment in the Russian context have received only limited scholarly treatment, particularly as applicable to nineteenth-century Russian literary and critical texts.

The complex relationship between the fashion industry and Russian society figures prominently in the work of Djurdja Bartlett and Christine Ruane.[9] Although the two scholars document sartorial mechanisms in different temporal frames – Bartlett focuses on socialist fashions, while Ruane focuses on the imperial ones – their respective examinations both trace fashion's effects on gender and social identity, politics, and the economy. Bartlett's study

[8] Among the many cultural histories of fashion in nineteenth-century France, Philippe Perrot's *Fashioning the Bourgeoisie* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994) and Valerie Steele's *Paris Fashion* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988) are considered classical approaches to the topic, examining broadly on the economic, political, and symbolic dimensions of clothing. A recent treatment that examines modernity and urban development through the prism of fashion is Heidi Brevik-Zender's *Mode and Modernity in Late-Nineteenth-Century Paris* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015).

[9] Djurdja Bartlett, *FashionEast: The Spectre that Haunted Socialism* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010); and Christine Ruane, *The Empire's New Clothes: A History of the Russian Fashion Industry, 1700-1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). Ruane has also examined the topic of the Russian fashion industry in a number of articles, all of which advance the notion that fashion was a crucial indicator of Russia's industrial development and accompanying social changes.

examines the evolution of socialist fashion, from the utopian dress of the 1920s, to the official egalitarian and utilitarian styles of the Stalinist period, and finally, to the unofficial everyday fashion of the 1960s. Bartlett argues that in order to suppress the changing and discontinuous nature of fashion, the regime invented a mythical consumer space in which fashion played a highly representational role by reaffirming conservative aesthetics and the socialist master narrative. Fashion, she further suggests, became an important domain of symbolic manipulation, supplanting terror as a tool used by the regime to gain political loyalty from its middle class. The political legitimation of fashion as a rational practice and its entry into the body of approved cultural capital of the Soviet period serves as a useful model in examining nineteenth-century writing about fashion, as elements from the fashion columns in literary journals and the fashion press crept into literary texts, creating a representational space that combined high aesthetic values and a commercial outlook. While my project does not focus on the tsarist regime's attitudes to writing about fashion, it nonetheless builds on Bartlett's notion that changing sartorial narratives illuminate the challenges posed to normative cultural, political, and social frameworks.

In her study of the Russian fashion industry, Christine Ruane examines the role of clothing in the politics of imperial and social identity in the period between 1700 and 1917. She defines fashion as a dynamic phenomenon, which illustrates "a person's financial resources, aesthetic tastes, and whims," thereby amplifying the dynamic nature of clothing by cataloguing change while simultaneously categorizing individuals according to their fixed gender, social, or ethnic identity.[10] Ruane argues that as the system of estates gave way to a class society, and

[10] Ruane, 2.

industrialization, bureaucratization, and education disrupted the traditional way of life, fashion became central to the process of bridging the social gap, serving as a medium for the renegotiation of class identities. For Ruane, the formative moment of the Russian fashion industry occurred in 1701 with Peter the Great's dress decree, which was directed not only at identity politics but also at economic considerations. She uses this historical moment to reassess the standard view that Russian industrial development began to take place only after the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, and instead argues that the production and business practices of the fashion industry throughout the nineteenth century formed a foundation for further development of capitalism in Russia.[11] Although Ruane's study is instructive in its examination of the sphere of consumption as generated by the fashion industry, its focus is mainly on the object of production, namely, clothing, rather than on the individuals that produced it and on the implications of that production in the symbolic economy. By focusing exclusively on writing about fashion in the literary milieu, my project aims to uncover how objective representations of clothing, appearance, and taste in turn shaped the attitudes of writers, critics, and the reading public that produced and consumed those textual representations.

The notion that sartorial transformation serves as an index of social change has received particular scholarly attention in studies of the genesis of Russian radicalism in the 1860s. In his study of socialism's transformation from a discursive to a practical activity in the period between 1855 and 1870, Abbott Gleason dedicates a chapter to the "Emergence of Populist Style," as practiced by Pavel Ivanovich Iakushkin, an ethnographer whose stories and sketches about the

[11] Alexander Gerschenkron, "Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective," *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1952), 5-30. An example of the prevalence of this view of Russian economic development can also be found in David Mackenzie and Michael W. Curran, *A History of Russia and the Soviet Union*, 3rd edition (Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1987), 453-59.

"life of the people" contributed to the formation of the ideological basis of Slavophilism.[12] Gleason notes that although Iakushkin himself was neither an ideologue nor an effective orator, his historical and physical appearance at a crucial moment in the formation of Russian social thought made him a symbolic figure for various ideological movements.[13] Iakushkin's peasant costume and folkloristic practice signified to his contemporaries alternately, an incarnation of the Holy Fool, the essence of the Russian people, the embodiment of *narodnichestvo*, and even the negation of hierarchy, bureaucratic formality, and social order. His physical presentation and public persona eluded simple classification, and were characterized by his contemporaries as "unimaginable" and "indescribable."[14] Although Iakushkin's peasant costume and persona seemingly signify a kind of aesthetic minimalism rooted in the simplicity of the Russian peasant, Gleason's study demonstrates that the meaning of Iakushkin's appearance is arbitrary and dynamic, and has value only insofar as it can be exchanged for and defined in terms of new meanings in the ideological sphere.

Claudia Verhoeven's study of Dmitrii Karakozov's assassination attempt as an exceptional, yet formative moment in the origins of terrorism also examines the meaning of Karakozov's physical appearance and the implications it carries for the formation of a public persona among the radical intelligentsia. In the chapter titled "*Armiak*; or, "So many things in an overcoat!" Verhoeven suggests that the material reality of Karakozov's peasant *armiak* "had consequences for Karakozov himself, for the execution of his crime, for his alleged co-

[12] Abbott Gleason, *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s* (New York: Viking Press, 1980), 226-289.

[13] Gleason, 235.

[14] Gleason, 244.

conspirators, and for revolutionary politics," and that fin de siècle fashion thus became synonymous with political violence.[15] Prior to Karakozov's physical and historical appearance, nihilist style was characteristically unadorned, yet conspicuous in its austerity: simple dress; long hair for young men and short for women; informal address and brusque manners; dirty fingernails; Fra Diavolo hats or Polish caps, and blue tinted glasses.[16] While nihilist style left no doubt at all as to the politics and identity of its wearer, and was therefore unsuitable for an active revolutionary life, Karakozov's *armiak* allowed for camouflage among the crowds, allowing its wearer to simultaneously don the persona of a peasant, a *meshchanin*, a student, and a revolutionary. Because the *armiak* attained different meanings in the accounts of eyewitnesses and police investigators, the imperial authorities could not conclusively resolve whether or not Karakozov covered up a conspiracy. Verhoeven concludes that the *armiak* signifies terrorism's capacity to blend in and move under the cover of the crowd, which is ultimately disconnected from the "mood of the masses" through its strategic connection to their appearance.[17] Both Gleason's and Verhoeven's view of fashion as a dynamic phenomenon that is deployed by the subject to generate new meanings is instructive for my project, as it underscores the notion that the significance of fashion lies in its potential for a multiplicity of interpretations and, in turn, for the production of new identities, social attitudes, and discursive practices.

Although literary scholars have not produced comprehensive studies of the link between fashion and literature in the latter half of the nineteenth century, several isolated studies are

---

[15] Claudia Verhoeven, *The Odd Man Karakozov: Imperial Russia, Modernity, and the Birth of Terrorism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), 104.

[16] Irina Paperno, *Cherynshevskii and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 17.

[17] Verhoeven, 125.

instructive in their approach to this topic. In "A 'Buttoned-Up' Hero of his Time: Turgenev's Use of the Language of Vestimentary Markers in *Rudin*," Boris Christa argues that vestimentary markers in literature function to further the process of characterization, to transmit social information, and to indicate character change.[18] He identifies two types of vestimentary markers: synchronic, which are absolute, and diachronic, which change according to the individual's degree of compliance with dress codes in a given time and location. Using the concept of the diachronic marker as it appears in the descriptions of fashions in *Rudin*, Christa offers a systematic study of the characters' social standing and development, which, he argues, are made transparent by the clothing they choose to wear. Thus, Lezhnev's worn overcoat from homespun linen signifies his Slavophile tendencies, while Pandalevskii's misplaced provincial dandysim reveals his ambition for a higher social standing as well as his ultimate social collapse. Following his account of vestimentary markers as a device prevalent in the novel's characterization, Christa concludes that "this device plays a particularly substantial role in relation to the main hero,"[19] whose sartorial shifts imitate his ideological transformation from a velvet-and-feather-outfitted dandy to a shabbily-dressed revolutionary. Although Christa's analysis is instructive in its focus on the symbolic nature of dress in literary texts, it fails to address the historical, cultural, and aesthetic import of Turgenev's pervasive use of vestimentary markers in *Rudin*. Drawing and expanding upon Christa's approach, my project examines the ways in which the sartorial frame not only enhances characterization, but also functions as a site of aesthetic and social inscription by simultaneously revealing and concealing cultural conventions.

[18] Boris Christa, "A 'Buttoned-Up' Hero of his Time: Turgenev's Use of the Language of Vestimentary Markers in *Rudin*," *Turgenev and Russian Culture*, Joe Andrew, ed. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), 127.

[19] Christa, 132.

Two recent studies, namely Anne Dwyer's "Of Hats and Trains: Nikolai Leskov and Fyodor Dostoevsky between Russia and the West" and Natal'ia Ivanova's "On Chekhov and Ladies' Fashions" address the ways in which writing about fashion in general, and sartorial references in particular reflect and shape cultural, ideological and aesthetic trends.[20] Dwyer's article explores cultural traffic in the Russian west via the interrelated motifs of hats and trains, which stand metonymically for the rise of nationalism and the arrival of industrial modernity. Dwyer argues that "as the most immediately visible aspect of a person's appearance and one mandated for wear by the custom of the time, hats signal their wearer's identity; but as markers of class, nationality, occupation, or age, hats can also serve as a disguise."[21] This oscillation between the legibility of appearance and the possibility for deception or misunderstanding lies at the heart of Leskov's and Dostoevsky's travelogues, which utilize sartorial anecdotes as avenues into sweeping pronouncements about the uncertain nature of Russian imperial identity. In both cases, fashion's potential for generating confusion of cultural attribution results in situations where individuals from different national and social backgrounds try to ascertain one another's identity, with the Russian intellectual-cum-travelogue author emerging as the representative victim of the case of mistaken identity. Although Dwyer's analysis of sartorial markers ultimately aims at uncovering Leskov's and Dostoevsky's respective attitudes towards the nature of empire and national identity, her article is instructive for my own work in suggesting that fashion is a crucial index of modernity, and should consequently be considered in studies that

[20] Dwyer, Anne, "Of Hats and Trains: Nikolai Leskov and Fyodor Dostoevsky between Russia and the West," *Improvising Empire: Literary Accounts of the Russian and Austrian Borderlands, 1862-1923*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2007. Ivanova, Natal'ia, "O Chekhove i damskoi mode," *Neva* 1 (2010).

[21] Dwyer, 69.

aim to uncover the blurring of aesthetic, cultural, and social boundaries in the increasingly industrialized and capitalist mid-century Russian space.

In her comprehensive study of Chekhov's writings on women's fashions between 1883 and 1903, Natal'ia Ivanova argues that the "evolution of fashion, as presented in Chekhov's works, gives us an idea of the changes in aesthetic and ethical attitudes, the tastes of that era, and allows us to consider Chekhov's poetics through a different lens."[22] Ivanova, much like Christa in his article on Rudin, analyzes the importance of sartorial markers in aiding characterization, by serving as indicators of the characters' social and financial status. However, Ivanova extends her study to include an analysis of taste and attitudes to dress in Chekhovian texts, arguing that only a consideration of the full scope of sartorial practices can reveal the author's aesthetic and ideological positions. The twenty-year period that she chooses as her focus abounds in public discussions about one fashionable item in particular, namely, the bustle. Over the course of this period, the bustle's value as a fashionable currency fluctuated, spurring debates not only about the nature of style, but also about the status of women, the public perceptions of health and physiology, the blurring of social lines, and the changing notions of art and aesthetics. The transformations in Chekhov's own aesthetic and ethical attitudes are revealed in his textual contemplations of the bustle, as he indicates in his 1884 story "Fragments of Moscow Life" (*Oskolki moskovskoi zhizni*) that "we will not be surprised by bustles on Bandogs, imposed upon the creatures 'for security's sake' by husbands and lovers," and in his 1897 story "In the Native Corner" (*V rodnom uglu*) that the "aunt, a lady of forty-two, wore a fashionable gown tightly

[22] "Эволюция моды, представленная в творчестве Чехова, дает представление об изменениях в эстетических и этических взглядах, вкусах в ту эпоху, позволяет взглянуть на поэтику Чехова несколько в другом ракурсе" (Ivanova, 12).

cinched at the waist, clearly wanting to appear younger and appealing."[23] Chekhov's parodic treatment of women's fashions in these two texts mimics public discourse about the constraining nature of the bustle, and consequently, about the symbolic implications of the sartorial discipline imposed on women's bodies. By the 1900s, however, Chekhov's authorial perspective shifts from the parodic treatment of the binding and capricious nature of women's fashions to objective and impressionistic description of clothing, thereby mimicking the shift from an exaggerated feminine shape as defined by the bustle to form-conscious, flowing dresses of neutral colors. Ivanova suggests that the study of Chekhov's consistent and informed usage of the multifaceted nature of women's fashions in his fiction, diaries, and correspondence provides a novel avenue into the understanding of his poetics, of his self-professed status as a "professional observer of life" (*professional'nyi nabliudatel' zhizni*)[24] and of the cultural and social climates of his time. Ivanova's conclusion that the study of fashion in Chekhov's time is not the study of the "mundane everyday" but rather the study of the cultural realities of that period informs my own project, which aims to restore and elevate fashion's role in the process of cultural signification in nineteenth-century Russia.

The idea, directly and indirectly advanced in the aforementioned historical and literary studies that fashion interposes a network of meaning between the object and its user, finds its foundations in Roland Barthes' semiological explorations of fashion. In *The Fashion System* and *The Language of Fashion*, Barthes proposes the categories of the "real garment," the "represented garment," and "communicating through clothes" as the defining features of the

[23] "[…] нас не удивят турнюры, в которые 'для безопасности' мужья и любовники будут сажать цепных собак," and "Тетя, дама лет сорока двух, одетая в модное платье, сильно стянутая в талии, очевидно, молодилась и еще хотелась понравиться" (Cited in Ivanova, 4, 8).

[24] A.B. Derman, *Tvorcheskii portret Chekhova* (Moskva, 1929), 74.

written system of fashion.[25] For Barthes, the study of fashion engages not merely a system of nomenclature, but "all vestimentary features already constituted into a system of signification;" that is, the fashion system considers elements beyond the material reality of clothing to encompass the symbolic meanings encoded not only in the object, but in the categories (cultural, linguistic, political, social, and so on) used to assign meaning to that object.[26] Thus, any such analysis addresses neither clothing nor language, but the rendering of one into the other, insofar as the former is already a system of signs. By rejecting the decorative and functional aspects of fashion as their primary originating force and locus of meaning, Barthes' analytical method challenges the notion that fashion is an ephemeral phenomenon outside of the elevated and sublime realm of artistic expression, and promotes the study of the fashion system as a valid object for critical inquiry. Drawing and expanding upon Barthes' semiological model, my project focuses on the construction and dissemination of written fashion in the literary sphere, and its relationship to aesthetic, cultural, and social narratives.[27] Written fashion encompasses not only texts such as fashion columns and advertisements that explicitly address the latest styles and fashionable wares, but also writing that draws upon discourses of and about fashion in order to register and examine cultural, social, and political changes. This type of writing relies on the inherent unpredictability and mutability that Barthes attributes to the fashion system, giving rise to texts that can alternately represent resistance or regulation, identity or pretense, disruption or categorization in any sphere of human activity.

[25] Roland Barthes, *The Fashion System* (Berkeley: UC Press, 1990) and *The Language of Fashion* (New York: Berg, 2004).

[26] Barthes, *Fashion System*, 33.

[27] Barthes also calls it "described fashion," which underscores what he views is the intrinsically textual value of dress, clothing, and their various representational incarnations. Barthes, *Fashion System*, xi.

While Pierre Bourdieu's sociological studies are not limited to examinations of fashion practices, they are instructive to my project insofar as they attempt to explicate the mechanisms of cultural production and consumption. Bourdieu's work is grounded in the socio-historical aspects of cultural production, thus converging with the tenets of New Historicism, studies of the institutional framework of literature and literary criticism and, in a broader sense, cultural studies. It addresses such issues as aesthetic value and canonicity, the relationship between cultural practices and broader social processes, the social position and role of intellectuals and artists, and the relationship between high culture and popular culture. In his two seminal studies, *The Field of Cultural Production* and *Distinction*, Bourdieu argues that in any given field, agents occupying the diverse available positions or creating new positions engage in competition for control of the interests and resources which are specific to the field in question.[28] In the cultural field generally, and in the literary field specifically, competition often concerns the authority inherent in recognition, consecration, and prestige. Authority based on consecration or prestige is purely symbolic and may or may not imply possession of increased economic capital. Thus, in order to explain the differences in cultural practices that remain unexplained by economic disparity, Bourdieu posits the concept of cultural capital. Cultural or symbolic goods differ from material ones in that one can consume them only by apprehending their meaning.[29] The concept of symbolic capital denotes the ensemble of cultivated dispositions that constitute such schemes of appreciation and understanding. The possession of this code of appreciation is accumulated

[28] Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (New York: Columbia UP, 1993) and *Distinction* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1984).

[29] Bourdieu, *Field*, 38-40, 112-141.

through a process of acquisition, refinement, and cultivation.[30] While a variety of social institutions participate in the propagation and mediation of cultural capital, literary and journalistic media emerge as critical players in this process since their reach crosses economic and social divisions. Depending on the circumstances of their production and consumption, these media have the potential to make symbolic capital more or less accessible to their audiences, in turn disrupting or affirming established structures of authority and power. As my project aims to demonstrate in the context of the mid-nineteenth century Russian literary sphere, the tension between the symbolic and economic capital with which writers such as Nekrasov, Panaev and Goncharov engage, challenges the normative aesthetic and social lines, thereby complicating the lines of representation.

In conceptualizing the sphere of cultural production, Bourdieu posits the field of production and the field of taste as its constituent components. He argues that the two fields are structurally homologous with the social groups that produce them; that is, the cultural product reflects the particular taste level of the social class from which it originated. Because taste is articulated in such a way as to be unintelligible to outsiders of the class in which it was produced, social mores and barriers are reinforced through the process. On the other hand, as Georg Simmel points out, taste and fashion not only differentiate social strata from one another, but also function as mechanisms of social unification through imitation.[31] For Simmel, union and segregation are two fundamental and inseparable features of fashion; elite classes initiate a fashion in order to distinguish themselves from the masses, and when the mass consumers

[30] Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 11-96, *passim.*

[31] Georg Simmel, "Fashion," *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 62.6 (1957), 541-544.

imitate it in an effort to eliminate external markers of distinction the elites abandon existing fashions for newer ones, sustaining the cycle of imitation and change. Because the propagation of fashion and taste is contingent upon imitation, it results in greater uniformity and unity within a social group, as well as in the greater subjugation of individuals within that same group as they sacrifice personal choice to what has been chosen for them by the fashionable majority. The dynamic tension between social freedom and individual subjugation, and conversely, between social subjugation and individual freedom not only organizes the fashion system, but also accounts for its symbolic value in reflecting and shaping cultural and social processes.

The conceptions of fashion and taste as dynamic processes that consistently negotiate and communicate uniformity and change are crucial to understanding the mechanisms of textual production in the latter half of the nineteenth century, as the production and consumption of literary texts in Russia gradually moves beyond a small circle of individuals. My project aims to demonstrate that this movement is not only slow and labored, but also orchestrated largely by the literary and social elites with some participation from the middling groups, rather than their lower- and middle-class counterparts as previous studies focusing on the "bottom-up" restructuring of the literary field of this period have suggested. The gradual expansion of the literary market, I argue, takes as its point of origin the purveying of taste in large measure through the motifs of "fashion" and "the fashionable"; motifs, which by their very nature are flexible and adaptable to various genres, ideologies, and social groups. In tracing the process by which nineteenth-century Russian writers combine high culture with popular forms, I aim to demonstrate the ensuing paradoxical reinforcement of social norms, as well as the emergence of the complicit consumer whose participation in the sphere of consumption supersedes social divides. Each chapter of this project focuses on a unique moment in the cultivation of fashion,

taste, and consumer habits in the latter half of the nineteenth century, beginning with Nekrasov and Panaev's commodification of literature in *Sovremennik* during the 1840s, through Goncharov's narratives of self-fashioning and Chernyshevsky's examination of commerce and ideology, to Tolstoy's commodification of the female subject in *Anna Karenina* during the 1870s, and its subsequent echoes in our contemporary cinematic experience of the novel.

* * *

The texts examined in my dissertation are paradigmatic representations of the new informational, socio-economic, and political environment that became increasingly manifest in the second half of the nineteenth century. During this period, the autocracy prevented direct expression of its subjects' political and social aspirations, relegating them to the realm of literature, which as a result acquired high cultural status. Critics and writers were seen as figures of ultimate moral, political, and social authority, operating as mediators between the rarefied intellectual sphere and the mundane everyday. The rise of print-capitalism in Russia beginning in the 1840s combined with anxieties over political revolutions in Europe during the same period challenged traditional narratives of divine, ontological truth residing in the monarchy, and precipitated the search for alternative ways of linking culture, society, and the individual. Romantic belief in the original genius of man and in self-expression as the ultimate goal of humanity was replaced in this period by Positivism, Materialism, and Utilitarianism, which foregrounded the function of logic and science in generating human progress and a rational organization of society. Bolstered by changes in Russia's social fabric, these philosophies saturated the pages of print media and literature, elevating the material and the mundane to the

aesthetic realm. The realist aesthetic pledged that literature would portray contemporary reality completely and truthfully, while also engendering virtual discursive worlds that would appeal to the public sphere that possessed the growing financial wherewithal to support the print industry.

The rise of print capitalism in Russia coincided with the nascent consumer revolution in its urban centers. Although the full expanse of industrial acceleration did not occur until the final decade of the nineteenth century, the growing money economy and increased production of consumer goods mid-century transformed the material culture of daily life for the gentry, the bourgeoisie, and the middling ranks.[32] Driven by a combination of commercial incentives and changes in tastes, this "industrious revolution" resulted from a combination of production, distribution, and consumption of goods, and maintained its progress through a consistent mobilization and training of new consumers and advocates of consumption.[33] The process of advertising and selling goods involved touting innovation, advocating the indulgence of personal pleasures, and developing individual aspirations in accordance with the latest trends.[34] From this perspective, the rise of consumerism helped undermine the foundations of traditional society in which the autocracy defined social identities and granted opportunities for social advancement.

[32] The rise of Russia's industrial economy and domestic market has been outlined in, among others, Petr Liashchenko, *History of the National Economy of Russia to the 1917 Revolution* (New York: Macmillan, 1949); Peter Gatrell, *The Tsarist Economy*, 1850-1917 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986); and Arcadius Kahan, *Russian Economic History: The Nineteenth Century* (Chicago University Press, 1989).

[33] Coined by Jan de Vries, the term "industrious revolution" refers to a consumer-level change (particularly at the level of the individual household) with important demand-side features that preceded the Industrial Revolution, a supply-side phenomenon. For an extended discussion of the concept see Jan de Vries, "The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution," *The Journal of Economic History* 54.2 (1994), 249-270. Because of the contested nature of the beginning and duration of Russia's Industrial Revolution among historians of the Imperial period, de Vries' conceptualization is more appropriate and instructive to my discussion here.

[34] For an assessment of advertising's role in reflecting and shaping Russia's increasingly diversifying social fabric at the turn of the century see Sally West, "The Material Promised Land: Advertising's Modern Agenda in Late Imperial Russia," *Russian Review* 57 (July 1998): 345-363.

As Melissa Frazer and William Mills Todd have demonstrated in their studies, Russian writers by the first third of the nineteenth century had begun to feel a strong sense in their own ranks and a corresponding change in the reader.[35] Their debates about the nature and development of literature and culture derived from an anxiety that a literary world limited to the confines of an aristocratic salon was giving way to a more anonymous sort of literature in which "the reader was no longer a friend or even an acquaintance, but merely a source of profit."[36] Responding to market conditions in which literary success depended on the text's appeal to the reader-consumer, Russian writers turned to fashion writing as a mode that catered to the culture of consumption on the one hand, but that also allowed the writer to disseminate his own visions of modernity, as well as to express his anxieties about industrialization and urban development.

The rise of print and consumer industries in turn coincided with developments in the fashion industry, including the proliferation of fashion texts both in specialized publications and literary journals, factory production of fabrics and ready-to-wear clothes, and the development of retail centers.[37] All of these developments were emblematic of the increasing speed and mechanization of modern life, as well as the socially transformative power of fashion. The shopping arcade or *passazh* in particular became a cultural institution representing prosperity and progress in nineteenth-century Russia. Mid-century shopping arcades shared technological elements with railway design, as their architects applied principles of iron and glass construction

[35] Melissa Frazier, *Romantic Encounters: Writers, Readers, and the 'Library for Reading'* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007); William Mills Todd III, *Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986).

[36] Frazier, 22.

[37] For overviews of the Imperial fashion industry see Ruane; for a case study of ready-to-wear production see Tatiana Aleshina, "K istorii proizvodstva gotovogo plat'ia v Moskve v seredine XIX-nachale XX v.," *Trudy Gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo muzeia* 67 (1988), 133-147.

already used in designing the railroad stations along the Moscow-Saint Petersburg line.[38] On a symbolic level, these common structural origins of shopping centers and railways signify the union of aesthetics and utility, as well as of commerce and communication. Fashion texts of the period reflect both the excitement and anxiety of these uneasy unions, and provide a record of how mechanisms of modernity were communicated to Russian readers in the latter part of the century.

* * *

My dissertation project offers an innovative look at some well-studied texts such as novels by Chernyshevsky and Tolstoy, as well as explorations into works by well-known authors such as Goncharov and Panaev that have not received significant scholarly attention but are equally compelling for the role they play in representing consumer culture and modernity. In this project, I combine the perspectives of fashion, commodification theory, and cultural sociology to re-examine the priorities and aesthetic choices of canonical writers and to offer new readings of understudied texts and authors. The corpus of texts in this dissertation represents a range of social and historical perspectives on fashion, taste, and consumerism, united by the common thematic thread that employment of discourses of and about fashion gives rise to internally contradictory narratives that simultaneously and variously advocate for stasis and change, unity and segregation, aesthetics and commerce, adherence to social norms and expression of the

[38] William Craft Brumfield, "From the Lower Depths to the Upper Trading Rows: The Design of Retail Shopping Centers in Moscow" in *Commerce in Russian Urban Culture 1861-1914*, Iurii Petrov, ed. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001), 168.

individual self. Panaev's fashion columns and sketches provide a chronological and stylistic entry point by providing a template for the usage of written fashion in the dissemination of social values, literary trends, and political ideology. This template finds direct echoes in Goncharov's novels of formation, which examine the effects of the consummate pursuit of money, rank, and style on the moral development of the individual self and the broader social fabric. Much like the preceding texts in this corpus, Chernyshevsky's radical novel ultimately presents its audiences with an account of ideologically correct social progress muddled with references to consumer culture and commercial pursuits; by giving rise to this seemingly contradictory message, his novel actively engages with the polysemous nature of the fashion system. Finally, Tolstoy's classic novel employs the mode of fashion to construct tableaux of spectacle and consumption in order to examine the nature of modern subjectivity under shifting social norms, particularly as applicable to the feminine subject. Unlike many studies of fashion that focus solely on identity politics through feminist readings of costume and the body, the following chapters explore how fashion was conceived broadly across gender lines. By considering visual and written texts as well as material culture, this study allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the role of fashion in aesthetic depictions of the period.

Taking cues from Amy Mandelker's tropological and intertextual approach to the theme of visual representation of the feminine in *Anna Karenina*,[39] my methodology for the study of written and performed fashion involves close readings of key textual and visual passages, some of which are notable for considerable critical traversal, others of which have been overlooked or have usually received a more literal interpretation. Each chapter is intended to stand alone as a

[39] Amy Mandelker, *Framing Anna Karenina: Tolstoy, the Woman Question, and the Victorian Novel* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993).

self-contained essay, and this dissertation may be read in that manner. My methodological approach here is associative; my argument does not wholly rely on a linear, chronological progression, despite the thematic, textual, and historical correspondences within and between the individual chapters. Rather my intention is to explore the various trajectories of the motif of fashion and of the fashion system in some of the theoretical, textual, and contextual complexity in which it becomes manifest.

Chapter One, "Dressing up the Russian Literary Journal: Fashion, Fiction, and Textual Fluidity in *The Contemporary*" begins with an overview of the mid-nineteenth century media environment, focusing on the literary journal and its thematic and structural features. Drawing in particular on the fashion column as a central point of competition between the dominant journals of the 1840s, the chapter traces the transformation of *The Contemporary* (*Sovremennik*) into the most commercially successful and socially progressive publication of the period through the development and marketing of a symbolic economy in its fashion texts. These texts informed an expanding group of subscribers, which included the provincial gentry and the urban middling professionals about the latest styles and cosmopolitan tastes, endowing them with the symbolic capital required for social ascent. In examining the reasons and mechanisms behind the column's appeal to old and new readers alike, I turn to the generic and ideological underpinnings of Ivan Panaev's fashion advice, which variously took the form of advertising, feuilleton, novella, parody, *physiologie*, and society tale. Because of its ostensibly marginal position in the journal, the fashion column offered a site for generic experimentation protected from censorial reach; this laboratory would prove crucial to later developments in nineteenth-century Russian prose fiction, as my readings of Panaev's texts, as well as those of his successors in subsequent chapters will demonstrate. Writing about fashion emerges in my analysis as a mode that involved blurring the

distinctions between literature and journalism, culture and cultural commentary, tradition and innovation.

Chapter Two, "Redressing the Provincial Gentleman: Social Progress and Its Discontents in Ivan Goncharov's Prose" examines Goncharov's texts of the late 1840s and 1850s through the prism of the fashion column in literary journals. As a member of the circle of contributors and critics gathered around *The Contemporary*, Goncharov seemingly enjoyed full participation in the established literary milieu, yet his provincial merchant origins and bureaucratic occupation presented significant obstacles in the process of his becoming accepted as an arbiter of aesthetic trends and a purveyor of symbolic capital. This chapter considers his epistolary fashion column "Letters of a Friend from the Capital to a Provincial Bridegroom" (*Pis'ma stolichnogo druga k provintsial'nomu zhenikhu*) and its echoes in the novels *An Ordinary Story* (*Obyknovennaia istoriia*) and *Oblomov* as guidebooks instructing the provincial gentry and the bourgeoisie in proper sartorial, ideological, and moral etiquette necessary for success in the urban milieu. Set against the backdrop of critical articles and memoirs of Goncharov's contemporaries, these texts also emerge as paradigmatic representations of the underlying social, ideological, and aesthetic power structures that guided the self-fashioning process of those individuals like Goncharov, who aimed to take advantage of the changing class structures. In examining the mechanism through which Goncharov's texts not only served important literary and social functions, but also served as expressions of the author's status, I engage the theoretical structures of cultural sociology, whose methods aim to explicate the link between culture, the formation of the self, and representation. This chapter serves as an innovative contribution to scholarly treatments of the formation of the self in mid-nineteenth century Russia and offers a case study of the crucial role the acquisition, consumption and display of symbolic capital played during this period.

While the first two chapters examine fashion writing's role in shaping economies of literary journals and of the self, Chapter Three, "*What Is to Be Done?*: Ideology and Consumption in the Age of Great Reforms" turns to its ambiguous role in forging and promoting new aesthetic and social ideologies during the period of the Great Reforms. The social reforms undertaken during this time were seen as symbolic events that paved the way for what, in the language of the day, was called a "transfiguration of all life" (*preobrazhenie vsei zhizni*), including state and society, ethical and aesthetic conceptions, everyday human relations, and specifically, of the human being (the "new man").[40] Referencing Nikolai Chernyshevsky's own pronouncements about the formative role of philosophical materialism in shaping literature and society, this chapter reconsiders the ways in which the radical social message of his novel *What Is to Be Done?* (*Chto delat'?*) becomes muddled precisely because of its main metaphor of progress: the sewing cooperative. My reading of the novel focuses on the brief concluding chapter and Vera Pavlovna's engagements in organizing sewing cooperatives, as they mediate the utopian notion of the "new (wo)man" and the consumerism from which the new people are to emerge. As a narrative of individual and social transformation, this text is a paradigmatic illustration of the uneasy union between realist aesthetics and the consumption of fashionable wares including literature and philosophy. In tracing the various incarnations of the fashion system throughout the novel this chapter contributes to scholarly treatments of the interplay between ideology and the literary economy on the one hand, and the interplay between ideology and everyday life on the other.

[40] Irina Paperno, *Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1988), 5.

The final chapter, "*Anna Karenina,* 'Banana Karenina', and Commodified Subjectivity" turns to Leo Tolstoy's aesthetic theories, which present art as a communicative endeavor that engenders a transformative effect in its audiences, consumers, and subjects alike. Although Tolstoy characterizes art's domain as one unfettered by structures of power or economic processes, Anna Karenina nonetheless emerges as a female subject that inspires voyeuristic pleasure and consumption, particularly as sartorial references often accompany her appearance in the novel. Examining Anna's commodified subjectivity through the prisms of ekphrasis and fashion illustration, this chapter uncovers one of the mechanisms by which the novel shapes and examines the modern female subject, as well as the role consumption plays in the aesthetic experience of literature. The latter part of the chapter reconsiders the novel's commodified female subject in the context of Joe Wright's 2012 cinematic adaptation and the marketing campaign surrounding the film. Rather than focusing on the film's relative failures as an adaptation, I reflect on its significance as a fashionable product that much like Tolstoy's novel transcends genre, culture, and class. Because of its structural indebtedness to the literary tradition of the society tale and to the visual tradition of the fashion plate, as well as its popularity in the cinematic realm as a visual representation of the material and ethical realities of consumer culture, *Anna Karenina* emerges as a paradigmatic fashion text in both its literary and cinematic incarnations.

While the motif of fashion has frequently been sidestepped in academic studies of literature as a frivolous object of study, this project aims to demonstrate its utility as an interpretive tool that allows us to trace the changes not only in culture and society, but also in the structures of power. In every epoch, fashion reflects particular notions of taste, and taste itself is an important element of cultural hegemony, since it is reflective of social, economic and cultural

capital. Each chapter examines the transformation in the flow of cultural capital, while also focusing on how that flow ensures the social and cultural reproduction of the ruling class. Drawing on a variety of textual sources, I aim to construct a study of ideas about fashion and the contexts in which were they were produced. Rather than focusing on fashion, this dissertation instead examines fashion culture, which involves new social roles, new forms of communication, and ultimately new values and attitudes. My project thus considers the implications of fashion not only for the development of the Russian literary sphere in the nineteenth century, but also for our contemporary cultural processes.

Chapter One

Dressing Up the Russian Literary Journal:

Fashion, Fiction, and Textual Fluidity in "The Contemporary"

In the mid-nineteenth century, literary journals assumed a dominant position as an instrument for the propagation of taste by chronicling, criticizing and shaping developments in the cultural, political and social spheres. They provided an initial publication outlet for virtually all works of Russia's great novelistic tradition, as well as a center around which writers structured their social and literary identities. By the 1840s, Russia had two dozen active and serious literary journals, some with a special theatrical, historical, or political readership and almost all with substantial involvement in the worlds of commerce, politics and ideas.[41] Despite the variety of publications, major journals from the preceding decade dominated the literary scene, including *The Library for Reading* (*Biblioteka dlia chteniia*, founded in 1834), *The Contemporary* (*Sovremennik*, founded in 1836), and *Notes of the Fatherland* (*Otechestvennye zapiski*, founded in 1839). They competed for a limited readership[42] with a recognizable

[41] The journals' extraliterary roles have received detailed attention in studies intended for journalism students such as A.V. Zapadov, *Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XVIII-XIX vekov* (Moscow: Vys. shkola, 1973) and B.I. Esin, *Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XIX v.* (Moscow: Vys. shkola, 1989). An overview of the thick journals' role in shaping political discussion and even political action over the course of the imperial period has been provided in *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, ed. Deborah A. Martinsen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

[42] In a draft letter to Count A.Kh. Benkendorf, 19 July-10 August 1830, A.S. Pushkin remarked that "purely literary journals have, instead of 3000 subscribers, barely 400, and consequently, their voice would be utterly ineffective on behalf of the author" (A.S. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 14 [Moscow: AN SSSR, 1941], 280-282). Early print runs of *The Contemporary* under Pushkin's editorial control in fact ranged from 900 to 2400 copies, as cited in Esin, 48. Jeffrey Brooks reports that thick journals reached only a limited audience even by the 1880s and 1890s, with circulation of even the most successful not exceeding 15000. These and additional circulation and literacy figures at the end of the tsarist era are available in his "Readers and Reading at the End of the Tsarist Era," *Literature and Society in Imperial Russia, 1800-1914*, ed. William Mills Todd (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1978), 102 and 97-150 *passim*.

structural formula that included an opening section of *belles lettres*, followed by literary criticism, digests of trends in political, historical, or economic thought, and concluded by a Miscellany (*Smes'*) section that contained everything from satirical articles and parodies to news of the latest scientific discoveries, and reports of the latest fashions. Within this general scheme, journals emphasized different elements as they emerged, changed, and disappeared according to the character of the times.

By 1846 *The Contemporary* in particular had lost its position among the leading literary and cultural tastemakers of the period.[43] Founded by Alexander Pushkin in 1836, its early contributions included poetry and prose pieces by Evgeny Baratynsky, Nikolai Gogol, Fyodor Tyutchev, Pyotr Vyazemsky, Vasily Zhukovsky, and by Pushkin himself. The journal came under Pyotr Pletnev's editorial control following Pushkin's death, turning away from polemics about contemporary social and literary mores, and adopting a more conservative position, in the process losing participation by noted cultural figures of the period.[44] Subscribers' interest in the publication also declined, with subscription figures reaching a low of 233 in 1846, from approximately 900 in the early 1840s.[45] Noting *The Contemporary*'s drop in popularity with both contributors and subscribers, Gogol blamed its questionable status on what he perceived was Pletnev's problematic editorial vision:

> *Современник* вышел плохим журналом. [...] У тебя нет качеств журналиста: ни юношеского живого участия ко всем волненьям современным, ни того трепета любопытства к вопросам, раздающимся в массе общества, ни наконец

[43] For a complete list of contributors to its initial run, see E.I. Ryskin, *Sovremennik, 1836-1837: ukazatel' soderzhaniia* (Moscow: Kniga, 1967).

[44] In the October 8, 1840 letter Pletnev remarked to Iakov Grot, a frequent contributor of articles on Russian orthography, lexicography and grammar that "it is impossible that I would be unable to fill up four little books with *something*." Cited in Zapadov, 255.

[45] Zapadov, 255.

> энциклопедического любопытства науколюбивого стремления обнимать с равной охотой все, что ни относиться к развитию познаний человеческих во всех родах.[46]
>
> *Sovremennik* has become a bad journal. […] You [Pletnev] possess none of the qualities of a journalist: neither the lively, youthful concern for all contemporary movements, nor the quivering curiosity for questions echoing among the masses, nor the encyclopedic curiosity or scientific aspirations to equally survey all spheres of human experience.

In Gogol's estimation, Pletnev's approach was insufficiently "journalistic," that is, ideologically ("[lacking] concern for contemporary movements [and] … curiosity for questions echoing among the masses"), linguistically (not "encyclopedic"), and stylistically (lacking "scientific aspirations") divorced from contemporary reality. The notion that literary journals should occupy a borderline position between literature and journalism in order to secure commercial success garnered attention from writer-journalists of the 1830s, particularly over the course of the "journal wars" [47] of 1825-1834, which forced the literary aristocracy to contend with a more utilitarian approach to the texts it produced, as well as the possibility of a broader literary audience. This climate of increased liberalization and economic competition continued well into the 1840s, propagating the view of journalism and mixed genres as cultural institutions crucial to the success of the publishing industry, as well as the sources of new material. Gogol's remarks on Pletnev's editorial guidance, then, outlined the approach that would lead to a commercially and creatively successful publication, and it was precisely this approach that would be adopted

[46] N.V. Gogol, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v chetyrnadtsati tomakh*, vol. 8 (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1952), 421.

[47] The term was first applied by N.A. Polevoi in 1825 to describe the polemics between his *Moscow Telegraph* (*Moskovskii telegraf,* founded in 1825) with the periodicals of F.V. Bulgarin and N.I. Grech, *Son of the Fatherland* (*Syn otechestva*, founded in 1812), *Northern Archive* (*Severnyi arkhiv,* founded in 1822), and *The Northern Bee* (*Severnaia pchela,* founded in 1825) over journalism's role in Russian life. Polevoi argued that journalists had an obligation to publish for the "middle ranks" and the provincial gentry. For a detailed account of the affair, see Chester M. Radkiewicz's "N.A. Polevoi's *Moscow Telegraph* and the Journal Wars of 1824-1834" in Martinsen, 64-87.

by *The Contemporary*'s subsequent editors, Nikolai Nekrasov and Ivan Panaev, following their procurement of the journal in 1846.

This chapter traces Nekrasov and Panaev's transformation of *The Contemporary* into one of the most commercially viable and socially progressive publications by focusing on one of the key elements of its structure, the fashion column. My approach aims to uncover the fashion column's flexibility and capture the dynamic nature of its cultural role. Although I describe some of the fashion column's crucial features in the course of the chapter, I will not attempt a historical or systematic discussion of its properties – a task made problematic by fashion's inherently changeable nature. Instead, I intend to describe the journalistic sources and ideological underpinnings that made the column appealing to contemporary readers, as well as uncover the column's contribution to the evolution of Panaev's society tales and physiological sketches. In tracing the fashion column's echoes in popular prose genres of the period, I will treat writing about fashion as a mode that involved blurring the distinctions between literature and journalism, culture and cultural commentary, tradition and innovation. The fashion column's capacity to engage and critique traditional cultural assumptions through genre experimentation allowed it to highlight the emerging aspects of the human condition in the changing social environment.

Innovation in the Miscellany Section

Nineteenth-century literary journals relied on a recognizable combination of structural elements that would preserve existing subscribers' interest as well as attract the attention of new readers. Most journals defined themselves in their subtitles according to combinations of areas of

interest, which included among others literature, politics, and history.[48] Each issue contained a section of prose with a short story or two and installments of one or more novels; a small section of poetry with up to a dozen poems in it; and a section devoted to literary criticism, book reviews, and articles summarizing current thought in an entire area of scholarship.[49] In addition to the aforementioned sections devoted solely to literature and philology, the journals also contained segments devoted to politics, economics, history, and international affairs, as well as the Miscellany section that catered to a variety of interests and tastes through articles on a range of current and fashionable topics. Because of its assortment of perspectives, the Miscellany section in particular provided a potentially fruitful venue for the articulation of new ideologies and experimentation with new genres.

Nekrasov and Panaev's acquisition of *The Contemporary* in 1846 arose partly as a response to the overly formulaic and ideologically stagnant atmosphere of competing publications, most notably *Notes of the Fatherland*[50] under the editorship of Andrei Kraevskii. Always a better editor than writer, Kraevskii[51] edited the literary supplement of *Russian Invalid* (*Russkii invalid*, founded in 1813) and helped Pushkin resolve the latter's organizational problems at *The Contemporary*, thereby forming a kind of genealogical, if not generative link

[48] *Notes of the Fatherland*, for instance, designated itself as a "scholarly-literary" (*ucheno-literaturnyi*) journal, while *The Library for Reading* was known as the "journal of literature, science, arts, commerce, news, and fashion" (*zhurnal slovesnosti, nauk, khudozhestv, promyshlenosti, novostei, i mod*).
[49] A more systematic overview of the "algorithmic" structure of literary journal is provided in Robert L. Belknap, "Survey of Russian Journals, 1840-1880" in Martinsen, 95-97.

[50] Hereafter abbreviated as *Notes* in the text.

[51] Kraevskii's career trajectory exemplifies the gradual transition to commercial independence in periodical publishing, as suggested by Louise McReynolds in her *The News under Russia's Old Regime: The Development of a Mass-Circulation Press* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991), 30-51. A complete overview of *Notes*' role in establishing an early venue for the publication of works by Westernizers is offered in V.I. Kuleshov, *Otechestvennye zapiski i literatura 40-kh godov XIX veka* (Moscow: MGU, 1959).

between the two publications. Although *Notes* established itself as the most popular literary journal of the early 1840s through the publication of landmark works such as Mikhail Lermontov's poem of Romantic rebellion *Demon* (*Demon*, 1842) and Aleksandr Herzen's proto-populist novel *Who Is To Blame?* (*Kto vinovat?*, 1845) as well as Vissarion Belinsky's literary and social critiques, it had by mid-decade lost its top position due to censorship and Kraevskii's consequent micromanagement of contributors' texts, particularly those of Belinsky.[52] This increasingly conservative turn in a leading publication allowed *The Contemporary*'s editors to set a liberal and socially progressive agenda for their journal, thereby attracting contributions from such eminent literary figures as Belinsky and Herzen, and over the course of its issues in subsequent decades, Nikolai Dobroliubov, Nikolai Chernyshevsky and Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin. Announcing the journal's acquisition to friend, frequent contributor to *Notes*, and ardent member of Belinsky's circle, Nikolai Ketcher, Panaev wrote: "I have purchased Pletnev's journal. It seems it cannot get better than this. The journal is unsullied … and bears such a wonderful name!"[53] Panaev's exuberance at the promise of myriad possibilities for *The Contemporary*'s philosophical direction and aesthetic content thus stood at odds with Pletnev's final announcement as editor in the journal's December 1846 issue, in which he promised subscribers that the change in editorial control would not be mirrored by changes to the journal's ideological orientation.

[52] Kraevskii attempted to temper Belinsky's political views by assigning him reviews of texts that lacked a clear ideological perspective, such as dictionaries, grammars, textbooks, and specialized scientific publications. Belinsky bemoaned his status in correspondence with other contributors to *Notes*, remarking that Kraevskii had reduced him to the status of a "charlatan" (*sharlatan*) and a "draft horse" (*on delaet menia vodovoznoiu loshad'iu*). Esin, 72.

[53] "Я купил у Плетнева журнал. Кажется, лучше этого быть не может. Журнал не запачканный … и носящий такое удивительное имя!" (Letter of September 26, 1846, cited in Esin, 73).

Despite the innovative vision of its new editors, *The Contemporary* continued to compete for subscribers with *Notes*, whose texts were geared towards the nascent intelligentsia, and with *The Library for Reading*[54], which in the 1830s and 1840s abandoned the principles of high-minded journalism and expressed an editorial policy of producing entertainment for the reading public, catering to its interests, and putting out reviews of only the most current of cultural products.[55] *The Contemporary*'s paucity of subscribers was compounded by its financial difficulties, as production costs far outweighed subscription revenues, leading Nekrasov to proclaim in a note scribbled on accounting ledgers, "I can't [support it], I literally can't!" ("не могу я, не могу буквално")[56] Nekrasov's correspondence further illuminates the origins of the journal's early operational losses; in an 1847 letter to Ketcher he reveals that in order to successfully compete with *Notes* at the level of content, *The Contemporary* exceeded its planned number of pages by sixty percent, forcing its editors to pay out significantly greater honoraria to its contributors.[57] Over the course of 1847 and 1848, the highest-paid contributor was Belinsky, whose salary doubled when he moved from *Notes* to provide *The Contemporary* with its

[54] Hereafter abbreviated as *Library* in the text.

[55] Melissa Frazier offers an extensive discussion of Osip Senkovskii's editorial vision and attitudes toward the literary marketplace in *Romantic Encounters: Writers, Readers, and the "Library for Reading"* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 2007).

[56] In 1847-8, *The Contemporary* had 2000 subscribers, generating 100,000 rubles in revenue, while production costs amounted to 112,000 rubles, not including honoraria paid out to various contributors, including Belinsky. Over the course of the first two years under new editorship, *The Contemporary* continued to post operational losses between 10,000 and 25,000 rubles per annum. V.E. Evgen'ev-Maksimov, *Sovremennik v 40-50 gg.: ot Belinskogo do Chernyshevskogo* (Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo pisatelei, 1934), 41. Detailed accounting ledgers for *Sovremennik* between 1847 and 1866 are provided in Nikolai Nekrasov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem* (*PSS*), vol. 13.2: "Materialy redaktsionno-izdatel'skoi i obshchestvennoi deiatel'nosti" (Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 1997), 173-212.

[57] Advertisements announcing the publication of the first volume indicated that *The Contemporary* would be issued in monthly installments of approximately twenty eight-page impositions (печатные листы); Nekrasov cites a total of over four hundred pages per issue by the end of the first year's print run, suggesting an increase in page content of at least 20 percent. Nekrasov, *PSS*, vol. 14.1: "Pis'ma, 1840-1855" (Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 1998), 85-86.

ideological center, thereby taking away subscribers and prestige from its competitor.[58] In the context of the journal's early financial circumstances and competition from other publications, the Miscellany section in particular served to accommodate *The Contemporary*'s growing number of contributors, and attract a broader audience seeking respite from the conservative currents seeping into the Russian press in the period immediately preceding the 1848 revolutions.

According to the editorial statement advertising the first volume of *The Contemporary* under new management, the Miscellany section was to include "literally everything pertaining to our understanding of contemporary science, literature, the arts, and mores" ("словом все, что входит в понятие о современном состоянии наук, литературы, искусств и общественного быта").[59] Notably absent from the description of this all-encompassing section were the categories of Russian politics, economics and society, since the censors expressly prohibited the inclusion of such material in any section of the journal. Commentary about the contemporary socio-political conditions nonetheless crept into the Miscellany section in the form of articles, editorial pieces and reviews devoted to topics such as international commerce, technological breakthroughs, and world religions. Thus, the inaugural issue's Miscellany section opened with a column ostensibly devoted to the recent abolishment of Britain's Corn Laws, while actually focusing on the implications of that event for Russia's grain production, land ownership, and the

[58] Belinsky received more than 15,000 rubles (4500 of which he received *prior* to joining the journal) for his contributions to *The Contemporary* in 1847 and 1848, which amounted to more than fifteen percent of the journal's operational budget for its first year.

[59] Cited in Evgen'ev-Maksimov, 65. Descriptions of the contents of the first volume of *The Contemporary* under new editorial control appeared in the newspapers *Russian Invalid*, no. 245 and *The Northern Bee* , vol. 253, as well as in the penultimate volume (vol. 11) of *The Contemporary* for 1846.

future of free trade and imports.[60] Subsequent installments of the section included reports of pre-revolutionary conditions in France via Pavel Annenkov's feuilleton "Letter from Paris" (*Pis'mo iz Parizha*), through which he also questioned the successes of fashionable social philosophies such as utopian socialism and their applicability to the Russian milieu.[61] Criticism of restrictive domestic policies appeared in the column "Contemporary Notes" (*Sovremennye zametki*) through vignettes by various, usually anonymous authors, on public education in Britain, precious metals trade and geological discoveries in Russia, and the publishing industry in Paris.[62] The disembodied feuilletonistic authorial voice also expressed disapproval of corporal punishment and serfdom,[63] revealing a decidedly westernizing direction of the journal on economic and social matters, and doing so in a section seemingly out of censorial reach.

The practice of including progressive, often subversive material in the Miscellany section extended not only to coverage of economic and social issues, but also to topics in culture and literature. Of particular interest to the journal's creators were innovations in the spheres of science and education, which they promoted as institutions key to Russian social development. These institutions represented practical opposition to Idealist thought and organized religion,

---

[60] G. Nebol'sin, "O preobrazovanii khlebnogo zakona v Velikobritanii i o vidakh na sbyt khleba na eto gosudarstvo." *Sovremennik*, vol. 1 (1847), ot. 4, 1-18. Because each section of *The Contemporary* is numbered separately, I will be using the section designation "ot." (abbreviation of *otdel*, or section) with the section number throughout for the sake of clarity.

[61] Annenkov satirized the logical conclusion of utopian socialism by describing what he perceived was the frivolity of its methods: "Частъ [общественного богатства] каждого работающего определяется не талантом его, а действителюной нуждой. Но где мерило? [...] Остается только распределять общественные богатсва по темпераментам, по расоложению к брюнеткам и блондинкам (то-то бы хорошо!)" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 1 [1847], ot. 4, 35).

[62] *Sovremennik*, vol. 4 (1847), ot. 4, 62-74; vol. 3 (1847), ot. 4, 35-38; and vol. 3 (1847), ot. 4, 64-80, respectively.

[63] "Various views of features of a good master and of his attitudes towards his peasants" (*Razlichnye mneniia ob usloviiakh khoroshego upravliaiushchego i ob otnosheniiakh ego k krest'ianam*), *Sovremennik*, vol. 3 (1847), ot. 4, 60-63.

while advancing the principles of materialism and dialectics, which members of the Belinsky circle, and consequently the group of writers gathered around *The Contemporary* viewed as crucial to understanding Russia's past, present and future. The progressive ideological atmosphere of the Miscellany section was buoyed by the inclusion of belletristic pieces by Ivan Turgenev and Fyodor Dostoevsky,[64] which also propagated the Realist aesthetic, thereby underscoring the inextricable link between literature and society. The combination of review and news articles, polemical pieces, socio-political commentary, and the *belles lettres* thus rendered the Miscellany section a microcosm of the literary journal's overall structure, yet the section that represented the amalgamation of commerce, partisan politics and aesthetics on an even smaller, more integrated scale was the fashion column.

The Fashion Column and the Creation of a Symbolic Economy

Fashion columns in mid-nineteenth century literary journals typically consisted of translations[65] about current Parisian fashions accompanied by two hand-colored fashion plates for an additional subscription charge. The fashion column in the literary journal thus differed little from those in periodicals dedicated exclusively to fashion.[66] *Notes'* fashion column was characteristic in its austerity, as it included no images, only text offering technical descriptions of

[64] Turgenev's *A Sportsman's Sketches* (*Zapiski okhotnika*, 1847-1852) was first published serially in the Miscellany section, beginning with "Khor and Kalinych" in *Sovremennik*, vol. 1 (1847), ot. 4, 55-64. Subsequent installments in the collection appeared in the "Literature" (*Slovesnost'*) section. Dostoevsky's "A Novel in Nine Letters" (*Roman v deviati pismakh*) was published in the same volume, also in the Miscellany, 45-54.

[65] The most popular sources for Russian translations during this period included the French fashion journals "Les modes parisiennes" and "Moniteur de la mode."

[66] Ruane, 87-8.

fashions, advice about what to wear on particular social occasions, and limiting the descriptions to the Parisian milieu, rather than transplanting and adapting them to the Russian context.[67] Furthermore, the tone of these columns betrays a conservative narrator whose purpose is to objectively and pragmatically inform the public about fashionable goods, rather than to provide commentary about their cultural and social import. He therefore appears not as a *flâneur* hiding in and emerging out of the crowd as he surveys the urban landscape; instead he is an outsider, a passive observer merely reporting the latest trends without any knowledge of their abstract significance.[68] The fashion column of *Library* provided much of the same type of information as *Notes*, but broadened its descriptions to include styles for men, women, and children, suggesting that being fashionable was an activity intended for all age groups.[69] Moreover, *Library* transplanted its advice into the Russian milieu, clearly marking it as such through references to Russian urban settings and well-known representatives of the elite.

Unlike the fashion columns in *Notes* and *Library*, whose contents were restricted to reports of the latest styles, *The Contemporary* eschewed a purely journalistic tone and offered fashion advice to its readers in the form of parodic sketches, textual advertisements, novellas and epistolary exchanges. The first installments of the column were managed and written solely by Panaev and his wife, Avdot'ia Panaeva, but subsequent contributors included Andrei

[67] *Otechestvennye zapiski*, "Mody," vols. 50-62 (1847-48) *passim*.

[68] For a model discussion of the *flâneur*, see Walter Benjamin, "The Flâneur," in his *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1999), 416-455. Although the particularities of the fashion column in *Notes* are beyond the scope of this chapter, the detached narrator is its persistent feature, as evidenced by abundant repetition of the phrase "they say" (*govoriat*), especially in the opening paragraphs of each column. In addition, this narrator frequently admits to his ignorance about the particularities of the fashion trade by wondering, for instance, where the fashionable people obtain their wares: "Как наши модистки получили модели для такого рода шляп? Но оставим это" (*Otechestvennye zapiski*, vol. 51 [1847:3-4], 266).

[69] *Biblioteka dlia chteniia*, "Mody," vols. 70-82 (1847-48) *passim*.

Kroneberg[70] and Ivan Goncharov. (The contribution of the fashion column to Goncharov's prose is the subject of Chapter Two of my dissertation.) Born into family of hereditary nobility with strong literary and social networks in Saint Petersburg, educated at the "Blagorodnyi pansion" which combined government service training with instruction in proper manners, and having left a position at the Ministry of National Education to pursue a career in journalism, Panaev was not only well-versed in gentry mores but also in the latest trends in culture and society. Panaeva's origins as the daughter of actors, her simultaneous status as Panaev's wife and Nekrasov's common-law wife, and her renown as one of the fashionable beauties of Saint Petersburg rendered her a de facto expert on all matters pertaining to personal aesthetics and taste. The Panaevs' social standing afforded them not only intricate knowledge and experience of gentry life, but drew to them Petersburg and Moscow literati which included, among others Annenkov, Botkin, Dostoevsky, Goncharov, Turgenev and Tyutchev, all of whom gathered at the Panaevs' weekly salon to discuss the latest philosophical and literary developments.[71] Endowed with an abundance of symbolic capital and occupying a central position in the sphere of cultural production, the Panaevs were perfectly poised to instruct the gentry and bourgeois reader on the particularities of "the art of dressing" (*umen'e odevat'sia*), and by extension, the standards of good taste for any mid-century urban dweller. Their fashion column thus served the dual

[70] Kroneberg made his name through translations of Shakespearean works, namely *Hamlet, Macbeth, Much Ado About Nothing* and *Twelfth Night*, which were first published in *The Contemporary* and *Notes.* He also contributed many pieces of literary criticism to *The Contemporary*, including a review of George Sand's final novels and a study of contemporary German drama.

[71] Ivan Panaev describes the circle of literati that gathered at his Saturday salon in his *Literaturnye vospominaniia* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia lit-ra, 1950), 241-255. Avdot'ia Panaeva's memoirs provide an exhaustive record of literary gatherings at her salon from the 1840s until the late 1870s; see her *Vospominaniia* (Moskva: OGIZ, 1948).

purposes of educating existing readers and attracting new ones by providing instruction in creating and leading an aesthetically enlightened existence. [72]

The "Fashions" (*Mody*) column of the inaugural issue of *The Contemporary* in 1847 opened with a justification of fashion as an intellectual pursuit and provided its readers with a glossary and set of instructions on how to read the column at hand as well as its subsequent installments. Characterizing fashion as a "serious subject" (*ser'eznyi predmet*), Panaev adopts a pseudo-scientific tone to illuminate the linguistic origins of social distinction and taste:

> Для того, чтобы одеваться хорошо, надобно прежде всего иметь утонченный, образованный вкус. [...] Разрядиться по моде, *по последней картинке* не значить еще одеваться со вкусом. Люди светские никода не одеваються *по картинке* ни в Париже, ни в Лондоне, ни в Петербурге, нигде. Они одеваються *к лицу*, они выбирают из журналов только истинно изящное... в этом и заключается вся тайна туалета дамского и мужского.
>
> In order to dress well, one must first have refined, educated tastes. […] Dressing fashionably, *according to the latest images* does not also imply dressing tastefully. Members of high society never dress *by the image*, not in Paris, London, Petersburg, or anywhere else. They dress *according to what becomes them*, they only choose the truly elegant from journals… and that is the very secret of women's and men's dress.[73]

The opposition *po kartinke – k litsu* signifies not only modes of dressing, but also suggests the binaries "unrefined – refined" and "lacking taste – tasteful," which rhetorically label one's position in society and are thus even more significant than the fashionable wares one dons. Although Panaev briefly suggests here that "the art of dress" rests in individual expressions of taste, he undermines that claim by noting that journals read by a mass audience are the actual sources and arbiters of that taste, relegating the activity of dressing "according to what is

[72] Evgen'ev-Maksimov notes that the fashion column stood to attract to *The Contemporary* hundreds of desperately needed new subscribers, 224.

[73] *Sovremennik*, vol. 1 (1847), ot. 5, 1. Italics are in the original.

becoming" to the social realm. Because both are prominent features of the social fabric, language and fashion are inextricably linked, and can therefore share the discursive space of a literary journal.

Panaev pursues the metaphor of the journal as a manual of good taste further by addressing key terms in the vocabulary of style. He indicates that "respectable people use the terms *trendy man*, *trendy woman*, and *dandy* only in the ironic sense" ("слова *модник*, *модница*, *франт*, *франтиха* употребляются порядочными людьми только в одном ироническом смысле"), further recommending that any earnest use of such terms be confined to descriptions of images on banners advertising barber shops and beauty parlors.[74] The latter suggestion underscores the linguistic and social divide among the readers of *The Contemporary*, which the fashion column attempted to bridge by addressing itself to the bourgeois and the gentry reader alike. However, while the column provided a kind of primer on fashion terminology for the bourgeois reader, it served to refine the gentry reader's aesthetic and ideological tastes. In an entry devoted to appropriate attire for a high society ball Panaev focuses on the elegance of a "charming, airy, perfectly suitable dress… *avec une coiffure de fruits*," justifying his grudging use of French terminology with the notion that the Russian language lacks the verbal sophistication required to express the delicacy of women's fashions.[75] By representing French culture as fundamentally progressive by virtue of its highly specialized lexicon, Panaev demonstrates the broadly Westernizing direction of the journal. On the other hand, Gallomania is

[74] *Sovremennik*, vol. 1 (1847), ot. 5, 1. Italics are in the original.

[75] The following justification is included after the French phrase: "Мы поневоле вмешиваем французские фразы (читательницы верно не будут на нас за это в претензии), потому что по-русски нет никакой возможности выражаться с приличной грацией о дамских туалетах" (*Sovremennik*, "Mody" vol. 3 [1847], ot. 5, 1).

a passé trend[76] by the mid-nineteenth century, and Panaev's ironic justification is underscored by his parenthetical hope that the female readers will not begrudge his overuse of French terminology, suggesting that Russian culture has progressed beyond unquestioning imitation of the French. The technique of subsuming such progressive aesthetic and social ideologies in a seemingly frivolous column mirrored the approach employed to circumvent censorial disapproval in the journal as a whole, and as a way of linking the readers' everyday interests with their intellectual pursuits.

Aware of the column's potential for bridging the commercial and the aesthetic spheres, Panaev consistently produced texts rooted in both categories in an effort to preempt any accusations of dilettantism. His column included textual advertisements[77] that simultaneously catered to the businesses of fashion and publishing, and references to high culture in the form of excerpts from classic literary works or allusions to famed literati such as Pushkin and Nekrasov. A typical advertisement consisted of a description of fashionable items of clothing, accessories such as hats or jewelry, rare fabrics, or housewares including furniture, followed by the name of the store where the pieces could be acquired, or the name of the designer or artisan who could supply the items on demand. Thus, in June 1847 *The Contemporary*'s readers were encouraged to purchase corded silk cloaks at the "English Store" (*Angliiskii magazin*) or at "Giber's" (*magazin Gibera*); to commission straw and batiste hats at the workshop of a Mme. Labuser; to adorn their feet in the enchanting footwear of Sobolev (*Sobolev udivitel'nyi charodei*); and to

[76] By 1850, the outmodedness of speaking French in polite society would be unambiguously articulated for the reader: "Была мода говорить по французски. Нынче она выводится. [...] Говорите по русски — это нынче в моде, и слава Богу!" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 21 [1850], ot. 6, 235).

[77] Sally West points out that "advertising was at once the messenger of commerce, the financial linchpin of the mass-circulation press, and a new avenue of enterprise." See her "The Material Promised Land: Advertising's Modern Agenda in Late Imperial Russia," *The Russian Review*, vol 57 (1998), 345.

avail themselves of chairs designed by Catherine the Great's furniture-maker, Heinrich Gambs.[78] The column also advertised lifestyle publications such as etiquette books, health and beauty manuals, and boutique brochures, asserting itself as the authoritative resource on all matters pertinent to fashionable living, particularly in Petersburg. Competitors' attempts at professing prestige in the field of fashion were denigrated, as exemplified by the October 1847 column, whose narrator dismisses the broadly distributed "Directory of Aleksei Mikhailovich Zharygin's Stores" (*Spravochnaia kniga iz magazinov Alekseia Mikhailovicha Zharygina*) as an exaggerated and fraudulent account of the stores' inventories and of Zharygin's expertise in fashion.[79] The narrator further bolsters his position as the harbinger of modern styles by embedding excerpts of Pushkin's poem "If life deceives you…" (*Esli zhizn' tebia obmanet…*, 1825) into his review of Zharygin's brochure; the repetition of "the present is dismal" (*nastoiashchee unylo*) relies on the reader's knowledge of the preceding line, "in the future lives the heart" (*serdtse v budushchem zhivet*), and on the implicit association of that future with *The Contemporary*'s fashion column and its narrator.[80]

The necessity of demonstrating the compatibility of intellectual and commercial existence, that is, of literature and fashion, is a recurrent concern in Panaev's column. He blurs the line between aesthetics and commerce not only by interpolating winged words (*krylatye*

[78] *Sovremennik*, "Mody" vol. 6 (1847), ot. 5, 3-4.

[79] Over the course of three days the narrator conducts an exhaustive search for Zharygin's chain of department stores (*magaziny*) advertised in the brochure along Nevsky Prospect, only to discover a small shop (*lavochka*) with a meager selection tucked in the corner of a side street. This discovery confirms his own knowledge of the city's fashionable venues and reasserts the expertise which he shares with his readers: "Я не упоминул бы о объявлении г. Жарыгина, если бы г. Жарыгин некоснулся до предмета слишком близкого мне, до предмета, на изучение которого я посветил всю жизнь мою" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 10 [1847], ot. 5, 9).

[80] *Sovremennik*, vol. 10 (1847), ot. 5, 6 and 8. A.S. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v shestnadtsati tomakh*, vol. 2 (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1959), 96. Translation from *Pushkin Threefold: Narrative, Lyric, Polemic, and Ribald Verse*, trans. Walter Arndt (New York: Dutton, 1972), 197.

slova) into descriptions of fashionable wares, but also by constructing entire columns around several lines of recognizable poetry. Lamenting unfavorable weather that has delayed the onset of summer in Petersburg, the narrator opens the June 1847 entry with a line from *Eugene Onegin* (*Evgenii Onegin*, 1833) describing a typical "northern summer": "[it is] a version / Of southern winters" (*karikatura iuzhnykh zim*).[81] This lyrical musing leads directly to a discussion of spring fashions that are still *en vogue* due to the characteristically cool seasonal climate, leaving neither a graphic nor a semantic division between the high cultural reference and the marketable object. Panaev thus conditions the reader to conceive of aesthetics and commerce as occupying the same discursive sphere, which is a principle he expands upon in other installments of the column.

Panaev explores the potential conceptual links between intellectualism and fashion in an entry ostensibly dedicated to the latest Parisian and Petersburg styles for men. The text opens with the pronouncement that "many thinkers and *scholars* (of the seminarian variety) argue that it is indecent for a man to care about his costume, that such trifles can only be left to a woman, *for* her intellectual abilities are weaker than those of man."[82] Establishing that women are "spiritual juveniles" (*dukhovno maloletnie*) who occupy themselves with mere rags and outfits (*triapki i nariady*), the narrator further suggests that men's time is filled with discussions of scholarly (*predmety uchenye*) and sublime (*vysokoe i prekrasnoe*) matters, and that they therefore wear clothes merely to avoid being nude (*dlia prikritiia nagoty svoei*). To prevent the reader from taking the opening remarks as representative of authorial opinion or of the column as

[81] *Sovremennik*, vol. 6 (1847), ot. 5, 3. Translation from A.S. Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin*, trans. James E. Falen (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990), 101.

[82] "Многие умники и *ученые* (из семинаристов) утверждают, будто мужчине неприлично заботиться о своем туалете, будто о таких пустяках может думать только одна женщина, *ибо* у нее умственные способности слабее, чем у мужчины" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 4 [1847], ot. 5, 5). Italics are in the original.

a whole, Panaev establishes a narrative frame that attributes the remarks to the "walking anachronisms" (*khodiachie anakhronizmy*) in the intelligentsia ranks, that is, to those intellectuals who subscribe to the already passé Romantic views of gender relations and self-fashioning. Such an unnamed learned individual is subsequently described attending a dinner party inappropriately attired – he wears a high-waisted jacket instead of the etiquette-mandated tailcoat – and disdainful of well-dressed guests, leaving the narrator to lament the sartorial division between polite society and literary elites still present in Russia, but no longer extant in Western Europe.[83] Russian intellectual elites' sartorial backwardness thus mirrors their inadequate familiarity with social graces and, more importantly, with contemporary social attitudes, including ideas about the position of women in society. They emerge not only as subjects of the fashion column, but also as a potential audience in need of its instruction as much as any other social group.

Rather than only appealing to the intellectual elites' position in society as harbingers of the new and the modern by suggesting that fashion is a vehicle for attaining such a position, Panaev also challenges their insistence on the division between high and low culture. In the entry on men's styles described above he reiterates the appropriate vocabulary of fashion by noting that he does not want his readers to think that it is the column's purpose to turn mankind into fops (*franty*) who dress "according to the latest fashion plate" (*po poslednei modnoi kartinke*)[84]; indeed, the very term "dandy" is to be considered *démodé*. Yet he insists that being a fashionable

[83] "Эти чудаки, пренебрегающие своим туалетом, ходячие анахронизмы, существуют только у нас, где еще жизнь общественная так мало развита. В западной Европе и ученые, и литераторы, и художники ничем не отличаются в своем костюме от людей светских" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 4 [1847], ot. 5, 6).

[84] "Да не подумают читатели наши, что мы хотим обратить все человечество во *франтов*. Мы терпеть не можем франтов, этих господ, одевающихся по *последней модной картинке*" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 4 [1847], ot. 5, 6). Italics are in the original.

cultural figure is indeed possible, once again employing Pushkin's verse to make his case: "One may be a man of reason (*del'nyi*)/ And mind the beauty of his nails."[85] As with previous instances of embedded poetry, these lines from *Eugene Onegin* invite the reader to recall the entirety of the stanza, which recounts Eugene's elaborate preparations for an evening out on the town, and which follows descriptions of his stylishly furnished apartment. The reference to beautiful nails evokes Pushkin's attentiveness to his own manicure, which was a known feature of his public persona and received prominent representation in portraiture of the poet.[86] Subsequent lines of the stanza[87] compare Eugene to Pyotr Chaadayev, the philosopher-journalist whose first "Philosophical Letter" provided the ideological underpinnings of the Westernizer movement, and whose foppish tastes partly inspired Pushkin's novel in verse. These allusions to major literary and philosophical figures of time past thus underscore the inextricable link between fashion and cultural production.

Panaev's latent characterization of Pushkin as a "man of reason" draws out the sensible – businesslike (*del'nyi – delovoi*) binary as a model of public behavior which incited journalistic and epistolary polemics among cultural figures of Pushkin's generation. The aforementioned "journal wars" dealt precisely with this issue, with Polevoi, a merchant's son, leading the call for a *delovoi* approach to literary production and publishing, and Bulgarin and Grech, both of noble extraction, endorsing the virtues of a *del'nyi* approach espoused by gentlemen-writers such as

[85] "Быть можно дельным человеком / И думать о красе ногтей…" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 4 [1847], ot. 5, 5). Falen, 15.

[86] Pushkin was known to be particularly fond of manicuring the nail on his pinky finger, and had commissioned a special coverlet to protect the nail while sleeping; *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' krylatykh slov i vyrazhenii*, ed. Vadim Serov (Moskva: Lokid, 2005), 87. Perhaps the most prominent representation of Pushkin's well-maintained manicure may be found in Orest Kiprensky's 1827 portrait of the poet.

[87] "Второй Чадаев, / Мой Евгений..." (Pushkin, *PSS* vol. 6, 15).

Pushkin, and championed in the literary almanacs that continued to pervade the publishing industry of the early 1830s. Yet, as Lidiia Ginzburg points out in her article "Pushkin i Benediktov," this split had become far less intelligible to its participants by the mid-1830s, as evidenced by the booming popularity of poems by Vladimir Benediktov, a then-civil servant at the Ministry of Finance.[88] Panaev described the origins of Benediktov's success as residing in the fact that "both, the Petersburg literati and civil servants were in ecstasy [from his poetry]"; his modest collection of poems received praise from the likes of Zhukovsky, Vyazemsky, and Turgenev, as well as from Pletnev and the nascent middling class (*chinovniki srednei ruki*) readership.[89] In 1841, Belinsky would further delineate the composition of the latter group, which he designated as "*iaryzhnaia publika*, consisting of officers and civil servants,"[90] a group that by the mid-1840s would constitute the main patrons, consumers, and in certain cases, producers of all genres of journalistic output. Panaev's awareness of a diverse reading public formed outside of the confines of seminaries and gentlemen's clubs, yet interested in the performative aspects of such spaces and the elevated social status bequeathed by those performances, motivates the combination of high and low, the gentlemanly and the bureaucratic, the *del'nyi* and the *delovoi* features in his column. The fashion texts not only provided the new middling reader with the symbolic capital needed to make advances in polite society, but also

[88] L.Ia. Ginzburg, "Pushkin i Benediktov," in *Pushkin: Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii* vol. 2 (Moscow: AN SSSR, 1936), 148-182.

[89] "Появление стихотворении Бенедиктова произвело страшный гвалт и шум не только в литературном, но и в чиновничьем мире. И литераторы и чиновники петербургские были в экстазе от Бенедиктова" (Panaev, *Vospominaniia*, 116).

[90] Cited in Ginzburg, 160. *Iaryzhnyi* finds its roots in *iaryga*, a term which in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries designated the lowest-ranking clerk in the police force, later used as a euphemism for a range of social types, including tradespeople, farmworkers, drunks, and itinerants.

effaced the *del'nyi-delovoi* dichotomy for the gentleman writer, for whom the purveying of taste in the form of the latest trends became an acceptable profession.

The increasing topical and genre heterogeneity of *The Contemporary*'s fashion column led Panaev to broaden its aesthetic scope beginning with the November 1847 issue through the publication of his serialized novella "The Grand Secret of Dressing Accordingly: An Experimental Society Novel in Two Parts" (*Velikaia taina odevat'sia k litsu: opyt velikosvetskogo romana v dvuh chastiakh*).[91] The text's ostensible purpose and intended audiences were delimited by the titles of the opening chapters: "Chapter One: From Which the Gracious Readers May Observe, Among Other [Things], Fashionable Ladies' and Men's Evening Attire" and "Chapter Two: In Which We Can Particularly Observe the Latest Hairstyles, the Most Fashionable Delights, Etc."[92] These titles mobilized the readers' familiarity with the practical and linguistic aspects of fashion established in the preceding columns, and called up in particular the opening column's prescription: "we do not use the term *in fashion* because that phrase is too vulgar; to reiterate, *fashion* is constituted of taste, of the art of *dressing accordingly*."[93] While these unambiguous headings continued to entice old and new readers with the promise of the latest styles and instruction in matters of taste, the novella also fulfilled an important literary function through the experimental structure announced in its title. Combining

[91] Ivan Panaev, "Velikaia taina odevat'sia k litsu: opyt velikosvetskogo romana v dvukh chastiakh," appeared serially in the following installments of *Sovremennik*: vol. 11 (1847), ot. 5, 1-6; vol. 12 (1847), ot. 5, 7-16; vol. 1 (1848), ot. 5, 1-5; vol. 2 (1848), ot. 5, 9-15; vol. 3 (1848), ot. 5, 1-4; vol. 4 (1848), ot. 5, 7-9; vol. 6 (1848), ot. 5, 3-6.

[92] "Глава первая, из которой благосклонный читатель и благосклонная читательница усмотрят между прочим модные дамские и мужские вечерние туалеты;" "Глава вторая, из которой можно в особенности видеть; новейшие прически, самые модные прелести, и пр."

[93] "Мы не говорим *в моде*, потому что это слово слишком вульгарно; повторяем, *мода* заключается во вкусе, в умении *одеваться к лицу*" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 2 [1847], ot. 5, 4). Italics are in the original.

popular literary genres of the period such as the society tale and the physiological sketch with feuilletonistic commentary, etiquette advice, and advertisements, Panaev tempered the pervasive commercialism of his text with aesthetic legitimacy. Before proceeding with a detailed analysis of Panaev's novella in relation to the fashion column, and their echoes in his subsequent work, I turn to a brief historical overview of journalistic and literary sources that informed his discursive and genre laboratory.

Sources: The Feuilleton, the *Physiologie*, and the Society Tale

The historiography of Russia's mass-circulation press has traditionally focused on political, social, cultural, and economic transformations.[94] In her landmark study, *The News under Russia's Old Regime*, Louise McReynolds argues that the press established a mediating institution between private individuals and the autocracy in which public opinion could take shape and find expression. She asserts that the political utility of the Russian press in the mid-nineteenth century cannot be gleaned only from its relationship to an expanding body politic and the formation of representative forms of government; rather, the Russian reading public "had to depend more heavily [than its Western counterparts] upon commercial print communications to develop an opposition to the autocratic form of government."[95] While McReynolds' primary focus is on the interplay between newspaper journalism and Russia's nascent liberalism, she also acknowledges that "an active public opinion cannot be dissociated from the commercialism of its

[94] Among the most commonly cited studies of the development of mass-circulation press are Zapadov's *Istoriia*, Esin's *Istoriia*, McReynold's *News* and Charles A. Ruud's *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982).

[95] McReynolds, 282.

origins."[96] Panaev's fashion texts represent the amalgamation of ideology, public engagement, and commerce described by McReynolds, as they draw on familiar discourses of the press to reach an expanding reading audience, as well as to test the capacity of high culture for social transformation.

McReynolds' study of Russian journalism is heavily informed by the ideas of Jürgen Habermas, whose *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* traces the structural correspondence between changes in politics and journalism, which in turn reveals that newspapers opened up the "public sphere," a space where readers could form and institutionalize opinion, and then wield it as a political weapon.[97] Once newspaper journalism became fully commercialized in the form of mass-circulation dailies, the influx of private values consistently eroded the press' value as a public institution, thus depriving the readers of a space in which to engage in critical debates. Developing from the competition of private commercial interests, the mass-circulation newspapers conflated public and private, rendering their readers into "passive beings, mirrors rather than critics of their society."[98] Habermas' notion of the "public sphere" is instructive in accounting for the spread of liberal bourgeois ideology, as is his insistence on the capability of the popular press to privatize public values and reproduce the status quo, although the latter point comes up against some

[96] McReynolds, 5.

[97] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989), 4.

[98] Habermas, 55.

limitations in the Russian context.[99] Nekrasov and Panaev's project in *The Contemporary* typifies Habermas' framework through its broadening of public discourse and attendant challenges to autocratic and bureaucratic centers of power. The Miscellany section, which offered a variety of topics and viewpoints to its readers, and the fashion column in particular, which depended on constant innovation to keep its audience captive and informed of the latest trends, made possible the dissemination of new master narratives in a format that engaged a variety of discourses. Nekrasov and Panaev's collapsing of commercial interests and public values reaffirmed on the one hand those narratives which generated the greatest economic benefit in the new world of print capitalism, while also creating a space in which new conceptions of modern life could take shape and find expression. Their editorial policies thus aligned with the ideologies of the liberal gentry readers, whose patronage ensured the journal's continued financial success, as well as with the interests of a growing bourgeois and middling readership, whose subscriptions ensured not only the journal's competitiveness in the publishing field, but also its growing social reach.

In addressing the extent and nature of commercial and stylistic experimentation in *The Contemporary*'s fashion column, I first turn to a discussion of its structural indebtedness to and departure from the popular dailies of the period. Historians generally agree that the death of Nicholas I in 1855 breathed life into journalism and ended the state monopoly over the political system, the printing presses, and the national economy.[100] Prior to this period, readers turned to

[99] Konstantine Klioutchkine's unpublished PhD dissertation *Russian Literature and the Press, 1860-1914* (University of California, Berkeley, 2002), vii-x offers an extended critique of the application of Habermas' notions to the Russian context. See also Katia Dianina's "The Feuilleton: An Everyday Guide to Public Culture in the Age of Reforms," *Slavic and East European Journal* 47:2 (2003), 187-210.

[100] During this period the populace was swept up in the spirit of reform, which could be measured quantitatively in the press: between 1851 and 1855, thirty periodicals had begun publication, but between 1856 and 1860, five times that number appeared. Cited in Zapadov, 316.

the newspaper for foreign and domestic news, literary columns, lists of decrees and public events, and advertisements. Newspapers such as *The Northern Bee* (*Severnaia pchela*, founded in 1825), *Saint Petersburg News* (*Sanktpeterburgskie vedomosti*, founded in 1702) and *Moscow News* (*Moskovskie vedomosti*, founded in 1756) epitomize the brevity and directness of the mid-century journalistic environment insofar as all of the aforementioned publications consisted of four to six leaves of texts whose primary focus was on conveying information of practical use to noble bureaucrats and civil servants alike. Scholars have pointed out that the limited form and function of dailies contributed to the rise of literary journals as the dominant medium for literary, political, and social debates. This historical point, however, disregards the structural and discursive circulation between the daily newspaper and the thick journal.

The editorial statement for *The Northern Bee*'s 1847 print run[101] for instance, illustrates the structural similarities between the newspaper and the thick journal with the announcement that the daily would be expanding its offerings to include theater reviews, short literary texts, and a Miscellany column. Its opening issue for 1847 further blurs the lines between journalistic commercialism and high cultural values through an advertisement for the renewed publication of the conservative weekly periodical *Son of the Fatherland*, which was hence to be published "in the same format as *The Library for Reading*,"[102] contrary to its demonstrated political-historical focus. Similarly, the January 1848 volumes of *Saint Petersburg News* offered readers a serialized novella entitled "An Improbable Story" (*Nepravdopodobnaia istoriia*), which recast the staple Romantic plot of an unhappy marriage as a "true story" (*istinnoe proisshestvie, nevymyshlennyi*

[101] *Severnaia pchela*, no. 293 (December 31, 1846), 1169.

[102] *Severnaia pchela*, no. 1 (January 1, 1847), 1.

anekdot) and cautionary tale of a husband's prying into his wife's private space (namely, her dresser), only to uncover a collection of recently acquired fashionable wares rather than proof of her infidelity.[103] By incorporating structural and genre elements of literary journals into daily columns, newspapers elevated their cultural status while continuing to serve a purely informational purpose for the growing ranks of tsarist bureaucracy and middle-class readers.

Over the course of the 1840s, discursive traffic between newspapers and literary journals became increasingly bidirectional. Articles on socio-political and economic affairs published in dailies routinely found their way into *The Contemporary*'s Miscellany section as reprints, digests, and editorial pieces, in turn eliciting new commentary in newspapers. For instance, the 1847 Miscellany section article "The British Assessment of Russian Farming" (*Otzyv Anglichan o russkom zemledelii*) consisting of observations on the primitive state of Russian agriculture by the "enlightened British farmer" (*prosveshchennyi angliiskii fermer*) Salter precipitated polemics on the topic between *The Contemporary*, *Moscow News*, *Saint Petersburg News*, the biweekly *Farming Gazette* (*Zemledel'cheskaia gazeta*, founded in 1834), and even the official monthly *Journal of the Ministry of State Property* (*Zhurnal Ministerstva gosudarstvennykh imushchestv*, founded in 1841).[104] Such blurring of discursive lines permeated not only columns devoted to current affairs, but the fashion column as well. Lamenting the absence of new styles during the summer season, Panaev focuses on the publisher as the representative resident of Petersburg

[103] The story appeared serially in the following installments of *Severnaia pchela:* no. 6 (January 9, 1848), no. 8 (January 11, 1848), no. 9 (January 13, 1848), no. 11 (January 15, 1848), no. 14 (January 18, 1848), no. 16 (January 20, 1848).

[104] *Sovremennik*, vol. 2 (1847), ot. 4, 27-30. A detailed discussion of the polemics regarding the consequences of Britain's Corn Laws for international trade and agriculture is offered in Evgen'ev-Maksimov, 129-132.

whose professional life prevents him from abandoning the city for a sojourn at the *dacha*.[105] As in previous columns, Panaev's narrator belongs to the social group he is describing, lending journalistic veracity to complaints of being "chained" (*prikovan*) to Petersburg and obliged to produce booklets of text at regular monthly intervals for the growing numbers of subscribers.[106] Characterizing himself further as a "feuilletonist of fashion" (*fel'etonist mod*), the narrator pursues captivity as a metaphor for print capitalism by describing the publisher's encounter with a prospective subscriber who will only purchase the journal if the publisher commits to producing fashion texts and supplying accompanying images of fashionable attire.[107] By styling himself as a feuilletonist, Panaev not only reveals the constraints facing professional writers, editors, and publishers in the increasingly commercial publishing industry, but also highlights the generic links between the periodical press and literary journals.

Imported into Russia in the early 1820s, the feuilleton adhered to its French models, offering a counterweight to the seriousness in journalistic coverage of important political, economic, and social events.[108] Rather than providing a unified narrative, the genre's simple form and diverse content brought together collections of fragments ranging from sensationalized reports, theater and book reviews, advertisements of popular products, and anecdotes. Over the

[105] *Sovremennik*, vol. 7 (1847), ot. 5, 1-4.

[106] "Мы непременно обьязанные к каждому 1 числу месяца представлять вам по книжке от 20 до 25 печастных листов... мы поневоле прикованы к Петербургу. Для нас нет праздников..." (*Sovremennik*, vol. 7 [1847], ot. 5, 2).

[107] *Sovremennik*, vol. 7 (1847), ot. 5, 3.

[108] Studies of the feuilleton have typically been targeted to journalism students, but something of an exception are cultural histories of the genre such as Klioutchkine, 1-42; Dianina, 187-210; E.I. Zhurbina, *Iskusstvo fel'etona* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1965); *Fel'eton: sbornik statei* (Leningrad: Academia, 1927), of which B. Tomashevskii's "U istokov fel'etona," 59-71 and V.B. Shklovskii's "Fel'eton i esse," 72-79 are particularly representative.

course of the 1830s, the feuilleton flourished in commercial newspapers such as *The Northern Bee* and *The Northern Herald* (*Severnyi vestnik*, founded in 1804), which announced its appearance as "a new concept in our literary life… a section devoted to literary and theater reviews and other miscellaneous material."[109] Professional editor-journalists including Bulgarin and Senkovskii used the variety of material to maximize their success by attracting readers from the center of Russian culture—merchants, professionals, the middle and lower ranks of the bureaucracy, and the provincial nobility.[110] Although literary elites rejected this social turn in the periodical press, its discursive legacy would be readily evident in literary journals by the 1840s, during which the polished literary style of Karamzin and his followers as well as the cumbersome language of the late Romantics were abandoned, giving way to syntactic simplicity and the colloquial vocabulary of middle class professionals. Furthermore, the literary journals' Miscellany section functioned as a feuilleton on a larger scale by including articles on a variety of topics, often from its authors' personal point of view.

The Contemporary's fashion feuilleton (*fel'eton mod*) strove to share the social and lexical orientations of its newspaper counterparts. In addition to styling his narrator as a working journalist, Panaev adopted the discursive standards of feuilletonistic writing and advertised them to his audiences as fashionable. His assertion in the inaugural issue of the journal that the Romantic vocabulary of fashion must only be used "in the ironic sense" (*tol'ko v odnom*

[109] Cited in *Fel'etony sorokovykh godov: zhurnal'naia i gazetnaia proza I.A. Goncharova, F.M. Dostoevskogo, I.S. Turgeneva*, ed. Iu.G. Oksman (Moscow: Academia, 1930), 5.

[110] Bulgarin articulated this focus in a report to the Third Section describing the ranks of the Russian middle-class public and offering ways of managing public opinion. In F.V. Bulgarin, *Vidok Figliarin: pis'ma i agenturnye zapiski F.V. Bulgarina v III otdelenie*, ed. A.I. Reitblat (Moscow: NLO, 1998), 45-46.

ironicheskom smysle)[111] reinforced the stylistic shift in the language of the press of the 1840s by drawing attention to irony as one of its defining features. Rather than criticizing the new discursive trend in the manner of the cultural critics and writers who lamented the ironic and sarcastic language of literary journals and the offensively intimate tone of the press, Panaev traced its origins to Pushkin's elegant and timely verse.[112] A column ostensibly dedicated to instructing readers in the art of conversing with the fairer sex on a myriad topics including fashion opens with a formulaic fairytale description of a Russian feuilletonist (*byl na Rusi fel'etonist*) whose unsurpassed mastery of verse, aphorism, and anecdote alike appealed to a variety of audiences.[113] Noting that only a writer possessing the aforementioned talents is capable of writing articles about fashion (*on odin mog by lovko pisat' stat'i o modakh*), the narrator embeds lines from "To the Slanderers of Russia" (*Klevetnikam Rossii*, 1831) to reveal that Pushkin is the fabled feuilletonist whose talent reaches "From Perm to Tauris gleaming / From Finnish crags to ardent Colchis teeming."[114] The conflation of patriotic verse, far-reaching (both temporally and geographically) poetic genius, discursive play, and middling genres reinforces the importance of combining high and low aesthetics in conveying social and cultural messages in the new literary market. The classification of Pushkin as a feuilletonist of style

[111] *Sovremennik*, vol. 1 (1847), ot. 5, 1.

[112] During the early 1840s, N.D. Ivanchin-Pisarev noted in a letter to L.M. Snegirev: "Слог мой, распвено-карамзинский, или, как вы говорите - обточенный, уже выходит […] из моды." In the same period, V.K. Kiukhel'beker wrote in his diary: "надоела мне судорожная ирония, с какою с некоторого времени ово всем пишут." Cited in Klioutchkine, 12-13.

[113] *Sovremennik*, vol. 7 (1847), ot. 5, 1.

[114] "И мы вполне убеждены, хто он один во всей громадной Руси – 'от Перми до Тавриды, / От финских хладных скал до пламенной Колхиды…'"(*Sovremennik*, vol. 7 [1847], ot. 5, 2). Translation from Arndt, 105.

suggests that the pursuit of fashion should be viewed not only as a valid aesthetic activity, but also one that expresses the national spirit and social protest in the manner of Pushkin's poetry.

The physiologies of the 1840s subsumed and transformed the feuilleton to occupy the journalistic and literary spaces that were until then chiefly its territory. This period, dominated by the tenets of the Natural School (*natural'naia shkola*) is usually seen as formative in the development of the Russian novel.[115] Introduced by Faddei Bulgarin in an 1846 *Northern Bee* article to disparage writers who failed to rise above the simple copying of reality in their work, the term "natural school" received positive value in Belinsky's appropriation to designate the branch of Russian realism associated with Gogol. The hallmark genre of this new trend was the physiological sketch, which Belinsky championed as a medium for the development of a philosophically and politically progressive national literature on the one hand, and as a tool for socially didactic art on the other. Imported from France like the feuilleton, the physiologies constructed quasi-scientific classification of social types through detailed descriptions of the environs in which these types were to be found. In their Russian form, the sketches sought to maintain an objective, nearly photographic accuracy in depicting the middling and lower social strata of Moscow and Petersburg by approaching their subjects in an informal and often humorous tone, and including realia such as sounds and smells of the locales for an added natural dimension. By moving literature from the salons to the street, the physiologies' urban realism catered to the concerns of a newly expanding readership, while their focus on the spectacular

[115] A. G. Tseitlin offers a comprehensive history of the beginnings of the Russian realist novel over the course of the 1840s in his *Stanovlenie realizma v russkoi literature: russkii fiziologicheskii ocherk* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), with a particular focus on the role the physiological sketch played in the process. See also L.M. Lotman, "Proza sorokovykh godov XIX veka" in *Istoriia russkoi literatury v 10 t.*, T. 7 (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1941), 511-570.

realities of everyday life propelled literary production beyond the Gogolian focus on the purely gothic and grotesque aspects of Russian existence.

Throughout the 1840s, Belinsky promoted physiologies as a generative genre in both form and content. Already in an 1835 review of Gogol's collections "Arabesques" and "Mirgorod," Belinsky announced the "despotic reign" (*vladychestvo despoticheskoe*) of the short story in Russian literature, extolling the genre as best suited for encompassing the complexities and rapidly changing nature of all aspects of modern life.[116] The short story also stood to revitalize other literary venues and forms such as the thick journal and the novel by breaking them up into discrete yet dynamic sections or chapters,[117] each with the potential of examining a different cultural or social phenomenon that would ultimately present a comprehensive picture of human existence through the complete contents of a journal issue or a serialized novel. Belinsky expanded this celebration of short forms a decade later in his review of Nekrasov's two-volume anthology *The Physiology of Petersburg* (*Fiziologiia Peterburga*, 1845), characterizing the collection of essays and sketches as not merely descriptive (*opisatel'nyie*) but as lifelike (*zhivopisnye*) and reflective of a sensible approach to literature (*del'noe napravlenie literatury*).[118] In a subsequent collective assessment of the literary output for the year 1845, he rates the various physiologies – Vladimir Sollogub's satirical travelogue *Tarantas* and collection of sketches *Yesterday and Today* (*Vchera i segodnia*), Nekrasov's *The Physiology of Petersburg*, and Aleksandr Smirdin's *100 Russian Writers* (*100 russkikh literatorov*) – as most representative

[116] Vissarion Belinsky, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 13-ti tomakh*, T. 1 (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1953), 149-150.

[117] "Повесть – распавшийся на части, на тысячи частей, роман; глава, вырванная из романа" (Belinsky, *PSS*, T. 1, 150).

[118] Belinsky, *PSS*, T. 9, 216.

not only of Russian cultural production, but also of the current ideological and social tendencies. Belinsky saw in these works the demise of Romanticism and the gentleman writer, and the rise of representations of real life (*deistvitel'nost'*) and work, as well as the professionalization of writing. The texts' short format appropriately reflected not only the speed and efficiency of modern life but also of the literary marketplace, and appealed to the new literary consumer.[119]

As I have previously described, the growing critical focus on the business (*delovoi*) aspects of writing received aesthetic representation in Panaev's fashion column through the sensible – businesslike (*del'nyi – delovoi*) binary as a model of public behavior. In addition, Nekrasov's *Physiology*, with its diverse mix of contributors of various ages, ranks, and stations offered a practical illustration of the change in nineteenth-century Russian social and cultural life, whereby members of the petty gentry and the déclassé championed the downtrodden while negotiating and vindicating their own efforts at economic and social advancement. Despite belonging to different ranks, both Nekrasov and Panaev followed Belinsky's ideological persuasion that as Russia's aristocratic writers ceased being the sole promoters of social and moral ideologies, the national written expression was in need of not only middling writers, but also of middling genres and topics.[120] They understood that in the new literary market the success of individual publishers and authors depended on satisfying consumers more effectively than their competitors could, and that growing consumer sovereignty demanded a literature

[119] "Теперь все заговорили о действительности. У всех на языке одна и та же фраза: 'Надо делать!'" (Belinsky, *PSS*, T. 9, 381).

[120] In his *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, Dmitrii Grigorovich recalls that as soon as volumes of foreign works under the general title "Physiology" became ubiquitous in Petersburg book shops, Nekrasov conceived of a similar project in Russian: "Некрасову, практический ум которого был всега настороже, пришла мысль также издавать что-нибудь в этом роде" (Grigorovich, 82-83).

representative of more secular, rational, and cosmopolitan attitudes.[121] Physiological fiction mediated high and low genres, and in doing so, reflected the readers' demand for literature that represented their own lives. While Nekrasov and Panaev's *Contemporary* catered to the progressive tastes of their expanding audience, it also promoted the tastes of their existing audience by retaining elements of genres long held in high aesthetic regard, such as the society tale.

The society tale arose in the 1820s and 1830s as a response to French romantic realism, with Aleksandr Bestuzhev-Marlinskii, Vladimir Odoevskii, Panaev, Polevoi, and Sollogub among its most notable practitioners.[122] This genre opened new directions in the development of Russian prose by entrenching narrative action in the spaces of high society and thereby providing an alternative to sweeping historical novels, gothic adventure tales, travelogues, and epistolary exchanges. Writing in 1839, at the peak of the genre's popularity, Evodkiia Rostopchina wrote of the need to investigate "high society with the scalpel of a scientist and the intuition of a poet in order to remove gilding from tinsel, to expose the mirage, to incinerate the dream" ("свет скальпелем ученого и интуицией поэта, это значит раззолотить мишуру, изобличить марево, испепелить мечту").[123] Her comments illustrate a shift not only toward a realist approach to fiction rooted in pseudoscientific observation and analysis, but also toward a more

[121] Jeffrey Brooks credits consumer sovereignty for the development of commercial publishing and popular literature, as publishers increasingly competed for profit and influence in the cultural sphere, beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. See his *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Culture, 1861-1917* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), xv-xvi.

[122] Among society tale practitioners was also a rising generation of women writers, including Nadezhda Durova, Elena Gan, Evdokiia Rostopchina, and Mariia Zhukova. Extensive lists of practitioners, both male and female are available in R.V. Iezuitova, "Svetskaia povest'" in *Russkaia povest' XIX veka: istoriia i problematika zhanra* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1973), 172 and Neil Cornwell, *The Society Tale in Russian Literature from Odoevskii to Tolstoy* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998), 4-5.

[123] Cited in Iezuitova, 177.

critical treatment of aristocratic mores and tastes. The rise of the society tale coincided with the formulation of "the innovative argument in Russian prose fiction of the 1830s," which aimed to increase verisimilitude of prose fiction through the modernization of subject and the interiorization of narrative interest.[124] Reflecting this new narrative thrust, the society tale focused on the salient characteristics of the modern age, such as commercialism, egotism, and rationalism, and examined them through the prism of psychological drama set in the modish spaces of the gentry, including salons, ballrooms, and spas. Relying on staple chronotopes and plots to expose (*oblichenie*) the private features of the gentry psyche and lifestyle underlying its public behavior and social relations, the society tale prefigured the physiologies' scrutiny of various social types and class relations, and affirmed the inextricable link Belinsky posited in his writings between one's character and environment.

"The Grand Secret of Dressing Accordingly" in the Context of Panaev's Sketches

During the period between 1834 and 1840, Panaev was among the most prominent authors of society tales, and it was this early experience as practitioner of the genre that informed his subsequent experimentation with genre hybridity in *The Contemporary*'s fashion columns. Panaev made his literary debut with the society tale "Boudoir of a Society Woman" (*Spal'nia svetskoi zhenshchiny*, 1834), which traces the failed liaison between the poet Gromskii, a typical romantic artist, and the Countess Granatskaia, an unhappily married high society beauty. Following the romantic canon, Gromskii lives an impoverished existence of an individual of

[124] Elizabeth Shepard, "The Society Tale and the Innovative Argument in Russian Prose Fiction of the 1830s," *Russian Literature* 10 (1981), 114.

mysterious origins, lacks social graces, preoccupies himself with lofty notions of friendship and love, and feels alienated from a society engaged in material pursuits and disinterested in expressions of artistic genius.[125] In an effort to facilitate his relationship with Granatskaia, Gromskii employs his friend Verskii's knowledge of high society tastes and styles to emerge with an identity that will be more palatable to his intended and more appropriate for the social circles in which she resides. He thus emerges as a "pathetic slave to fashion" (*zhalkii podenshchik mody*), wearing a form-fitting frock coat and a curled hairdo that recall, albeit parodically due to their poor fit and awkward shape, the latest images from the *Petit Courier des Dames* or the *Moscow Telegraph* (*Moskovskii telegraf*, founded in 1825).[126] Gromskii's failure at fitting in is underscored by his insistence on using poetic language, "the language of the soul" (*iazyk dushi*) and his consequent inability to employ the artificially refined yet ironic idiom of high society.[127] Spurned by society and by Granatskaia, who engages instead in a liaison with Verskii, a fashionable count with the rank of state councilor, Gromskii unsuccessfully attempts suicide in her boudoir. The tale concludes with the aside that following a short period of recuperation, Gromskii "quit Petersburg for an unknown destination" (*neizvestno kuda uekhal iz Peterburga*); the poet is thus ejected from the narrative chronotope, demonstrating the superfluity of the romantic hero in the contemporary aesthetic and social environments.[128] Although Panaev constructs his narrative using the commonplace society tale tropes of the

[125] Ivan Panaev, *Sobranie sochinenii*, T. 1 (Moskva: Izdanie V.M. Sablina, 1912), 5-7.

[126] Panaev, *SS*, T. 1, 25.

[127] Panaev describes the language of high society as filled with referential artifice: "Он говорил о самых простых вещах с такой оборотливостью и ловкостью; речь его заострялась иронией, блистала красивой изысканностью, как вычурная бумажка, завертывающая самую простую конфетку" (Panaev, *SS*, T. 1, 27).

[128] Panaev, *SS*, T. 1, 46.

boudoir, the failed liaison, the misfit hero, and the unhappy heroine, he ultimately exposes the genre's shortcomings in fully accounting for the everyday experience and motivations of its subjects. Rather than providing a sentimental parable in this story, he instead makes an early attempt at fashioning a typology of the "society gentleman" (*svetskii chelovek*), which he will develop in his later prose sketches and the fashion column.[129]

Following the publication of "Boudoir of a Society Woman," Panaev went on to write several other society tales, with "Onagr" (1840) emerging as one of the prime examples of his experimentation with bringing together the society tale and the physiological sketch. The fundamental structural principle of "Onagr" coincides with the scientific perspective of a physiological sketch; it abandons the narrative logic of a story (*povest'*) in favor of descriptions of social types in everyday contexts, which systematically unify in collections of chapter subheadings such as "Chapter Three: Coachman in a Cornflower-Blue Fur Coat with a Glacé Sash – Boudoir of a Woman of Middling Rank – Virtuous Man with an Enormous Mouth."[130] Panaev underscores his taxonomic approach to high society types and social occasions not only through the tale's title, which establishes a genealogical link between the onager (a type of Asiatic wild ass) and the protagonist Petr Alekseevich Raznatovskii, but also through the epigraph, which consists of a detailed entry from J.F. Blumenbach's "Handbook of Natural History" (*Handbuch der Naturgeschichte*, 1780) describing the onager's temperament and

[129] Although an extended discussion of the origins of Panaev's typologization is beyond the scope of this chapter, it is worth nothing that his approach continues the narrative tradition of the 18th-century comedy of manners and comedy of character, which rely on staple character types and dialogue rather than plot development as a means of satirizing, exposing, and offering correctives to society's moral and ethical shortcomings. In the dramatic tradition of the early 19th century, *A Lesson to Flirts* (*Urok koketkam*, 1815) and *Woe from Wit* (*Gore ot uma*, 1823) combine the themes of neoclassical comedy with the kind of rhetorical flexibility and verisimilitude that will be further developed mid-century with the rise of vaudeville and the Natural School.

[130] "Кучер в васильковой шубе и глазетовом кушаке – Будуар госпожи среднего сословия – Добродетельный человек с огромным ртом" (Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 104).

geographical distribution. In his studies of natural history and anthropology, Blumenbach theorized a formative drive (*Bildungstrieb*) that directs organisms toward self-development and self-perfection at all levels, from the purely physiological to the cultural and social. This drive finds its parallels in the Romantic commitment to moral and spiritual perfection of man and his aspiration toward the sublime and the beautiful. However, Panaev uses the epigraph to upend the apparent affinity between Blumenbach's philosophy of nature and Romanticism's philosophy of spirit, by signaling to the reader that Raznatovskii's tastes will figuratively mimic those of the onager, who "satisfies himself with grass unfit for other animals" (*dovol'stvuetsia negodnoi dlia korma drugikh zhivotnykh travoi*).[131] Beginning with the opening lines Panaev thus dispenses with the typical protagonist of a society tale – a hero with Romantic aspirations and values, offering instead the pseudoscientific typology of a newly prevalent urban type, that of a provincial landowner (*pomeshchik*) with vulgar tastes and base aspirations; as the tale progresses, Panaev increasingly uses the term "onager" as a euphemism for his hero rather than referring to him by name.

The motif of taste as a defining feature in high society life simultaneously links Panaev's sketch to the society tale aesthetic, and serves as a conduit for the inclusion of realia and social commentary into the narrative. The plot of "Onagr" follows the typical developments in a society tale, wherein a young man from the provinces arrives to the capital with the goal of gaining entry into high society through self-cultivation and business ambition. However, Raznatovskii never

[131] Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 81.

entirely grasps the "grammar"[132] of high society conduct, as evidenced through the ironic interpolations of the omniscient narrator who frequently exposes the disparity between the protagonist's perception of social reality and the real thing. A notable moment occurs during Raznatovskii's morning toilette, as he ponders whether to don a striped, multicolored waistcoat or a black one with purple mottles.[133] During this period multicolored and multipatterned waistcoats were considered vulgar, and the narrator further emphasizes the inappropriateness of Raznatovskii's morning costume by describing its poor fit and excessive ornateness:

> Сюртук превосходно обрисовывает его талию; правда, он немножко узок ему и жмет под мышками, но, говорят, модные сюртуки все таковы; на бархатном жилете, испещренном шелковыми цветами, висит золотая цепь с змей, у которой красный глаз под яхонт...
>
> The frock coat perfectly circumscribes his waist; however, it is a bit tight and pinches the arms, but they say that all fashionable coats are like this; a golden chain with a ruby-eyed snake hangs from a variegated velvet waistcoat with silk flowers… .[134]

The parenthetical "they say" (*govoriat*) implies that Raznatovskii is in theory aware of the current styles, such as form-fitting coats for men, but that his provincial tastes lead him to ultimately misinterpret those trends in practice. In a subsequent description of Raznatovskii's reading habits, the narrator reveals that the protagonist prefers to obtain his information from the

[132] I borrow the term from Lotman's conceptualization of the "grammar of the ball" (*grammatika bala*), which refers to the notion that the ball was a social occasion during which the nobleman was neither a state servitor nor a private person, but a representative of his estate at an event with its own rules, structures, and hierarchies. See Iu.M. Lotman, *Besedy o russkoi kul'ture: Byt i traditsii russkogo dvorianstva (XVIII – nachalo XIX veka)* (Sankt-Peterburg: Iskusstvo, 1994), 121.

[133] "Какой бы жилет мне надеть сегодня, пестрый полосатый или черный с лиловыми разводами?" (Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 83).

[134] Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 84.

French liberal weekly *Journal of Debates* (*Journal des débats*, founded in 1789) rather than the Russian liberal daily *Saint-Petersburg News* (*Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti*, founded in 1703), thereby confirming his backwardness in both stylistic and ideological trends. The narrator's consistent attention to the discrepancy between high society tastes and Raznatovskii's interpretation of them inevitably results in Panaev's departure from the narrative conventions of a society tale, and a greater attention to the classification of the myriad social types that have come to occupy high society settings.

Much as in "Boudoir of a Society Woman," where the protagonist's lack of familiarity with social idiom accompanies his ill-fitting attire, in "Onagr" Panaev presents the reader with a protagonist whose linguistic vulgarity and misinterpretation of high society vocabulary betray his social origins on the one hand, and call into question the successful outcome of his refashioning on the other. The turning point of the tale occurs when Raznatovskii, besieged by creditors and in despair, receives a letter announcing his uncle's death and making him a landowner with wealth and a title. From that moment, he seems transformed into an authentic *svetskii chelovek* whose personal appearance and apartment reflect his newly elevated tastes; a survey of his living room reveals a Gambs sofa, a bronze clock from the English Store, and Schaefer wallpaper.[135] The narrator underscores this narrative transition by pointing out the semantic transformation that must invariably accompany Raznatovskii's physical refashioning into a society gentleman:

> [Слово "человек"] прекрасное и глубоко знаменательное, а оно, не имея никакого смысла отдельно, только с тремя прибавлениями, получает в нашем обществе важный смысл: человек *с именем*, человек *с чином*, человек *с деньгами*. *Имя, чин* и *деньги* – великие три слова!

[135] Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 121.

> [The word "man"] is beautiful and significant, but has no meaning on its own; it only gains important meaning in our society with three additional terms: man *with a name*, man *with a rank*, man *with money*. *Name, rank,* and *money* – three important words![136]

That is, the process of refashioning involves a shift in focus from humanist values (*chelovek* as in itself devoid of signification) to materialist ones (the addition of *imia, chin, den'gi* imparts meaning), wherein being is reduced to having. As the narrator explains, a linguistic change accompanies the ontological reorientation; the bourgeois idiom of business, commerce, and rank becomes conjoined with the principles of Romantic humanism, seeking a reconciliation between existence and being, between objectification and self-affirmation, between the self and society. Raznatovskii himself affirms this shift by noting that connections (attained through the purveyance of name, rank, and money) are crucial to social success, and that materialist values in fact coincide with aesthetic ones: "Это необходимо для настоящего светского человека; об этом и Бальзак пишет и вся Петербургская молодежь большого света придерживается этой моды."[137] Although the narrative ultimately supports the notion that social advancement depends on a commodification of the self as an aesthetic object or an object of fashion in the social sphere, it does so through a critical lens, ironizing the necessity of qualifying the category of man (*chelovek*) and all of its attendant moral and ethical values, with the language of material pursuit. In subsequent fashion columns, Panaev continues to investigate the potential outcomes and broader implications of the pursuit of fashion, money, and rank, while also combining literary genres and established tropes with journalistic forms in order to provide sartorial enlightenment

[136] Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 120. Italics are in the original.

[137] "This is a necessity for a true society gentleman; Balzac writes about it, and all high society Petersburg youth follow this fashion." Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 132.

to a nascent bourgeois readership. He thus attempts to reconcile not only aesthetic and material pursuits, but also safeguard the journal's financial future by providing the expanding reading public with engaging reading material to which they will continue to subscribe.

"The Grand Secret of Dressing Accordingly" emerged out of Panaev's experimentation with the society tale, as well as out of Honoré de Balzac's physiologies on a wide range of subjects.[138] Raznatovskii's invocation of Balzac is not incidental, and reflects the broad popularity of the author's physiologies in Russia, which lasted from the mid-1820s through the mid-1840s. Of particular importance is the *Treatise on Elegant Living* (*Traité de la vie éleganté*, 1830), which informs Panaev's novella both philosophically and stylistically. *Treatise* established the standards of "intellectual dandyism," which conceived of the dandy as an artist who renounces production and utility, and whose self-presentation removes barriers between aesthetics and the everyday, turning the self into a work of art.[139] Rather than taking a solipsistic turn in dandyism, Balzac advocated its democratization, arguing that the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie will share, "the former its traditions of elegance, good taste, and high policy, the latter its prodigious conquests in arts and sciences; the two together will lead the people onto the path of civilization and light."[140] In this context clothing becomes an expression of the whole of

[138] Balzac wrote a series of physiologies, including *The Physiology of Marriage* (1825), *The Physiology of Dressing* (1830), *The Gastronomic Physiology* (1830), *The Physiology of the Civil Servant* (1841), and *The History and Physiology of French Boulevards* (1844).

[139] Although monographs and scholary articles on the dandy in various contexts (historical, geographical, social and literary) are readily available, Ellen Moers' *The Dandy: Brummel to Beerbohm* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973) offers a comprehensive study of the many types of dandyism, including Regency dandyism and French dandyism.

[140] "L'aristocratie et la bourgeoisie vont mettre en commun, l'une ses traditions d'élegancé, de bon goût et de haute politique, l'autre ses conquetês prodigieuses dans les arts et les sciences; puis toutes deux, à la tête du peuple, elles l'entraîneront dans une voie de civilisation et de lumière" (Honoré de Balzac, *Traité de la vie éleganté* [Paris: Bossard, 1922], 54-55).

society, and fashion in particular functions as the organizing principle of works of art and craft (*elle est le principe des œuvres comme des ouvrages*), both reflecting and promoting socio-historical progress.[141] Although Panaev in his sketches and columns denounces the dandy as an object of artifice and therefore incapable of reflecting modern trends, he adopts Balzac's view of the artist as a mediator between the aesthetic and the material realms, and utilizes fashion as a conciliatory motif between the social classes. Inspired by the notions that "fashion is no longer determined by a person's wealth" (*la mode n'est plus restreinte au luxe de la personne*) and that "power comes from stipulating new distinctions" (*il existe une puissance chargeé d'en [distinctions] stipuler de nouvelles*), Panaev recasts his fashion column into a literary endeavor directed toward a broader audience.[142]

Panaev's novella recast the staple society tale plot of an unhappily married heroine and the beginnings of a scandalous affair as a pseudo-scientific account of gentry mores and an instructional manual on good taste, proper attire, and social distinction. Rather than focusing on the psychological drama of love intrigue playing out in familiar society tale settings such as the boudoir, the salon, and the masquerade ball, the narrator instead uses these topoi to record and comment on the newest trends as a self-proclaimed "feuilletonist of fashion" (*fel'etonist mod*). He frequently interrupts[143] his own accounts of amorous exchanges between the heroine and her would-be lover with extensive analyses of furnishings and fashionable trinkets, noting that the protagonists are drawn to each other not because of shared emotions and high ethical and

[141] Balzac, 101.

[142] Balzac, 60.

[143] The first such interruption occurs when the narrator shifts focus from description of the heroine's musings to her boudoir: "нежели говорить о ней, я скажу вам несколько слов о ея будуаре" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 11 [1847], ot. 5, 2-3).

aesthetic values, but because they "both posses the secret of refined taste and the superior knowledge of dressing" (*oba obladaiut tainoi utonchennogo vkusa i vysshim poznaniem tualeta*). To wit, they are both adorned in the latest styles and familiar with the fashionable purveyors of Saint Petersburg, in contrast to the heroine's husband, whose stylistic disparity with his wife (the most notable display of this occurs as he is seen at a ball wearing last season's tailcoat) mirrors and motivates the disharmony in their marriage.[144] In an ironic twist that affirms the primacy of objective reality over sentimental values, the novella ends as the heroine is happily reunited with her husband, who has received a sartorial education in the very same boutiques and tailor shops advertised throughout the text and in *The Contemporary*'s previous columns.

The overwhelming attention to the protagonists' material surroundings and the insertion of textual advertising to promote those wares represents Panaev's notable shift toward physiologies as a genre representative of the fabric and pace of modern life. Adele, the novella's heroine consistently struggles between her pursuit of Romantic love and aesthetic existence in the manner of a Balzacian heroine and what the narrator ironically terms as "banal everyday reality" (*poshlaia, povsednevnaia deistvitel'nost'*) manifested in the delivery of a bill from the English store or of furniture by Gambs.[145] Her every romantic interaction ultimately becomes subsumed by consumption, whereby a touch from her lover only attains significance as she acknowledges that "he holds all the secrets of art, beginning with the *grand secret of dressing accordingly*" ([ему] доступны все таины искусства, начиная с *великой тайной одеваться к*

[144] "При взгляде на нее и на него ужас неравенства брака ярко бросался в глаза..." (*Sovremennik*, vol. 12 [1847], ot. 5, 13).

[145] *Sovremennik*, vol. 3 (1848), ot. 5, 1.

лицу").[146] The novella's title becomes a kind of refrain throughout the text, signaling the union of the artistic and the practical and the sublimation of unknowable philosophical pursuits into material ones. Advertisements promoting particular shops or shopping districts (including, among others, "magazin Adel'khanova," "magazin Sharmera v Maloi Milionnoi," "angliiskii magazin," etc.), or physiological descriptions of fashions always follow this refrain, thus transforming the novella's characters into active consumers, whose private and public selves are realized fully only through that moment of consumption. By juxtaposing the passé and the fashionable in the ideological and everyday realms, Panaev offers his readers a model of pursuits suitable for the modern age.

The novella's narrator further underscores rationalism and commercialism as requisite pursuits of his age by noting that "thankfully, the pursuit of the abstract and the elevated is no longer fashionable, and I know that no one is impressed by bombastic eloquence… Everyone now understands that the true task in life consists of the grand secret of dressing accordingly, and man's calling lies in comprehending that grand secret."[147] By disavowing "bombastic eloquence," the narrator alludes to the new discursive environment of 1840s literary journals, whereupon the polished literary style of Karamzin and his followers as well as the cumbersome language of the late Romantics gave way to the syntactic simplicity and colloquial vocabulary of middle class professionals depicted in popular physiologies of the period. Furthermore, Panaev's styling of his narrator as a feuilletonist allowed him to adopt discursive conventions of the

[146] *Sovremennik*, vol. 11 (1847), ot. 5, 6. Italics are in the original.

[147] К счастью мода на отвлеченное и высокое давным давно прошла, и теперь, я знаю, никого не удивишь выспренним красноречием... Теперь все понимают, что настоящая задача жизни заключается в великой таине одеваться к лицу, а призвание человека в постижении этой великой таины (*Sovremennik*, vol. 3 [1848], ot. 5, 2).

newspaper, thus highlighting the generic links between the periodical press and literary journals, and the transition of Russian literature and readership from the salons to the street.

Over the course of the 1850s, Panaev's instructive fashion feuilletons grew into cycles of short stories aimed at uncovering the social psychology of urban types such as fops (*khlyshchi*) and demimondaines (*damy iz polusveta*, *kamelii*) in particular, and assessing the moral and ethical implications of their ostensibly successful pursuit of fashion and consumer goods. Whereas his sketches of the 1830s and 1840s presented the theme of conspicuous consumption in satirical and aspirational terms, his later texts increasingly express misgivings about the evolution of bourgeois consumer culture and the compulsive display of money and spending. Published in installments between 1854 and 1857, Panaev's *Essays on Fops* (*Opyt o khlyshchakh*) continue to employ the scientific perspective of the physiological sketch to construct taxonomies of various fops, as indicated in the title of each essay: "The High Society Fop" (*Velikosvetskii khlyshch*), "The Provincial Fop" (*Provintsial'nyi khlyshch*), and "The Higher School Fop" (*Khlyshch vysshei shkoly [De la haute école]*).[148] Although each type's origins and social habitats differ (*khlyshchi byvaiut razlichnykh rodov*),[149] descriptions of their physical appearance, daily diversions, and existential concerns reiterate the vocabulary of good taste and fashionable pursuits established in the fashion column. The persistent repetition of adjectives such as elegant, respectable, chic (*iziashchnyi*, *poriadochnyi*, *shik*) to account for not only the characters' surroundings and styles of dress, but also their mode of being (these adjectives frequently modify the term "man" – *chelovek*, as in the phrase *poriadochnyi chelovek*)

[148] The series appeared in the following installments of *Sovremennik*: vol. 11 (1854), ot. 1, 9-122; vol. 4 (1856), ot. 1, 141-216; vol. 4 (1857), ot. 1, 149-195.

[149] Ivan Panaev, *Povesti – Ocherki*, eds. A.L. Ospovat and V.A. Tunimanov (Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1986), 177.

creates an atmosphere of stagnation that rhetorically replicates the existential inertia of the fops and the society that surrounds them.[150] Panaev reinforces this stasis by entirely stopping narrative flow and instead providing the reader with a series of what he designates as textual "daguerreotypes" illustrating everyday scenes in the lives of fops and their immediate circle.[151] His allusion to this still innovative[152] photographic technique ostensibly lends an added air of veracity to the sketches, yet also renders them static. Just as the daguerreotype provides its viewers with the mere illusion of reality through figures that appear to be floating on top of the photograph, Panaev's cycle on fops suggests to its readers that the representatives of the culture of consumption have lost the ability to distinguish between the real and the facsimile in their constant pursuit of the new and the fashionable.

Panaev's taxonomies of Saint Petersburg demimondaines examine the seemingly inextricable link between commerce and moral corruption, and highlight the gentry's anxiety over the impact bourgeois consumer culture has on the cultivation of good taste and the development of respectable society. The sketches "The Lady from the Petersburg *Demi-Monde*" (*Dama iz peterburgskogo polusveta [Demi-Monde]*), "Camellias" (*Kamelii*), and "Sharlotta Fedorovna" focus on various types of kept women who manipulate men for material gain and emerge out of the social penumbra to become celebrity figures in urban spaces and fashion icons

[150] In Chapter 2, I revisit the concept of *poriadochnyi chelovek* and the theme of inertia as the final outcome of consumerist pursuits as they appear in Goncharov's texts.

[151] The opening chapter of *Velikosvetskii khlyshch* is subtitled "Дагерротип с артистического семейства и о том, как приятно проводить время в таких семействах." The photographic accuracy of Panaev's prose had already received recognition and praise in Belinsky's annual review of Russian literature for the year 1845: "[талант] г. Панаева […] можно назвать *даггеротипическим*" (Belinsky, *PSS*, T. 9, 397). Italics are in the original.

[152] The daguerreotype was first mentioned in print in the September 27, 1835 issue of *Journal des artistes*, and introduced worldwide in 1839 with a public announcement in the London-based journal *The Athenaeum*. Over the course of the next twenty years it would become one of the most commonly used photographic processes.

in the society pages.[153] These women appear as ubiquitous fixtures at the opera, the masquerade ball, the latest restaurant, and the promenade along Nevsky Prospect, erasing the boundaries between bourgeois and polite society, and embodying the hedonism and moral bankruptcy of the culture of consumption.[154] The narrator of "*Demi-Monde*" attempts to delineate for the reader the distinctions between the *kameliia* and the demimondaine, ultimately finding the only difference between the two lies in that the former openly sells herself, while the latter merely engages in the pursuit of pleasure:

> Вся разница между нею и ними в том, что оне продают себя, а она *увлекается*, хотя, в сущности, основа их жизни одна – основа шаткая и неопределенная. И она и оне живут настоящим: сегодня в довольствие и роскоши, завтра, может быть, без куска хлеба.
>
> The difference between her and them is that they sell themselves and she *gets carried away* [by her affairs], though in reality, the foundation of all of their lives is equally shaky and uncertain. They all live for the present: in contentment and luxury today, nary a piece of bread tomorrow.[155]

While the participation of the courtesan (*kameliia*), the demimondaine, and implicitly any female consumer in the culture of consumption signals increasing social fluidity and class integration, the discomfiting similarity between the three types of women blurs the boundary between transgression and propriety, and renders material pursuits both illicit and stylish. These women's uncertain social status makes them yearn for luxuries to establish their position in society, but

---

[153] The texts appeared serially under the common title "Sketches and notes from the New Poet's Petersburg Life" (*Ocherki i zametki Novogo Poeta o peterburgskoi zhizni*) in the following installments of *Sovremennik*: vol. 3 (1856), ot. 5, 49-60 and 60-65; vol. 3 (1857), ot. 5, 126-148. It is notable that the sketches and the fashion column occupied the same generic and discursive space in the journal, namely the Miscellany section.

[154] The narrator of "Camellias" and "Sharlotta Fedorovna" frequents these social spaces not only to encounter kept women in person, but also to overhear conversations or gossip about these women's latest fashionable wares and pursuits. See, for instance, Panaev *SS*, T. 5, 74-75 and 256-257.

[155] Panaev, *SS*, T. 5, 69.

their equally precarious economic status means that their habits of consumption makes them particularly vulnerable to vice and financial ruin. Although Panaev praises in both "*Demi-Monde*" and "Sharlotta Fedorovna" these women's symbolic position in the rapidly modernizing Russian social sphere, he ultimately questions the role compulsive consumerism plays in the spread of moral depravity and dissolute lifestyles.[156] Much as his cycle on fops, his sketches on demimondaines betray an anxiety about the culture of consumption, whose participants confuse the real and the fake, both in material and moral terms.

The fashion columns of *The Contemporary*'s first-year run subsumed and transformed the feuilleton, the society tale, and the physiological sketch, to occupy the journalistic and literary spaces that were previously the domain of those genres. This stylistic experiment presented not only a challenge to the Romantic literary establishment, but also a model for the realist turn in Russian literature through texts that included "real-life" details such as fashion commentary and advertising. Panaev's combination of the society tale and the physiological sketch in particular aided in the propagation of liberal ideology, whereby the generic hybridization both concealed and revealed the philosophical and material wares promoted in the fashion texts. The fashion column also reinforced the notion of writing as a professional pursuit, and posited the union of aesthetics and commerce as a crucial element in the growth of contemporary media institutions and the prosperity of nineteenth-century media society. The circulation between distinct discursive and generic domains exhibited in these columns appealed

[156] The narrator of "*Demi-Monde*" remarks: "Если развитие общественной жизни заключается в экипаже, в мебелях, в туалетах, в умножении публичных увеселении, ресторанов, в расположении дам, называемых камелиями и прочее, то мы точно развываемся выстро" (Panaev, *SS*, T. 5, 62). Similarly, the narrator of "Sharlotta Fedorovna" notes the ubiquitous social role of *kamelii*: "эти размножающияся с каждым днем *дамы* начинают играть роль довольно заметную, выходят иногда из своей сферы и приобретают вне ея силу и значение" (Panaev, *SS*, T. 5, 259. Italics are in the original).

to new and varied audiences by offering them divergent conceptions of self and society, while also providing them with instruction on taste necessary for social advancement and progress.

Chapter Two

Redressing the Provincial Gentleman:

Social Progress and Its Discontents in Ivan Goncharov's Prose

Я свободный гражданин мира, передо мною открыты все пути...

I am a free citizen of the world; all roads are open to me…

Ivan Goncharov[157]

[Дружинин –] Вот это талант, не чета [...] вознесенному до небес вами апатичному чиновнику Ивану Александровичу Гончарову. Эт[о], по-вашему, светил[о] – слепорожденны[й] крот, выползши[й] из-под земли: что он может создать? […] Надо, к сожалению, сознаться, что от новых литераторов пахнет мещанской средой…

[Druzhinin possesses] talent unmatched by your apathetic civil servant Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov, whose praises you sing. This luminary of yours is a mole, blind from birth and crawling out from underground: what can he create? […] Unfortunately, we must confess that the new writers reek of the bourgeoisie…

Ivan Turgenev[158]

Although historians of Imperial Russia typically identify the Emancipation Reform, whose implementation began in 1861, as the defining moment in the restructuring of nineteenth-century economic, legal, and social structures, the reorganization of the Russian social sphere in particular was already well under way by the 1830s, and figured prominently in the discourses of

[157] Ivan Goncharov, "Na rodine," *Sobranie sochinenii v 8-mi tt.*, T. 7 (Moskva: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1954), 226.

[158] Turgenev's comment to Nekrasov and Panaev in early 1848 regarding the publication of Aleksandr Druzhinin's epistolary novella *Polinka Saks* in the December 1847 issue of *The Contemporary*. Turgenev believed that Druzhinin's text was important in promoting the journal's progressive orientation and offered a timely critique of the limitations Russian society put on women's intellectual and spiritual development. Avdot'ia Panaeva, *Vospominaniia* (Moskva: OGIZ, 1948), 190-191.

national and individual identity over the course of the 1840s and 1850s.[159] Even prior to the period of the Great Reforms, the noble estate (*dvorianstvo*) was amorphous, consisting of Russian and foreign hereditary aristocracy, individuals distinguished by wealth, rank, and closeness to the autocracy through military and bureaucratic service, as well as a wide range of people whose modes of existence were not always easily distinguishable from those of educated members of the merchant classes.[160] As educational requirements for service cadres acquired greater stature, and legal rights became more equalized across social groups, downward and upward mobility became commonplace in all estates, with déclassé nobles joining the ranks of the intelligentsia or the laboring poor, and peasant entrepreneurs joining the ranks of the commercial-industrial elites. Consequently, middle groups encompassed elites and semi-elites of service, education, and wealth, and included groups such as the intelligentsia and the liberal educated society (*obshchestvo*), whose existence was marked by a relative lack of political authority and an unstable economic status. Composed primarily of educated individuals of various ranks (*raznochintsy*), the intelligentsia emerged as a self-defined, self-proclaimed subgroup that shared with other estates (including the peasantry, the professions, and even the

[159] Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter notes that Peter III's 1762 manifesto exempting the gentry from obligatory state and military service (*Manifest of vol'nosti dvorianstva*) and Catherine II's 1785 charter (*Zhalovannaia gramota dvorianstvu*) exempting the gentry from taxation and corporal punishment, as well as granting them freedom of assembly and the right to form local assemblies, laid the groundwork for the integration (both formal and informal) of the nobility into other estates and vice-versa. In this sense, the 1861 reforms merely deepened the split between the nobility and the autocracy and extended the reach of economic privileges and legal rights to classes outside of the ruling and service elites. See the chapter on "Ruling Classes and Service Elites" in her *Social Identity in Imperial Russia* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997), 21-36.

[160] Wirtschafter outlines six mechanisms of achieving nobility, including: a. granted by the sovereign, b. achieved by reaching commissioned officer rank in military service, c. achieved by reaching collegiate assessor rank in civil service, d. achieved through membership in foreign noble families, e. achieved through membership in titled Russian noble families, f. achieved through membership in ancient well born (untitled) Russian noble families. She asserts that this variety of mechanisms accounts for porous hierarchical relationships and socioeconomic disparities in the noble estate. Wirtschafter, 24.

autocracy) the need to assert its identity through "staged and ritualized displays of cultural values."[161] Thus, as old boundaries of estate became increasingly more porous and indeterminate, political and intellectual affiliations formed across them, uniting individuals of unstable economic status and limited political influence in shared ideological and aesthetic pursuits. A representative case of this trend was the circle of editors, critics, and writers grouped around *The Contemporary* in the 1840s and 1850s, which included not only Ivan Panaev and Nikolai Nekrasov, respectively members of the hereditary nobility and déclassé landed gentry, but also Avdot'ia Panaeva, daughter of an actor and an opera singer, Vissarion Belinsky, son of a naval doctor and grandson of a priest, and Ivan Goncharov, descendant of wealthy provincial grain merchants. Because of the group's mixed origins, its attitudes to identity tended to be individualistic and existential rather than retrospective; private values were ideologized and merged with public conduct, and the *dvorianstvo* culture of propriety and refinement coalesced with the commercial pursuits and materialism of the middle ranks.

Despite the ultimately diverse social composition of *The Contemporary* circle, Goncharov faced considerable obstacles in joining the literary profession and gaining acceptance from the social and artistic elites. Following the end of his university education in 1834, which included broad philological training and exposure to the mores and tastes of *obshchestvo*, Goncharov expressed the Romantic sentiment that as "a free citizen of the world" he could pursue any avenue of professional or personal development. Yet, despite his Romantic projections and aspirations of a literary career, his early opportunities were limited to

[161] Examples of such displays include the imperial court's ceremonial "scenarios of power," affected peasant dress of Slavophiles, and the nihilist subculture of the 1860s characterized by external markers of belonging, such as blue-tinted glasses and cigarettes (*papirosy*). For additional examples see also Wirtschafter, 91.

bureaucratic posts in Simbirsk and Saint Petersburg. Over the course of the late 1830s and early 1840s, Goncharov published several poems and short stories and joined the Maikov circle, which he characterized as a dynamic and inexhaustible wellspring of new ideas in philosophy, science, and art.[162] His participation in this circle afforded him the opportunity to forge professional relationships with established critics and promising young writers, including Belinsky, Grigorovich, Dostoevsky, Turgenev, and Panaev. Indeed, Goncharov's socialization into the literary milieu was crucial to the publication and subsequent success of his first novel, *An Ordinary Story* (*Obyknovennaia istoriia*, 1847), which was read and critiqued in the Maikov and the Panaev salons, published in *The Contemporary*, and reviewed with acclaim by Belinsky. Despite these associations and early success, Goncharov struggled with the nagging awareness that his noble acquaintances perceived him as an "apathetic civil servant" (*apatichnyi chinovnik*) and a "bourgeois" (*meshchanin*) and doubted his potential contribution to the development and dissemination of progressive ideas and aesthetic tastes. This awareness of social inadequacy found its expression in his critical and literary texts, which attempt to bridge the gap between real-life practices and socially desirable modes of being and thought.

Contemporary critics such as Belinsky, Druzhinin, and Nikolai Dobroliubov readily identified civic consciousness and empirical observation as the guiding principles of Goncharov's aesthetics and the origins of the practical didacticism of his prose, and applied his social typologies to themselves and to Russian society as a whole. However, they ultimately neglected to consider the import of Goncharov's literary method for the author's social, ideological, and artistic development, and ignored the link between the various narratives of the

[162] "[Он] кипел жизнью, людьми, приносившими сюда неистощимое содержание из сферы мысли, науки, искусств" (A.G. Tseitlin, *I.A. Goncharov* [Moskva: Izd. AN SSSR, 1950], 30).

self promoted in his texts and his own struggle for personal and social improvement. Commenting on the autobiographical foundation of both *An Ordinary Story* and *Oblomov* (1859), Goncharov indicates that his writing originates in his own experience and the experience of those like him.[163] Moreover, he notes that the mechanism for the production of his texts involves "creating, working, thinking" (*delai*, *rabotai*, *dumai*) – a series of decidedly pragmatic pursuits characteristic of a professional approach to literature, and requires the abandonment of Romantic reverie (*mechtaniia*) and introspection.[164] This tension between the spiritual ideal and pecuniary pursuits (which extend to literary and artistic production) of the modern age receives critical and prescriptive treatment in Goncharov's fashion columns in *The Contemporary* and in his novels of formation. These texts function as advice literature for the provincial gentry and the urban middle groups by presenting them with instruction in proper sartorial, ideological, and moral etiquette requisite for successful ascent in the changing social and cultural spheres. In addition, these texts implicitly articulate the difficulties in Goncharov's own self-fashioning as a prominent member of the mid-nineteenth century cultural establishment, and address the growing anxiety among the intelligentsia about the relationship between ideological commitment and the conduct of everyday life, particularly as it applied to their participation in the burgeoning consumer culture.

In examining the mechanism through which Goncharov's texts not only served important social and literary functions, but also served as expressions of the author's status, I engage the

[163] "Когда я пишу, я, конечно, имею в виду и себя, и многих подобных мне. Я основываюсь на опыте; со мною то же бывало, и я, бывало, терялся в мечтаниях, тогда как натура моя говорила мне: делай, работай, думай" (Tseitlin, 56).

[164] Goncharov's emphasis on *rabota* and *delo* echoes the *delovoi* portion of the *del'nyi-delovoi* binary of literary production discussed in Chapter 1 of this dissertation.

theoretical categories proposed by Clifford Geertz and Stephen Greenblatt, whose methods aim to explicate the link between culture, the formation of the self and representation. In Geertz's view, human beings are "cultural artifacts" insofar as "there is no such thing as human nature independent of culture."[165] He defines culture as not constituted primarily as "complexes of concrete behavior patterns—customs, usages, traditions, habit clusters," but rather as "a set of control mechanisms—plans, recipes, rules, instructions—for the governing of behavior."[166] Within this scheme, the formation of the self functions without regard for a sharp distinction between literature and social life by crossing the boundaries between the creation of literary characters, the shaping of one's own identity, the experience of being influenced by outside forces, and the attempt to fashion other selves. Greenblatt's model of "self-fashioning" expands upon Geertz's system in asserting that self-fashioning is a cultural system of meanings and control mechanisms that creates specific individuals by governing the passage from abstract potential to concrete historical embodiment. Greenblatt posits that literature functions within this system in three related ways: "as a manifestation of the concrete behavior of its particular author, as itself the expression of the codes by which behavior is shaped, and as a reflection upon those codes."[167] By integrating these three literary functions in textual interpretation, Greenblatt's approach avoids the limitations of literary biography, of the idea that art is simply an expression of an ideological superstructure, and of the notion that literature is merely a detached reflection of the prevailing behavioral codes. Geertz's and Greenblatt's models of cultural poetics emerge

[165] Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 51.

[166] Geertz, 44, 49.

[167] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (University of Chicago Press, 1980), 4.

as particularly instructive for the analysis of Goncharov's texts, because his writings both explicitly advertise themselves as and implicitly perform the function of instructional manuals on public and private conduct. His fashion columns and novels of formation thus offer insight into the contribution of ideology to everyday life, as well as into the discursive circulation between these two spheres.

Employing the prism of cultural poetics, this chapter analyzes the ways in which Goncharov's texts of the late 1840s and 1850s chronicled contemporary social changes and presented their readers with taxonomies of self-fashioning in a society increasingly driven by the acquisition, consumption, and display of both wealth and symbolic capital. Using Goncharov's fashion columns in *The Contemporary*, as well as the feuilletons and physiological sketches of his contemporaries, I outline the range of fashionable social types whose ideological, moral, and aesthetic trajectories reflect the ambivalent relationship between the commitment to social progress through individual cultivation and the engagement in compulsive consumption. This conflicting perspective on the mechanisms for upward social mobility lies at the core of *An Ordinary Story* and *Oblomov*, two bildungsromans that alternate Romantic and Realist narrative paradigms as a means of offering negative recommendations for the formation of personality and critically assessing the outcomes of the pursuit of rank and luxury. As this chapter aims to illustrate, Goncharov's hybridization of the bildungsroman with popular literary forms such as the feuilleton, the physiological sketch, and the society tale generated instructional texts that question the commodification of the self and expose the creative and spiritual stagnation resulting from the split between civic virtue and everyday conduct. In articulating the contemporary anxieties about social progress, Goncharov relied on the modalities of written fashion already established and deployed in *The Contemporary*, allowing him to construct

conflicting, cross-rank perspectives on the desire for social mobility and its outcomes. His texts unequivocally link the conceptions of fashion as a collection of the latest styles and fashion as a consistent mode of perceiving and behaving, exposing in the process the intellectual, social, and aesthetic structures that govern the generation of identities in mid-nineteenth century Russia.[168]

Typologies of Social Elevation

The growing convergence of professional and intellectual pursuits between the gentry and other social groups in the second third of the nineteenth century led to a proliferation of advice literature aimed at providing the middling and provincial classes in particular with instruction in taste, style, and manners. It encompassed a range of forms, including comprehensive etiquette guides and household manuals, as well as shorter texts such as the feuilleton, the fashion column, and the physiological sketch.[169] These treatises on private and public conduct established theoretical prescriptions intended to shape the conscious assimilation of social rules, but also posited observation and imitation of others as fundamental mechanisms in the unconscious assimilation of refined appearance and behavior. Fashion's "double

[168] In defining self-fashioning, Greenblatt acknowledges that the usage of the verb *fashion* as "a way of designating the forming of a self," evokes *fashion* as "[a set of] particular features or appearance, a distinct style or pattern," that is, its long-term usage as a noun designating concrete stylistic choices (Greenblatt, 2). He suggests that self-fashioning entails a renegotiation of defined cultural practices and a transgression of social conventions, that is, "the achievement of a less tangible shape" and the crossing of boundaries between aesthetics, identity, and experience (Greenblatt, 2). Self-fashioning thus emerges as a mechanism of communicating the tension between the tangible and the symbolic structures that define systems of public signification and cultural poetics.

[169] In her comprehensive study of advice literature, *Refining Russia: Advice Literature, Polite Culture, and Gender from Catherine to Yeltsin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) Catriona Kelly suggests that advice literature includes all texts that may be read as "treatises of conduct" or as "prescriptive literature" (xix). Her analysis of advice literature in this study ranges from etiquette books to advertisements, journal and newspaper articles, political cartoons, jokes, and canonical literary texts. My usage of the term "advice literature" in this chapter follows her wide-ranging definition.

function"[170] of uniting members of a particular class through imitation, while simultaneously segregating that class from others served as a prominent feature of feuilletons and sketches aimed not only at delineating distinctions within and between strata, but also at cultivating principles of acceptable conduct in an increasingly integrated social sphere. As the tastes of the gentry and the rising middle groups merged, the communication of social distinction often occurred through the conspicuous display of wealth, which was encapsulated in the formula "rank and money" (*chiny i den'gi*). This maxim, coined by Evdokiia Rostopchina in her society tale of the same name, came to symbolize not only a preoccupation with high-status consumer items and prominent service posts, but also the successful adoption of socially-sanctioned modes of being and self-fashioning.[171] As typologies of socially ascendant personalities of this period illustrate, the pursuit of "rank and money" must be conducted according to a set of stylistic and behavioral principles, lest its practitioners become financially, morally or spiritually bankrupt, or end up exhibiting the tastes of the déclassé or the bourgeoisie. The dandy (*frant*), the lion (*lev*), the cultivated man (*chelovek khoroshego tona*), and the respectable man (*poriadochnyi chelovek*) emerge as frequent subjects of these typologies, embodying the traits requisite for social success and serving as templates plucked from real life (*deistvitel'nost'*) for the readers to follow.

Relying on the conventions of the society tale and the *physiologie*, the narrator of Vladimir Sollogub's sketch "Lion" (*Lev*, 1841) follows the titular figure's meanderings through

[170] Georg Simmel, "Fashion," *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 62.6 (1957), 544.

[171] The plot of Rostopchina's 1839 society tale focuses on the protagonist Svirskii, and his unsuccessful pursuit of a society lady who marries another man of greater wealth and status. She dismisses the steadfast Svirskii with the explanation: "Вы не богаты, вы не в чинах" (Evdokiia Rostopchina, *Stikhotvoreniia. Proza. Pis'ma.* [Moscow: Sovremennaia Rossiia, 1986], 305). August von Haxthausen, a German economist and lawyer who visited Russia in 1843, also attested to the preoccupation with conspicuous consumption and expenditure with the observation that "money is made and spent almost immediately" (August von Haxthausen, *The Russian Empire: Its People, Institutions, and Resources*, trans. Robert Faire [London: Chapman and Hall, 1856], 85).

high society locales including the ball, the boudoir, and the masquerade, engaging in a "sociology of mores" (*zaniatie nravo-ispytatel'noe*) designed to acquaint the reader with this prominent social type.[172] The opening lines establish imitation and attention to fashion as elementary principles of access to high society and Western values: "В Петербурге, как вам и мне известно, модный свет подражает Парижу и Лондону," signaling that the ensuing text should be read as a series of stylistic and behavioral directives.[173] Much as in Panaev's "The Grand Secret of Dressing Accordingly," a slavish dedication to fashionable attire represents a misreading of the high society aesthetic; rather, as the lion explains, a correct espousal of it involves the combined pursuits of fashionable clothing, lifestyle, and ideology: "Чтоб быть львом, недостаточно хорошо одеваться, хорошо уметь жить, обманывать женщин; но надо уметь властвовать над мнением, надо, чтоб доселе самые свободные мысли Европы, мысли о моде, о молве, делались послушными и раболепными орудиями."[174] The lion thus emerges at the vanguard of progressive thought and public opinion despite his seemingly superficial pursuits of fashion and womanizing, and embodies a kind of social "compass" (*magnitnaia strelka*), which provides direction for proper public conduct and being.[175] His exclusively dark-colored accoutrements (including a dressing gown, a waistcoat, a tailcoat, and a hat) in rich fabrics such as velvet and leather connote not only the weighty and respectable nature of his social role, but also a bridging of the old categories of noble and middle groups; his

[172] Vladimir Sollogub, "Lev," *Otechestvennye zapiski*, vol 15 (1841), ot. 3, 274.

[173] Sollogub, 264. "In Petersburg, as we both know, fashionable society imitates those of Paris and London."

[174] Sollogub, 268. "To be a [true] lion, it is insufficient to dress well, live well, deceive women; one must hold sway over public opinion, and make hitherto the most liberal European thoughts, ideas about fashion, and rumors [his] obedient and subservient tools."

[175] "Он магнитная стрелка, указывающая фешенебльному миру куда идти и что делать" (Sollogub, 269).

adoption of black and brown, the primary colors of bourgeois male clothing, suggests a move toward absolute simplicity, and away from distinction based purely on birth or wealth.[176] Yet, the combination of the lion's appearance and the narrator's likening of him to a mechanical object ultimately produce an ambiguous image of self-fashioning in high society, as the lion simultaneously appears as the leader of social progress and promoter of civilizing values, and as an automaton driven by the pursuit of material pleasure and the rejection of aristocratic propriety. The latter activities in particular circumscribe the lion's path to distinction, which he ideologizes to his many followers (male and female alike) at the masquerade by noting that one must ignore the judgment of society and live for pleasure alone (*molva svetskaia – glupost'; nado zhit' dlia naslazhdeniia*), and that sincere romantic attachment is a "false currency" (*fal'shivaia moneta*) unacceptable in a high society more interested in "real money" (*nastoiashchie den'gi*) and profitable investments.[177] The masquerade setting underscores the contradictory nature of the lion's public persona, as his austere elegance and philosophical sophistication obscure the moral and spiritual bankruptcy of his cynical attitude to being, which consists of consumption and material pursuits. Sollogub's sketch thus constructs an ambivalent portrait of a high society type, serving as both a cautionary tale and a chronicle of desirable

[176] The lion adopts dark colors regardless of time of day or social occasion, see Sollogub, 268, 273. For an extended discussion of the color black as a fashion trend that signifies social distinction among creative elites and intellectuals from the 1830s onward, see Valerie Steele's *Paris Fashion: A Cultural History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 92-96.

[177] Sollogub, 277, 279.

social values to the upwardly mobile reading public.[178]

Sollogub's contemporaries and later critics read his works not only as condemnatory or parodic treatments of the author's own aristocratic milieu, but also as faithful accounts of changing trends and social codes. In the sketch "High Society" (*Bol'shoi svet*, 1840) Sollogub's narrator remarks that he chronicles contemporary gentry mores as an insider, rather than merely offering imaginary or romanticized figures of gentry life.[179] The ideal high society type thus emerges at the intersection of material and intellectual fashions, social pressures, and explicit codes of public conduct, all of which Sollogub catalogs for his readers through a physiological lens. Commenting on the integrated nature of Sollogub's aesthetic approach, Belinsky highlighted its attention to psychological and material detail, observation, and characterized it as an authentic rendering of the everyday reality of the upper classes: "Поэтическое одушевление и теплота чувств соединяются в нем с умом наблюдательным и верным тактом действительности. […] Художественное достоинство повестей графа Соллогуба преимущественно заключается в подробностях и колорите."[180] Although Sollogub actively employed the techniques and approaches of physiological literature, and aligned his texts with

[178] The lion's dual nature recalls Sollogub's own real-life vacillation between his aristocratic upbringing and his public persona as a *literator*. Panaev notes that this split ultimately foiled the development of Sollogub's career as a professional writer: "Это был недостаток общий всем тогдашним литераторам-аристократам […]. Граф Соллогуб имел сначала непреодолимую наклонность к литературе, но серьезному развитию этой наклонности мешали его великосветские взгляды и привычки…"(Ivan Panaev, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, [Moscow: Pravda, 1988], 161-162)

[179] "Я должен выбирать лица своего рассказа не из вымышленного мира, не из небывалых людей, а среди вас, друзья мои, с которыми я вижусь и встречаюсь каждый день, нынче в Михайловском театре, завтра на железной дороге, а на Невском проспекте всегда. Вы, добрые молодые люди, друзья мои, вы хорошие товарищи, но вы не рыцари древней чувствительности, вы не герои нынешних романов. Вы похожи на всех людей, и, сказать правду, таинственности, романтизма я не вижу в вас!" (Vladimir Sollogub, *Sochineniia grafa V.A. Solloguba*, T. 1 [SPb.: Izd. A. Smirdina, 1855], 85).

[180] Belinsky, *PSS*, T. 8, 420. "Poetic animation and emotional fervor come together in his works with a discerning intellect and faithful consideration of reality. [...] The artistic merit of Count Sollogub's stories arises chiefly out of attention to detail and appearance."

the Gogolian tradition by using elements of the grotesque for social critique, his contemporaries readily identified positive modeling in the social types he catalogs. Thus, figures such as Belinsky and Lermontov read "High Society" in the early 1840s not as a parody or vaudeville, but rather as an instructive account of the advantages and pitfalls of high society life and its inner mechanisms.[181] In an 1857 review of Sollogub's collected works, Dobroliubov highlighted the scientificity of the author's narrative technique, categorizing Sollogub as a "statistician, ethnographer, and historian,"[182] whose texts provide guidance in etiquette and taste, particularly as applied to the spheres of language and communication. Reflecting on the rhetorical style in "Lion," Dobroliubov identified the motivation behind the protagonists' elevated and mannerly demeanor: "Соллогуб помнил, что у нас должно говорить так, как напишет человек с вкусом, и хотел дать образец для подражания нашим салонным героям. [...] [Соллогуб заставляет] создаваемые им лица говорить не так, как они *говорят*, но *как должны говорить*."[183] Thus, regardless of their social standing, Sollogub's characters strive for the kind of rhetorical refinement and tasteful conduct that the author aims to instill in his readers; his texts

[181] The publication of "High Society" in 1840 occasioned a host of comparisons between the protagonist Leonin's initiation into Petersburg high society and Lermontov's early experiences in the city in the mid-1830s, prompting Sollogub to emphasize the character's "social significance" (*svetskoe zhachenie*) rather than the parallels to an individual in his immediate circle. Yet, as a number of scholars have pointed out, neither Lermontov nor members of Petersburg high society found the self-referentiality of this text problematic: "Известно, что современники не воспринимали 'Большой свет' как пасквиль: ни Карамзины, ни Белинский, ни сам Лермонтов. […] Итак: Лермонтов не увидел ничего для себя обидного в том, что заговорили о его близости к соллогубовскому Леонину" (V. E. Vatsuro, "Belletristika Vladimira Solloguba, *Materialy k biografii* [Moskva: NLO, 2005], 256; see also I.S. Chistova, "Belletristika i memuary Vladimira Solloguba," *V.A. Sollogub: Povesti. Vospominaniia.* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1988), 5-8].

[182] "Он решился даже из светлой сферы поэзии спуститься в область смиренной прозы и сделался статистиком, этнографом, историком, биографом, даже критиком и исориком литературы" (N.A. Dobroliubov, *Sobranie sochinenii v deviati tomakh*, T. 1 [Moskva: Goslitizdat, 1961], 523).

[183] Dobroliubov, *SS*, T. 1, 528. Italics are in the original. "Sollogub understood that we [writers] are obliged to present the communicative model of a person with taste, and thus provided a model for imitation for our high society protagonists [in the real world]. [...] [Sollogub makes] his protagonists speak not as they *do*, but as they *ought to*."

reiterate assimilation and informed imitation as mechanisms crucial for access to the upper social strata.

Sollogub's 1841 sketch "Bear" (*Medved'*) takes the form of prescriptive literature by formulating typologies of desirable public conduct that emerge out of the suppression of the self in fulfilment of a disinterested civic ideal. The opening paragraphs establish the primacy of a homogenized perspective by noting the dynamic uniformity of the glittering crowd assembled at Peterhof fairgrounds: "Все это движется, колыхается, волнуется при блеске пылающих перспектив."[184] Although the narrator enumerates a variety of groups, including, among others, peasants, soldiers, foreigners, provincials, students, dandies, and young ladies, their common observance of social decorum and correspondingly appropriate self-fashioning in that public space temporarily blurs the individual differences, thereby creating the image of a modern and disciplined society.[185] Much as in "Lion," the various lion figures (both male and female in this sketch) embody the civilizing and rational impulses of progressive elites, while the eponymous bear represents the boorish and sentimental tendencies of a Romantic culture in decline. The bear occupies a nebulous social sphere positioned between a lifestyle based on professional pursuits (*zhizn' kabinetnaia*), and a lifestyle based on hereditary wealth (*zhizn' gostinaia*); unable to master the *chiny i den'gi* formula in any of its variants, he is relegated to an existence of solitude, superfluity, and marginalization. His unsuccessful self-fashioning and failed integration into high

[184] Sollogub, *Sochineniia*, T. 1, 377. "[The entire crowd] moves, sways, churns, under the gleam of sensational vistas."

[185] The temporary erasure of individual difference is contingent upon all parties' recognition of their proper spheres, often delimited by their clothing, as in the following description from the story's opening: "Тут русский мужик в кафтане становится рядом с вельможей в шитом мундире и, наглядевшись вдоволь, уже поздно возвращается к себе в избу, где долго будет ему что рассказывать хозяйке и соседям" (Sollogub, *Sochineniia*, T. 1, 376).

society (*svet*) stem from his lack of refinement (*dikost'*), which manifests itself most apparently in his inappropriately familiar and provincial idiom and unbecoming outward appearance; he is thus both philosophically and stylistically unfashionable.[186] Sollogub uses the ball setting to underscore the bear's outcast status by contrasting his costume with that of the fashionable guests:

> [В]се эти офицеры были так ловко затянуты в своих мундирах, а франты так тщательно придумали свой дачный костюм; булавочки их так ярко сверкали; фраки их были такого отличного покроя; галстухи переливались такими фантастическими цветами, что любо было глядеть. В углу, съёжившись у стенки, смиренно стоял медведь. Широкий черный фрак его, казалось, был шыт по мерке каких-то кресел; широкие перчатки превращали руки его в безобразные медвежьи лапы; белый накрахмаленный галстук, с бантиком в виде мотылька, неумолимо душил его за горло, обнаруживая на затылке огромную стальную пряжку.
>
> All these officers were so deftly encased in their uniforms, and the dandies so meticulously concocted their dacha suits; their pins sparkled so brightly; their tailcoats were of such an excellent cut; the fantastically iridescent ties were a pleasure to behold. In the corner, cowering against a wall, meekly stood the bear. His oversized black coat seemed to be sewn to the measure of some sort of armchair; the wide gloves turned his hands into unseemly bear's paws; the white starched tie, with a bow resembling a moth, relentlessly choked him, revealing a huge steel buckle at the nape.[187]

The bear's somber and ill-fitting outfit, which is at once broad and confining, inconspicuously colored and ostentatiously accessorized, contravenes the glittering, colorful harmony of the costumes adorning the society crowd. The intimate association of phrases pertaining to light (*sverkali*, *perelivalis'*) with high society (*svet*) figures, and the contrasting dark, static, and ungainly descriptors (*chernyi*, *smirenno stoial*, *nakrakhmalennyi*, *shirokii*) of the bear, underscore the elites' position as beacons of fashion, good taste, and progress. Sollogub's

[186] The bear's colloquial register is best exemplified by his persistent use of the particle –съ and да-constructions in his failed romantic advances upon a princess (Sollogub, *Sochineniia*, T. 1, 391-393).

[187] Sollogub, *Sochineniia*, T. 1, 415.

juxtaposition of the two types takes on the form of physiological sketch-cum-etiquette manual by simultaneously offering positive and negative prescriptions of self-fashioning. Despite the somewhat ambivalent representation of the lion in this sketch and the stories discussed above, this figure receives unambiguously positive value as a model to be emulated, while the bear emerges as a cautionary model. The purpose of Sollogub's satire was ultimately not to disavow the presumptions of a higher stratum in the social organism, but to suggest the possibility of a positive, exemplary pattern of social behavior.

The lion figure receives a passing mention in Panaev's "Onagr" (1840), as a high society cosmopolitan counterpart to the eponymous provincial "onager" with aspirations of upward mobility. Both types embody the Russian national tendency to imitate European mores, particularly in the sphere of passing trends and superficial values: "Всем известно, что мы русские имеем претензию на европейскую внешность, что мы с изумительною быстротою перенимаем все парижския и лондонския странности и прихоти."[188] Yet, despite their common origins, the lion and the onager represent fundamentally different strata whose convergence signifies a veritable clash of cultures; the lion internalizes and articulates the tastes of high society of which he is a member, while the onager originates from the middle groups and applies bourgeois or provincial logic to matters of refinement as he climbs the social ladder.[189] Panaev notes that this figure represents a fundamentally new social trend taking hold in the capital, accompanied by a new social idiom: "[название онагр для царьков среднего общества] перейдет и к нам, и мы скоро привыкнем к нему, как привыкли к странным

[188] Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 94. "Everyone knows that we Russians lay claim to European appearance and prodigiously adopt all Parisian and London quirks and whims."

[189] This phenomenon is encapsulated in the chapter heading "*Derevenskiia mysli i stolichniia mechty*" (Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 95).

прозваниям 'львов.' В Петербурге очень много 'онагров,' несравненно более, чем 'львов.'"[190] Panaev's comment that onagers are becoming more commonplace in Petersburg circles than lions justifies the fashion column's edifying mission, as it introduces its readers to the behavioral, stylistic, and linguistic particularities of each type, and consequently offers recommendations and critiques for their conduct. Yet, the comment also hints at Panaev's anxiety over the onager's rising social prominence, as this type's base aspirations and middling tastes stand at odds with the type of modern, civilized society of which he is increasingly an archetype. Much like Sollogub's lion-bear juxtaposition, Panaev's lion-onager duality models desirable social tastes and conduct by means of contrast and negative prescription.

Iakov Butkov's two-volume collection *The Petersburg Heights* (*Peterburgskie Vershiny*, 1845-6) represents a shift in both social perspective and narrative approach to mechanisms of social ascent. Born to a family of Saratov bourgeoisie, Butkov lived in near-poverty upon relocating to Saint Petersburg and eventually fell under the patronage of Andrei Kraevskii, publisher-editor of *Notes of the Fatherland*, who recognized the young writer as a budding talent. Butkov's modest origins and early encounters with urban crowds of mixed rank (*tolpa*) endowed him with the idea that literary works should be written for a middling audience and reflect its experiences, rather than those of the noble estates.[191] Although this view dovetailed with the tenets of the Natural School, his portraits of petty bureaucrats and civil servants of lower ranks

[190] Panaev, *SS*, T. 2, 95. "[The term onager for those petty tsars of the middle-class] will soon reach us, and we will get accustomed to it as we are to the strange terminology designating 'lions.' In Petersburg there are incomparably more 'onagers' than 'lions.'"

[191] "[Е]сли книги пишутся – пишутся для срединной линии, и если в книгах описываются люди и действия людей, то люди непременно […] должны принадлежать к срединной линии..." (Iakov Butkov, *Povesti i rasskazy* [Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1967], 30).

systematically dissipated the aesthetic and social sentiments[192] typically applied to such protagonists, offering instead a dynamic and pragmatic vision of the social context from which they emerge; his texts represent the elevation of the "little man" (*malen'kii chelovek*) from *tolpa* into *obshchestvo*, and examine the implications of that journey. The collection's opening story, "A Respectable Man" (*Poriadochnyi chelovek*, 1845)[193] traces Lev Chubukevich's evolution from his position as a petty collegiate registrar (*melkii kollezhskii registrator*) to a position of great wealth and influence as a "respectable man," a ubiquitous fixture in fashionable restaurants, along the Nevsky Prospect promenade, and at prominent social gatherings. Rather than rising through service ranks, Chubukevich acquires his wealth in a serendipitous game of préférence and experiences a "moral shock" (*nravstvennoe potriasenie*) that prompts him to manifest the linguistically refined, but fatuous qualities implicit in the phrase "the self-induced and self-contained selfhood of the respectable man" (*samozdatel'naia i samozakliuchitel'naia samost' poriadochnogo cheloveka*).[194] This phrase ironically alludes to Chubukevich's newfound philosophical sophistication and individual autonomy, as his "respectable" status in practice demands the espousal of socially sanctioned tastes and manners, and in particular the willingness "to live at the expense of others" (*zhit' na chuzhoi schet*), a euphemism for the pursuit of rank

[192] Sentimental and philanthropic representations of the "little man" typically focus on the banality and dehumanization of his everyday experience, and on his inability to escape his environment. Paradigmatic texts of this type include Pushkin's "The Stationmaster" (*Stantsionnyi smotritel'*, 1831), Gogol's "The Overcoat" (*Shinel'*, 1842), and Dostoevsky's *Poor Folk* (*Bednye liudi*, 1846).

[193] This sketch was first published in installments in *Severnaia pchela*, vol. 132-136 (June 14-19, 1845).

[194] The narrator refers to this as an "elevated philosophical phrase" (*vysokii filosofskii slog*), thus satirizing the pursuit of individual refinement. Butkov, 33, 40.

and money.[195] Chubukevich's staunch commitment to his elevated status prompts him to organize a rigged game of préférence, during which he wins another man's entire inheritance, thereby bolstering his own reputation and estate. The story closes on a final image of Chubukevich as a man of means (*chelovek solidnyi*) with a young wife, a four-story home, and a fashionable carriage (*kareta novogo fasona*), solidifying his status as a "respectable man." This ending establishes the primacy of ambition and compulsive materialism in social advancement, and denies the "little man" the opportunity for moral and spiritual development befitting his new position. Though repeated throughout the text, the lofty idiom of the "respectable" self (*samost'*) ultimately rings hollow, as Lev Chubukevich remains the superficial and crass individual symbolically encoded in his very name; he appears to be a lion, but is fundamentally a mere "pipe-stem," whose base instincts overwhelm the societal codes of refinement, taste, and conduct.[196] Butkov's typology of the "respectable man" thus criticizes the social idealism of the period, questioning the abrupt transition of the middling classes to the upper strata solely by means of commodification of the self.

While Sollogub's and Butkov's typologies concern themselves with the self-fashioning of the urban gentry and middle classes, Aleksandr Kroneberg's fashion feuilleton takes the form of an epistolary advice column for the provincial gentry. The participants in the tripartite exchange are explicitly named as Petr Petrovich, the provincial gentleman seeking advice; Vladimir

[195] The narrator provides an exhaustive list of abilities and interests that attest to Chubukevich's refinement and cosmopolitanism: "[O]н обедал у лучших рестораторов столицы. [...] Он умел порядочно говорить о пустяках, напевал итальянские арии, бывал во всех театрах, пренебрегал русским, терпел немецкое, обожал французское и приходил в неистовый восторг от итальянского... (Butkov, 40).

[196] Chubukevich's incomplete refashioning parallels that of Panaev's "onager", Raznatovskii, whose social transformation involves a shift in focus from humanist values to materialist ones (the addition of *imia, chin, den'gi* imparts meaning), wherein being is reduced to having.

Chulkov, Kroneberg's pseudonym as a high society denizen administering instruction in urban fashions and tastes; and N.N., a mutual acquaintance of the two who observes and reports on Petr Petrovich's practical application of Chulkov's advice.[197] However, any reader of these epistles on some level adopts the imaginary stance or persona of the letter's original addressee, making it the ideal form for instruction in social conduct and self-fashioning; as Monika Greenleaf notes, in the epistolary form the reader is not only "an external eavesdropper on the entire correspondence" but also "the 'you' to whom each letter is addressed."[198] Prefaces that are added are intended to shape an ideal reading of the text, so much so that the author prefabricates any response of the reader. The first installment of the "Correspondence between a Petersburger and a Provincial" (*Perepiska mezhdu peterburzhtsem i provintsialom*) opens with an editorial note directed specifically at provincial ladies (*damy v provintsii*) unacquainted with "the grand secret of dressing accordingly" (*velikaia taina odevat'sia k litsu*): эти письма послужат к развитию вкуса […] и к искоренению некоторых диких и неизящных привычек.[199] This note underscores the broad nature of the fashion column's audience, which includes not only all the participants in the epistolary exchange, but also male and female provincial readers in need of instruction in taste, elegance, and proper conduct that will supplant their "savage habits."

Rather than presenting the readers with distinct typologies of social cultivation, Kroneberg constructs his texts using the generic and narrative principles already established in

[197] The epistolary series appeared under the following individual titles in *Sovremennik*: "Perepiska mezhdu peterburzhtsem i provintsialom," vol. 8 (1848), ot. 5, 3-11; "Otryvok iz pis'ma g N.N. k Chulkovu," vol. 9 (1848), ot. 5, 1-6; Otryvok iz pis'ma Chulkova k N.N., vol. 10 (1848), ot. 5, 3-11.

[198] Monika Greenleaf, *Pushkin and Romantic Fashion: Fragment, Elegy, Orient, Irony* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 24.

[199] *Sovremennik*, vol. 8 (1848), ot. 5, 3. "These letters will aid in the development of taste […] and the eradication of boorish and unsophisticated habits."

The Contemporary's preceding fashion columns. Bridging the aesthetic and the commercial spheres as Panaev did before him, Kroneberg's first two epistles focus on recommendations of fashionable shoes, stockings, and garters, delivered through a combination of references to high culture and textual advertisements. Chulkov's theorization and taxonomy of women's feet and legs (*Teoriia zhenskoi nozhki. Klassifikatsiia zhenskoi nogi.*) draw their inspiration from Pushkin's aesthetic preoccupation with these body parts, yet ultimately function as advertisements for shops along Nevsky Prospect; Sobolev's workshop emerges as a beacon of taste and fashion literacy, as it manufactures shoes whose cosmopolitan elegance and comfort not only compliment the foot, but also animate social gatherings of an entire provincial town and provoke high-minded discussions about the nature of fashion.[200] N.N.'s letter to Chulkov outlines a series of such discussions about the term "chic," variously interpreted by the provincial ladies as a newly designed variety of footwear (*osobenogo roda novoizobretennaia obuv'*), a type of fashionable walk (*osobennaia modnaia pokhodka*), or a particular position of the little toe in relation to the rest of the foot (*nozhka s mizintsem, pritaivshimsia za svoimi brat'iami*).[201] Despite the seemingly scientific and philosophical tone of these discussions, the provincial gentry's misinterpretation of the term based on purely material phenomena betrays their mundane preoccupations and lack of intellectual sophistication, casting into doubt the desired outcome of Kroneberg's "civilizing" project advertised in the editorial note. [202] Indeed,

[200] "[Б]ашмаки Соболева, явившиеся на действительно щегольской ножке Лизаветы Семеновны, привели в движение множество языков и лорнетов и породили несколько оригинальных сцен" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 9 [1848], ot. 5, 1).

[201] *Sovremennik*, vol. 9 (1848), ot. 5, 5.

[202] "[О слове *шик*] разговаривали как разговаривают иногда ученые люди о Гегеле, Гомере и т. п." (*Sovremennik*, vol. 9 [1848], ot. 5, 6).

N.N.'s observations confirm Chulkov's assertion in the first letter that provincial denizens primarily value appearances (*vneshnost'*), and not only put little stock in the cultivation of unseen qualities, but actively and often unsuccessfully conceal unflattering features of their style, and by extension, of their character.[203] This apparent recalcitrance of the provincial mentality represented a threat to civic and spiritual progress, as upwardly mobile groups could not be trusted to engage in consumption and acquisition in a moderate, sensible, and aestheticized fashion. Before examining incarnations of provincial resistance to and subversion of prevalent models of self-fashioning in Goncharov's novels of formation, I turn to a brief discussion of his fashion feuilletons, which not only build upon the corpus of typologies produced by his contemporaries, but also provide touchstones for the reading of the Aduevs' and Oblomov's narrative trajectories.

Goncharov's review of D.N. Sokolov's etiquette guide titled *Society Man, or A Guide to the Rules of Public Life* (*Svetskii chelovek, ili Rukovodstvo k poznaniiu pravil obshchezhitiia*, 1847) assesses the necessity for the "strange science" (*mudrenaia nauka*) of high society mores, disseminated through advice literature to the "uninitiated bumpkin" (*novichok iz derevenskoi glushi*) recently arrived in the capital.[204] Consisting of behavioral and stylistic prescriptions for an exhaustive range of public and private occasions, Sokolov's guide begins with the maxim that man is a social being whose abilities, activities, and essential nature derive from and are directed towards the social realm: "человек рожден для общества; все его способности, все его

[203] "Внешность, и одна только внешность, составляет главную их заботу […]. И тогда, как например платье и шляпка стоять им добрую скирду ржи, на остальную, скрытую и почти главную часть одежды жертвуется если один сноп" (*Sovremennik*, vol. 8 [1848], ot. 5, 5).

[204] This feuilleton first appeared in *Sovremennik*, vol. 5 (1847), ot. 3, 54-61. References in the text are to the following edition: I.A. Goncharov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati tomakh*, T. 1 (SPb.: Nauka, 1997), 494.

наслаждения и удовольствия направлены к общественной жизни; он имеет нужду в обществе, также как и общество нуждается в нем."[205] Adherence to codified standards of appearance and conduct, imitation, and discipline emerge as the primary channels to social acceptance, with "wise people endowed with common sense and good taste" (*liudi blagorazumnye s zdravym smyslom i iziashchnym vkusom*) acting as archetypes and arbiters of propriety.[206] While Goncharov acknowledges the necessity of direct experience and imitation for social mobility, he criticizes the process as inherently limiting to individual freedom and expression, and at odds with progressive thought and models of the self. Goncharov directs his attack at the "right-minded man" (*blagomysliashchii chelovek*), a type he posits as a parody of Sokolov's "wise man" (*blagorazumnyi chelovek*). As the embodiment of ubiquitous control and social discipline ("[он] стоит за вашей спиной, идет за вами в театр – всюду"), the right-minded man scrutinizes individual propriety and morality, and exacts punishment for any transgressions ("он инспектор приличий и нравственности [и] должен карать за нарушение правил общежития").[207] This anachronistic type recalls the punitive mechanisms of the autocracy designed to increase social cohesion, which ultimately result in individual subjugation. Instead, Goncharov advocates a return to simplicity and individual integrity as a conduit toward a unified, fluid, and modern society: "Общество требует, чтоб каждый был сколько можно

[205] Sokolov's guide includes headings ranging from "Правила благопристойности при богослужениях" to "Приличия пешеходов;" encompasses examples of acceptable and unacceptable conduct between master and servant, husband and wife; and offers instruction in proper attire, manners, topics of conversation, letter-writing, and even advice-giving. D.N. Sokolov, *Svetskii chelovek, ili Rukovodstvo k poznaniiu pravil obshchezhitiia* (SPb.: Tip. S. Peterburgskogo gubernskogo pravleniia, 1847), 4.

[206] Sokolov, 34.

[207] I.A. Goncharov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati tomakh*, T. 1 (SPb.: Nauka, 1997), 496.

естествен в своих манерах, походке, голосе, и прочем, то есть верен самому себе...".[208] His ideologization of individual mores and insistence on the consolidation of private and public spheres present an alternative model of self-fashioning for the middle groups, based on private conduct as a reflection of moral sensibility, civic responsibility, and social engagement.

"Letters of a Friend from the Capital to a Provincial Bridegroom" (*Pis'ma stolichnogo druga k provintsial'nomu zhenikhu*, 1848) emerged out of Goncharov's experimentation with the fashion feuilleton and the physiology, and represents a middling reaction to advice texts produced by high society insiders such as Sollogub, Panaev, and Sokolov.[209] Penned by the pseudonymous A. Chel'skii, the first letter opens with a taxonomy of the dandy (*frant*), the lion (*lev*), the cultivated man (*chelovek khoroshego tona*), and the respectable man (*poriadochnyi chelovek*), intended to clarify the distinctions between these common social types and to acquaint the provincial reader with the most desirable modes of self-fashioning. Chel'skii characterizes the dandy and the lion as embodiments of purely superficial expressions of refinement and taste, manifested in their appearance and carriage. The dandy's impeccable style and slavish adherence to fashion (*odevaetsia kartinno*) betray his narrow and empty worldview: "Франт уловил только одну, самую простую и пустую сторону уменья жить: мастерски, безукоризненно одеться. По ограниченности взгляда на жизнь, он, кроме этого, ничего усвоил."[210] The lion's stylistic prowess extends beyond attire to matters of personal taste and public conduct,

[208] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 496. This sentiment echoes the earlier: "А свет только и требует, чтоб человек был сам свой, чтоб он походил на себя и был *прост* и верен своей натуре..." (Goncharov, 495. Italics are in the original).

[209] This feuilleton first appeared in the "Mody" section of *Sovremennik*, vol. 11 (1848), ot. 6, 54-61 and vol. 12, ot. 6, 13-26. References in the text are to Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1.

[210] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 471. "The dandy has apprehended the single, most straightforward and fruitless feature of the art of living: that, of masterful and impeccable dress. Because of his myopic understanding of life, he has mastered nothing beyond that."

rendering him a role model for the rest of high society (*korifei v dele vkusa i maner*).[211] Yet, as Chel'skii notes, the lion's defining feature is a compulsive dedication to the pursuit and display of newness (*vkus ego v bespreryvnom dvizhenii*), making him an ultimately elusive and unreliable resource for the study of the art of living; indeed, he is the apotheosis of fashion's fickleness and changeability.[212] Dismissing these types as representative of exclusionary high society values and antiquated Romantic models of the self, Chel'skii champions the cultivated man and the respectable man, whose refined manners and tastes reflect their formal education and dedication to lifelong self-cultivation, rather than wealth or hereditary status. For the cultivated man, external indicators of elegance and status become secondary to public conduct defined by propriety, integrity, and an adherence to *comme il faut* in all interactions: "он обладает тактом в деле общественных приличий, то есть не одних наружных приличий... нет, приличий внутренных, нравственных: уменья быть, держать себя в людях и с людьми, как *должно*, как *следует*."[213] The respectable man consists of "a harmonious combination of internal and external qualities" (*garmonicheskoe sochetanie naruzhnogo i vnutrennego*), which accounts for his principled conduct in all spheres of human endeavor.[214] Although this figure may subsume within himself the qualities of a lion and a cultivated man, thereby becoming a living embodiment of class convergence, his essential nature remains unaltered and is expressed in all social and cultural contexts in the form of "external beauty and luminous morality"

[211] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 473.

[212] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 473.

[213] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 474. Italics are in the original. "He is tactful in matters of public decorum, not only in [his] carriage, but also in his personal morals: in the art of being, and in conducting [himself] *properly* and *comme il faut*."

[214] "Порядочный человек есть тесное, гармоническое сочетание наружного и внутреннего, нравственного уменья жить" (Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 476).

(*prelest' vneshnego i blesk nravstvennogo umen'ia zhit'*).[215] The respectable man thus emerges as the epitome of a progressive, cosmopolitan self, and provides a desirable model of self-fashioning for provincial and middle groups to emulate.

Chel'skii's second letter abandons purely theoretical prescriptions and taxonomies of the self in favor of practical advice on the science of living (*nauka umen'ia zhit'*). Relying on negative recommendations, that is, on illustrations of undesirable conduct, Chel'skii emphasizes the divide between *tolpa* and *obshchestvo* and the contrast between provincial and urban tastes and modes of being, which he superimposes on the former categories.[216] Echoing Kroneberg's misgivings about the steadfastness of middling mores and the vulgar emphasis on appearance rather than substance, Chel'skii laments the provincial landowners' tendency to not only limit themselves to external markers of refinement, but to also do so only during special social occasions rather than in their everyday existence: "Этот великолепный барин [с брегетом и золотой табакеркой в кармане] ходит частенько дома в грязном или разорванном халате, часто без жилета, без галстуха, в каких-нибудь валеных домашней работы сапогах [...]."[217] The modishness of the Parisian Breguet watch and glitter of the gilded snuff-box clash with the landowner's grimy and disheveled attire, symbolizing the apparent incompatibility of Western civility and progress with provincial baseness and stagnation. Chel'skii further derides the provincial penchant for combining conspicuous display of wealth and rank with homemade attire

[215] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 480.

[216] Catriona Kelly suggests that negative recommendations are most reflective of reality, since "the presence of an instruction not to behave in a certain way is generally some indication that a body of people exists who do so behave." Kelly, xxiii.

[217] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 482. "This magnificent gentleman [with a Breguet on his hand and a gold snuff-box in his pocket] often goes home in a dirty or torn dressing gown, often without a waistcoat, without a tie, with felted homemade boots on his feet […]."

and objects of adornment, dismissing the practice as not only tasteless and outmoded (*ne vo vkuse vremeni*), but as fundamentally incompatible with "the successes of the manufacturing industry" (*ne sodeistvu[iut] uspekham noveishei manufakturnoi promyshlennosti*), and therefore, modernity.[218] The quilted housecoat (*fufaika*) and the dressing gown (*khalat*) emerge as representative features of the provincial uniform, signifying a devotion to retrograde domesticity and antiquated values. Chel'skii's prescription for this state consists of a combination of professional and commercial pursuits; marriage to an educated, cosmopolitan woman; and active self-cultivation through education and imitation, which will together transform the provincial gentleman into a respectable man (*poriadochnyi chelovek*).[219] This series of instructional epistles provides source material for narratives of self-fashioning in *An Ordinary Story* and *Oblomov*, and offers insight into Goncharov's early engagement with the problem of reconciling the conduct of everyday life with ideological and moral commitment.

Progressive Inertia in *An Ordinary Story* and *Oblomov*

When *Oblomov* appeared in print in its entirety in 1859, it occasioned a host of reviews and engaged in contemporary polemics about the role of literature in shaping the public sphere.[220] In the aftermath of the defeat in the Crimean War, social critics called for

[218] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 489-490.

[219] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 486-489.

[220] Goncharov conceived the novel no later than 1847. "Oblomov's Dream" (*Son Oblomova*), which constituted Chapter 9 of the first part of the novel appeared in 1849 in *Sovremennik*. Goncharov completed Part I in 1850, and composed the remainder of the novel over the course of 1857 and 1858. For a comprehensive discussion of Goncharov's publication history see Janko Lavrin's *Goncharov* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954).

comprehensive reforms as well as for politically and ideologically engaged individuals who would devise and execute those reforms. Over the course of the 1840s, physiologies and other texts united by the tenets of the Natural School played an instrumental role in educating the public about civic responsibility and action through unflinching and often unsavory portrayals of various classes and their environs, intended to inculcate in the readers models of socially conscious conduct. By the late 1850s, these ostensibly objective typologies gave way to a "literature of exposure" (*oblichitel'naia literatura*), which explicitly publicized and criticized the vices, deficiencies, moral failings, and backwardness of Russian society, often through a satirical or feuilletonistic lens and without correctives.[221] Although the model of idle, apathetic existence that Goncharov constructs in *Oblomov* spans the literary tendencies of these two decades, his novel primarily "exposes" an individual's arrested development and unwillingness to adapt to a social sphere which advocates decisive action. Nonetheless, critics contended that Goncharov, fulfilled his civic responsibility as a writer by describing a character whom his contemporaries could pragmatically interpret as representative of cultural groups and psychological types in the dynamic social context of the period; that is, they read his text as a generic hybrid of the *physiologie*, *oblichitel'stvo,* and advice literature.

In his review of *Oblomov* titled "What is Oblomovitis?" (*Chto takoe oblomovshchina?*, 1859), Nikolai Dobroliubov focused primarily on the social import of Goncharov's work. His interpretation of the novel canonized the view that Oblomov represented the idealistic liberals who dominated Russian intellectual life in the 1830s and 1840s. Dobroliubov was less interested

[221] Oleg Kharkhordin locates the roots of *oblichenie* in the Orthodox Christian practice of doing public penance, and posits it as an important mechanism in the formation of the self in Imperial and Soviet Russia. See his *The Collective and the Individual in Russia: A Study of Practices* (Berkeley: UC Press, 1999). In the context of nineteenth-century Russian literature, Dostoevsky, Turgenev, and Saltykov-Shchedrin were among the main promoters and practitioners of this genre.

in Oblomov as a fictional hero than as a figurehead for the national myth of weakness, cowardice and failure. His assessment of the novel served as a comprehensive indictment of the earlier generation of intellectual elites, whose indulgence in lofty ideals, florid discourse, and aestheticization of everyday life masked a lack of progressive action. Due to the primacy of his social agenda as a radical critic, Dobroliubov evaluated Goncharov's creative technique only in passing, noting that "жизнь [Гончаровым] изображаемая служит для него прямою целью сама по себе."[222] While his appraisal of Goncharov as an objective painter of real life echoes Goncharov's own remarks about the autobiographical and contemporary origins of his characters' narrative trajectories, it should ultimately be interpreted in the context of Dobroliubov's own ideology, rather than as a comprehensive statement about the nature of the former's aesthetic principles.[223] Rather than locating redeeming qualities in the gentry and the middling classes, and seeking productive avenues for their convergence as did Goncharov and his contemporaries in their instructional texts, Dobroliubov advocated a radical break from the old social order and its associated aesthetic and ideological features.

Scholars have suggested that Dobroliubov's assessment of *Oblomov* reiterated and polemicized with Belinsky's review of Goncharov's first work, *An Ordinary Story*. [224] Dobroliubov's assertion that Goncharov's objective method represents the highest ideal of

[222] N.A. Dobroliubov, "Chto takoe oblomovshchina?," *I.A. Goncharov v russkoi kritike: sbornik statei* (Moskva: Goslitizdat, 1958), 55. "The representation of real life [in Goncharov's works] serves for [Goncharov] as an [artistic] end in itself."

[223] As D. S. Mirsky notes: "Although all his criticism is about works of imaginative literature, it would be grossly unjust to call it literary criticism. Dobroliubov had, it is true, a certain sense of literary values, and the choice of works he consented to use as texts for his sermons was, on the whole, happy, but he never so much as attempted to discuss their literary aspects." See his *A History of Russian Literature: From Its Beginnings to 1900* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1999), 226.

[224] See Alfred Kuhn, "Dobroliubov's Critique of *Oblomov*: Polemics and Psychology," *Slavic Review* 30.1 (1971), 93-109.

artistic creation was indeed borrowed directly from Belinsky's "Literary Review for the Year 1847" (*Vzgliad na russkuiu literaturu 1847 goda*), in which he extols Goncharov's faculty of vision and his ability to record life as it happens: "Схватить данный предмет во всей его истине, заставить его, так сказать, дышать жизнию—вот в чем [писательская] сила." [225] Belinsky's assessment here recalls his comments two years earlier about the "daguerreotypic nature" of Panaev's prose, underscoring the veracity of representation employed by both writers.[226] However, whereas the allusion to the photographic accuracy of Panaev's texts suggested a certain static quality, the biological metaphor describing Goncharov's texts as breathing organisms highlights the liveliness and contemporariness of his prose. Belinsky interpreted *An Ordinary Story* as a model of the social and ideological developments that took place in early 1840s Russia and suggested that Aleksandr Aduev embodied the languor of Romantic idealism, while his uncle, Petr Aduev, represented Realism's pragmatism and progress.[227] Consequently, literature of this period became more than ever a reflection of current social issues, which not only engaged members of the various strata, but also colored discussions of issues in other spheres of human endeavor.[228] In outlining the two categories of Aduevism, Belinsky prefigured Dobroliubov's establishment of the Oblomov type as representative of contemporary social trends. In addition to the consideration of Dobroliubov's indebtedness to

[225] Belinsky, *PSS*, T. 8, 374. "The essence of a writer's power lies in the ability to grasp the complete truth of a subject and animate it."

[226] See my discussion of this comment and its implications in Chapter 1.

[227] For an extended discussion of the correspondence between the ideological content of *Obyknovennaia istoriia* and Belinsky's ideology, see Russell Scott Valentino, "Paradigm and Parable in Goncharov's *An Ordinary Story*," *Russian Review* 58 (January 1999), 71-86.

[228] "В наше время искусство и литература больше, чем когда-либо прежде, сделались выражением общественных вопросов, потому что в наше время эти вопросы стали общее, доступнее всем, яснее, сделались для всех интересом первой степени, стали во главе других вопросов" (Belinsky, *PSS*, T. 8, 363).

Belinsky, his criticism should also be discussed in the context of critical polemics of the late 1850s. From this historical perspective, Dobroliubov's emphasis on Goncharov's objectivity and his discursive identification with Belinsky's ideas represent a challenge to non-radical critics such as Druzhinin, who maintained that civic responsibility and artistic expression are incompatible.

Using Goncharov's work as a practical illustration of his ideas, Druzhinin distinguished between didactic literature, which attempts to influence the ideas and actions of men, and artistic literature, which concerns itself with eternal values of truth and beauty. In his 1859 review of *Oblomov*, he argued that the novel represented the latter type of literature, in that its eponymous hero, with his immutable and uncompromising nature, embodied the ideal of truth.[229] Because of Druzhinin's focus on the novel's aesthetics and on the nature of its chief protagonist, his analysis emphasizes Oblomov's universal human qualities and does not venture into the inquiry of how his personality traits emerge in the text or what they communicate about contemporary culture; Oblomov is neither a specifically gentry type, nor a specifically Russian type, but an individual whose ideal life occurs outside of the sphere of any determinate activity, ideology, or national character. Much like Belinsky and Dobroliubov, Druzhinin praises Goncharov's attention to the realia of everyday life, yet likens the author's method to that of the Flemish painters, rather than to the "barren and dry naturalism" (*besplodnaia i sukhaia natural'nost'*) of his Natural School counterparts.[230] Druzhinin thus assigns a positive value to the microscopic details in Goncharov's prose, as they reflect the poetry of individual quotidian concerns and universal

[229] A.V. Druzhinin, "Iz stat'i '*Oblomov*', roman I.A. Goncharova," *I.A. Goncharov v russkoi kritike: sbornik statei* (Moskva: Goslitizdat, 1958), 169-170.

[230] Druzhinin, 166.

human strivings rather than the pettiness of modern life. Like Dobroliubov's review, Druzhinin's commentary reveals more about his own ideological platform than about Oblomov's role as an archetype of the period. However, his remarks are significant in that they represented an ideological position that was diametrically opposed to Dobroliubov's emphasis on the social relevance of art and its function in reflecting and motivating progress and activity.

Dobroliubov's indebtedness to Belinsky's views establishes not only a link between the two authors, but also a genealogical link between *An Ordinary Story* and *Oblomov*. Janko Lavrin addresses this connection in passing in a study of Goncharov's life and work, suggesting a similarity between the general themes of the two works; both novels trace the development of progressive bourgeois-capitalist society in Russia through a dialectical representation of old and new approaches to self-fashioning.[231] He casually notes that while Stolz may be read as a counterpart to the energetic Petr Aduev, Oblomov is a kind of "Aleksandr Aduev manqué."[232] In Lavrin's assessment, the basic motifs of Goncharov's first bildungsroman are amplified in the second by the addition of a number of characters as well as by a minute rendering of Oblomov's background.[233] Following the nineteenth-century critical tradition as well as the twentieth-century scholarly one, I aim to explore in this section the relationship between Goncharov's first two novels, particularly as it pertains to the characterization of Oblomov. Rather than examining the dispersal of the Aduevs' traits and ideology among the various characters in *Oblomov*, my study will focus on the incarnations of Aduevism in Oblomov alone. Departing from the readings

[231] Janko Lavrin, *Goncharov* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), 27.

[232] Lavrin, 30.

[233] Lavrin's assessment here has more in common with Druzhinin's critique than with those of the radical critics, as he focuses on the texts' aesthetic qualities rather than their social polemics and import.

of the radical critics and expanding upon Druzhinin's aesthetic one, I address the ways in which Oblomov incorporates two socio-ideological types that both criticism and scholarship have deemed as radically distinct. In tracing the development of Oblomov's personality, I consider the ways in which narratives of desirable self-fashioning promoted through advice literature and contemporary polemics on the nature of the progressive personality inform both novels, and provide avenues for Goncharov's critique of mid-century social processes based on aspirations of upward mobility.

Although critics have typically characterized *An Ordinary Story* as a novel with a traditional narrative structure and *Oblomov* as a novel lacking a plot, the correspondence between the two works lies precisely in their treatment of narratives that are associated with the protagonists' biographical trajectories. Aleksandr Aduev, a naïve idealist raised in the village of Grachi moves to Saint Petersburg, where, under the tutelage of his uncle, he gradually becomes inculcated with the values of social advancement and material gain. Disenchanted with the city's falseness and disappointed in his affairs with women, Aleksandr returns to Grachi with hopes of spiritual renewal. However, he quickly bores with the pace and substance of provincial life and returns to Saint Petersburg as a go-getter and careerist, having in effect become a replica of his uncle. In moving from the country to the city Aleksandr reproduces his uncle's geographical transition as well as the social and financial transformations metaphorically expressed in that voyage. This trajectory situates Goncharov's novel on the border between epochs and social strata, as well as at the transition point between them; it represents the increasing porousness of the old estate system, the decline of pure aristocratic values, and the compromise between

bourgeois and high society models of the self.[234] As Goncharov's contemporary Al'bert Starchevskii points out, Goncharov based Aleksandr on his real-life acquaintances: "из двух [знакомых], положительных и черствых, мечтавших только о том, как бы выйти в люди, составить капиталец и сделать хорошую партию, Иван Александрович выкроил своего героя."[235] This emphasis on the pursuit of capital, rank, and a "good match" thus functions not only as the organizing narrative principle of the bildungsroman, but also as a reflection of mechanisms of social advancement promoted through the typologies of self-fashioning. Indeed, the three pursuits outlined in Starchevskii's comment recall not only the maxim *chiny i den'gi*, but also directly parallel Chel'skii-Goncharov's tripartite formula for the transformation of a provincial gentleman into a *poriadochnyi chelovek.*

In abandoning the sleepy provincial idyll of Oblomovka and moving to Saint Petersburg in search of a career in civil service, Oblomov mirrors the Aduevs' trajectory. His initial youthful idealism, ambition, and presentiment of love and family happiness recall the Romantic disposition of Aleksandr's early dreams of fame, civic responsibility, and love.[236] On the other hand, the enumeration of Oblomov's early acquisition of wealth, servants, horses and a large apartment places him on the same path to social success as the pragmatic Petr, who first appears as an established civil servant and businessman with a good apartment, servants, and horses.[237]

---

[234] I refer here to Bakhtin's theorization of the bildungsroman chronotope, consisting of an image of man in national-historical time, which therefore embodies and reflects foundational historical shifts, rather than purely individual ones: "[man] is no longer within an epoch, but between two epochs, at the transition point from one to the other" (Mikhail Bakhtin, "The *Bildungsroman* and Its Significance in the History of Realism," *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, trans. Vern W. McGee [Austin: UT Press, 1986], 24).

[235] A.V. Starchevskii, "Odin iz zabytykh zhurnalistov," *I.A. Goncharov v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1969), 54.

[236] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 55. Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 179-80.

[237] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 54-5. Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 193.

Thus, Oblomov's simultaneous identification with both Aduevs provides him with the possibility of ultimately aligning himself with either the idealist or the pragmatic narrative paradigm; that is, he can pursue the model of an idealized, metaphysically-oriented self, deemed outmoded by cultural and social critics alike, as illustrated in the preceding discussion; or he can pursue the model of a progressive, albeit consumption-driven personality promoted with some reservation. In the course of the novel Oblomov vacillates between these two views and at different points may appear to favor one over the other. Ultimately, however, it is his vacillation itself, not his particular choices at different points in the novel that should be seen as indicative of his position with regard to the narratives available to him based on the models of the two Aduevs. Oblomov's frequent trips to the countryside outside of Saint Petersburg and his imaginary excursion to Oblomovka appear to emulate Aleksandr's trajectory, since they recall his return to the provincial idyll of Grachi. However, whereas Aleksandr's homecoming stimulates him to return to a productive life in the city, Oblomov's reverie induces him to create a microcosm of languorous country life in his city household. Moreover, he never attains Petr's professional status, since he eagerly resigns after making a clerical mistake and withdraws to his apartment never to work again. Thus, Oblomov denies the validity of a progressive pragmatic narrative and turns to what resembles a Romantic pastoral model, which he however never fully lives out. Furthermore, his disavowal of urban mores and a cosmopolitan lifestyle reiterates and enacts Chulkov-Kroneberg's concerns about the recalcitrance of the provincial mentality and its subversion of the civilizing tendencies of the modern social sphere.

Oblomov's attitudes to city life and social mores reflect his provincial worldview, thereby echoing Aleksandr's early impressions of the metropolis. Upon arriving to Saint Petersburg, Aleksandr expresses bewilderment at the city scene unfolding before him:

> [На улице] суматоха, все бегут куда-то, занятые только собой, едва взглядывая на проходящих, и то разве для того, чтоб не наткнуться друг на друга. […] Он посмотрел на домы – […] на него наводили тоску эти однообразные каменные громады, которые, как колоссальные гробницы, сплошною массою тянутся одна за другою. […] заперты со всех сторон, –кажется, и мысли и чувства людские также заперты.
>
> He went out into the street – it was crazy. Everyone was running somewhere, preoccupied only with himself, hardly glancing at passersby, and if so, perhaps only so as not to bump into someone. […] He looked at the houses – […] Sadness overwhelmed him when he saw these monotonous stone blockbusters, which dragged on like colossal mausoleums, one after the other, in a solid mass, […] closed in on all sides – and human thoughts and feelings are likewise closed in, it seems.[238]

His experience of the bustling, anonymous crowd and daunting, eerie architecture establishes the theme of alienation in the city, which Oblomov reproduces with only minor variation. His disillusionment with city life begins during his first day at work, where he observes the same type of activity previously noted by Aleksandr in the street: "беготня, суета, все смущались, все сбивали друг друга с ног."[239] When confronted with Stolz's claim "что-нибудь да должно же занимать свет и общество," [240] Oblomov responds that it is precisely such an attitude that has turned life into a "вечная беготня," arguing that contemporary man lives only for his work and the attainment of ranks, and is therefore always rushing to compete with others. Thus, Oblomov transports the bustling anonymous crowd from the street into the confines of the bureaucratic machine, which paradoxically functions to eliminate human interaction in what is

[238] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 203-4. Translation from *An Ordinary Story*, trans. Marjorie Hoover (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1994), 24-5.

[239] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 56. "They rushed about, they looked harassed, they ran into one another…" (Magarshack, 64).

[240] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 173. "But society has to be occupied with something or other…" (Magarshack, 172).

an essentially social setting, the workplace. Unable to reconcile the contradictions in professional life driven by constant yet seemingly aimless activity, Oblomov withdraws from it.

The social sphere, not unlike the professional, represents for Oblomov the alienation of the individual. When confronted by Volkov's enumeration of his myriad social activities and obligations, Oblomov meditates on the condition of contemporary man: "в десять мест в один день—и это жизнь! Где же тут человек? На что он раздробляетя и рассыпается?"[241] This assessment of the pace of society life and of modern man's consequent dispersal replicates Aleksandr's evaluation of the movement he witnesses on the street. In shifting his view from the public sphere, Aleksandr finds the same type of entrapment of the individual within the private space of the apartment, which offers no respite from social mores. Imagining how he might be received in one of the houses he passes by on the street, Aleksandr conjures up the image of cold, unfriendly faces that greet him with ceremony, dismiss his provincial appearance with disdain and amusement, and then quickly return to the clinking of their glasses and spoons.[242] Oblomov reproduces Aleksandr's vision in a conversation with Stolz, noting that people get together "as a work obligation" (*kak v dolzhnost'*), only to boast about social status and possessions, engage in fashionable pursuits such as promenading along Nevsky or dancing at a ball, make fun of one another, then casually return to their meals and card games.[243] Thus, Oblomov condemns the conventions of social refinement and codified public conduct for their automatization of everyday life and the dehumanization of the individual. However, whereas Aleksandr comes to

[241] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 20. "Make ten calls in one day – poor wretch! What's there left of the man? What is he wasting and frittering himself away for?" (Magarshack, 28).

[242] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 206.

[243] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 173.

accept those factors as an invariable feature of the progressive model of self-fashioning he eventually pursues, Oblomov adapts them to his lethargic milieu. His desultory conformism to unavoidable social proprieties is motivated by the thought that if he submits, he will be free of them.[244] This reluctant submission and insistence on the integrity of Oblomov's essential nature seemingly dovetails with Chel'skii-Goncharov's condemnation of social discipline exercised by refined society and the *blagomysliashchii chelovek* as its chief representative. However, Oblomov's consolidation of public and private conduct ultimately fails to reflect the sort of cultivation and social engagement that Goncharov advertises in his journalistic texts on self-fashioning.

While resisting the inhumanity of pragmatism and progress Aleksandr remains true to his Romantic ideals of friendship and love, as manifested in his interactions with women. His first love, Sof'ia, described as a "plump and rosy-cheeked girl" (*polnaia i rumianaia devushka*) represents the epitome of provincial love and the fecundity of the countryside. Her very appearance communicates an unrefined approach to matters of love and a commitment to traditional values of marriage and family: "[она будет] любить просто, без затей, ходить за мужем, как нянька, слушаться его во всем и никогда не казаться умнее его."[245] In moving from the country to the city, Aleksandr abandons the simplicity of pastoral love in favor of a loftier Romantic love in the city. His ideal is fulfilled in his affair with Iuliia Pavlovna, with whom he shares "sincere heartfelt outpourings" (*iskrennye, serdechnye izlianiia*).[246] However,

[244] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 7.

[245] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 187. "[She] shall love simply, without pretensions, take care of [her] husband as a nanny would, obey him in everything and never appear more clever than he" (Hoover, 13).

[246] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 367.

just as Aleksandr and Iuliia are allowed to reach the heretofore unattainable actualization of Romantic happiness, their idyll becomes mechanized and prosaic: "они продолжали *систематически* упиваться блаженством. Начались повторения. Желать и испытывать было нечего. […] ничто не мешало им привести в исполнение задуманный план."[247] Such, however are not the conditions in which Romantic love flourishes, since it requires insurmountable obstacles for its continuation. Aleksandr and Iuliia soon become mired in petty jealousies, curtail their "sincere outpourings" to one another, and assume the generic roles of a married couple, complete with discussions of the future order in their house, the arrangement of the rooms, and the acquisition of fashionable furnishings. Indeed, their transition from sentimentality to consumer pursuits is predetermined by Petr Aduev, who approaches affairs of the heart as business transactions; Petr attempts to convince Aleksandr to seduce Iuliia purely as a means of humiliating one of her other suitors, whose self-fashioning as a *lev* has led him to a financially dissolute lifestyle and left him unable to pay his debt to the uncle.[248] Disillusioned by what he deems a "sleepy, lethargic" love (*sonnaia, bez energii*) beset by material quotidian concerns, Aleksandr abandons Iuliia, and with her, his ideal of Romantic love. His futile attempt at seducing the impressionable young Liza is motivated by the purest animal physicality devoid of passion and love, and represents Aleksandr's final romantic encounter. His transition from Romanticism to Realism reaches its full extent in his marriage of convenience to a wealthy

[247] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 372. "They continued to revel in bliss methodically. Repetition set in. There was nothing to wish for and experience. […] nothing hindered them from carrying out their plans." (Hoover, 139). Italics are my own.

[248] Petr's early advice to his nephew on how to marry emphasizes the transactional dimension of the endeavor: "[надо жениться] по расчету..." (Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 244). In addition, Petr's wife Lizaveta Aleksandrovna frequently laments her husband's compulsive dedication to commercial and rational pursuits, even in matters of love: "весь кодекс сердечных дел был у него в голове, но не в сердце" and "о высоких целях он разговаривать не любил, а говорил сухо и просто, что *надо дело делать*" (Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 313. Italics are in the original.).

young girl from a good family, enacting his uncle's rational approach to love, as well as Chel'skii-Goncharov's formula of a good match's civilizing influence. His pragmatic, yet spiritually bankrupt pursuit of marriage also replicates the narrative trajectory of society tale heroes, whose social ascent follows from their individual subjugation to the tastes and mores of high society.

Although Oblomov's experiences with women are not as extensive as Aleksandr's, the two characters' views on love bear a significant resemblance. In the opening chapters of the novel, Oblomov envisions a plan for the development of his estate so vividly, that he is transported to an idyllic pastoral setting where he discovers his ideal woman: "за самоваром сидит… царица всего окружающего, его божество."[249] This utopian image of the domestic goddess is reminiscent of Aleksandr's Sof'ia. However, instead of abandoning that ideal like Aleksandr, Oblomov seeks it out in the women he encounters. His love affair with Olga represents the struggle between the pastoral ideal and Romantic love in the city. Since Olga, as a society lady, cannot be transported to Oblomov's provincial simplicity, he imposes on her the same Romantic ideals as those that Aleksandr seeks in his relationship with Iuliia. Following the pledge of mutual love and the establishment of the understanding that they will get married, Olga and Oblomov's relationship takes a decidedly prosaic turn:

> [Обломов] чувствовал, что светлый, безоблачный праздник любви отошел, что любовь в самом деле становилась долгом, что она мешалась со всею жизнью, входила в состав ее обычных отправлений. […] Поэма минует, и начинается строгая история.
>
> [Oblomov] felt that the bright and cloudless festival of love had gone, that love was truly becoming a duty, that it was becoming intermingled with his whole life, forming an integral part of its ordinary functions. […] The poetic period was over and stern reality

[249] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 76. "At the samovar sat the queen of it all – his divinity – a woman – his wife!" (Magarshack, 81).

was beginning.[250]

This passage evokes *An Ordinary Story* in two ways. First, it describes Oblomov's biography in terms that apply to Aleksandr: in both cases, a life full of Romantic promise concludes in a prosaic fashion, with a "somber story." The difference between Oblomov and Aleksandr is that the former never fully embraces the Romantic ideas he at times articulates. The second way in which this passage evokes *An Ordinary Story* is purely verbal and particularly forceful. The words "strogaia istoriia," at the end of this biographical paragraph signal the text's insistence that it be read after another, "ordinary story" and with it in mind.

Whereas the fulfillment of Romantic happiness propels Aleksandr into a pragmatic marriage, Oblomov's trajectory takes a decidedly pastoral turn. The failure of his affair with Olga leads him directly into the arms of Agaf'ia Matveevna, his plump and fecund landlady. Agaf'ia's appearance, with her ample bosom, wide hips, and energetic household manner recalls not only Aleksandr's Sof'ia, but also brings into reality Oblomov's vision of a domestic goddess. While Aleksandr abandons his pastoral and Romantic ideals in favor of a progressive narrative, Oblomov retains his provincial ideal of love, and uses it to facilitate the construction of a stagnant living environment. Like Aleksandr, Oblomov vacillates between women, seeking out his perfect complement. His relationship with Olga bears similarity to Aleksandr's relationship with Iuliia, but that is the limit of the association of the two men's attitudes towards love. Although Oblomov acknowledges the validity of the model Aleksandr embodies, he ultimately rejects it as futile. Oblomov's romantic trajectory mirrors the negative prescription in Chel'skii's second letter, which contrasts the modern husband (*sovremennyi muzh*) and the antiquated

[250] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 293. Translation from David Magarshack, *Oblomov* (London: Penguin, 2005), 287.

husband (*muzh drevnii*), characterizing the latter as "разряд тех мужей, которые на другой день свадьбы являются уже к жене в колпаке, плисовых сапогах, в азиатском халате, с словом *мамочка*, так что как будто сами говорят: 'Посмотри, какой я урод […]'."[251] Unlike the modern husband, whom Chel'skii champions as respectable and cultivated (*poriadochnyi, khoroshego tona muzh*) and therefore a symbol of social progress, the husband of old communicates a state of arrested development through appearance and discursive crudeness; he envelops himself in démodé and unfashionable peasant attire, and treats his wife as a mother-figure, rather than as a woman of refinement and society. The recurrent motif of the oriental dressing-gown (*aziatskii khalat*) symbolizes the backwardness of provincial tastes and a resistance to civilizing Western trends; its billowing shape connotes not only the informality and vulgarity of the domestic sphere, but also a crude selfhood marked by dormant passivity.[252] Oblomov's own oriental dressing-gown (*nastoiashchii vostochnyi khalat*) emblematizes not only his romantic, but also his physical and spiritual stagnation, which manifests itself through his inability to abandon the garment: "идти вперед – это значит вдруг сбросить широкий халат не только с плеч, но с души, с ума."[253] In persistently retreating to the womb-like confines of

[251] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 487. Italics are in the original. "[The antiquated husband] belongs to that category of men, who, the day after their wedding appear before their wives in a nightcap, felted boots, oriental dressing-gown, with the word *mommy* on their lips, as if to say: 'I am a freak of nature…'."

[252] In both Chel'skii's epistolary exchange and *Oblomov*, Goncharov qualifies the dressing-gown as "oriental." This is an important move, as it distinguishes the provincial form of the garment from its fashion-forward urban counterpart, which was often fitted, waisted, and adorned with satin or velvet, taking on the form of a housecoat rather than a formless gown. Sollogub's story "The Apothecary" (*Aptekarsha*, 1841) references the dressing-gown as a fashionable status item: "Халат его, сшитый в виде длинного сюртука с бархатными отворотами, свидетельствовал о щеголеватости его привычек..." (V.A. Sollogub, *Povesti i rasskazy* [Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1962], 83). Compare this to Oblomov's garment: "На нем был халат из персидской материи, настоящий восточный халат, без малейшего намека на Европу, без кистей, без бархата, без талии, весьма поместительный, так что и Обломов мог дважды завернуться в него" (Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 8).

[253] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 186. "What was he to do now? Go forward or stay where he was? […] To go forward meant to throw the capacious dressing-gown not only off his hsoulders but also from his heart and mind" (Magarshack, 186).

the dressing gown and surrendering to Agaf'ia's motherly domesticity, Oblomov firmly rejects models of self-fashioning based on urban and Western progressive trends.

Aleksandr's creative impulses are initially reserved for his poetry, in which he strives to glorify the lofty ideals of beauty, truth, friendship, and love. When his uncle expresses disdain at his poetic inclinations, Aleksandr retorts that "служба – занятие сухое, в котором не участвует душа, а душа жаждет выразиться,"[254] alluding to the creative poverty of civil service. Nonetheless, he accepts the official post which his uncle procured, and ironically gets involved in the uninspired business of translating agricultural documents. However, Aleksandr does not abandon his literary aspirations and submits his writings to a journal, which promptly rejects them as "weak, false, immature, flabby, not developed" ("слабые, неверные, незрелые, вялые, неразвитые").[255] Disabused of the notion that a poet can succeed on talent alone, Aleksandr resolves to perform his creative work thoroughly and properly. He abandons writing and turns all his poetic impulses towards the fabrication of a Romantic persona which he employs in his affairs with women. After he fails as both a Byronic and a Goetheian version of the Romantic hero and consequently becomes disillusioned with the eternal values of friendship and love, Aleksandr turns away both from his writing and from his attempts to realize Romantic models in his own life. Reconsidering his life trajectory, Aleksandr muses: "[I'd] been mistaken about being an author. What am I to do, what should I begin?" ("в авторстве ошибся. Что же делать, что начать?").[256] His inquiry into the control over his state and the existential question

[254] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 222. "The civil service is a dry occupation in which the soul has no part, but the sould thirsts to express itself" (Hoover, 37). Ironically, Aleksandr's response echoes Turgenev's comments about Goncharov's own status as an "apathetic civil servant" devoid of creative abilities.

[255] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 268.

[256] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 391.

that follows aptly describe Oblomov's state of being. However, while Oblomov resigns himself to a dreamlike existence, Aleksandr breaks away from it and replicates his uncle's pragmatic trajectory defined by commercial and consumer pursuits.

Although Oblomov's view of creativity does not encompass as many lofty goals as Aleksandr's, he too is preoccupied with the split between creative activity and work. Confronted with Penkin's didactic conception of literature, which he believes must accurately represent social types and everyday mores, Oblomov heatedly asserts that in such texts

> жизни-то и нет ни в чем: нет понимания ее и сочувствия, нет того, что там у вас называется гуманитетом. […] Где-же человечность-то? Вы одной головой хотите писать! Вы думаете что для мысли не надо сердца? Нет, она оплодотворяется любовью.
>
> There is no life [in these texts] – no true understanding of it, no true sympathy, nothing of what one can call real humanity. […] Where's your feeling of humanity? You want to write with your head only! Do you think that to express ideas one doesn't need a heart? One does need it – they are rendered fruitful by love.[257]

His defense of humanism and emotionally motivated thought in the face of realist objectivism evokes Aleksandr's comments about the split between artistic activity and practical work. In addition, his disavowal of programmatic texts promoting codified public conduct and civic responsibility (such as advice literature and physiologies) signifies a rejection of social prescriptions and dominant ideologies, and suggests a retreat into the essential self as the source of creative endeavor. While Oblomov does not engage in literary composition, he bears resemblance to Aleksandr in his predilection for organizing his life based on aesthetic models. Faced with Stolz's request to describe his ideal life, Oblomov effortlessly paints the portrait of

[257] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 27. Magarshack, 35.

simple, undemanding and sincere existence in a provincial idyll, prompting Stolz to proclaim him a veritable poet ("Да ты поэт, Илья!"), and place him into the specific category of a Romantic poet of nature.[258] Oblomov's creative achievement lies in his independence from particular models of self-fashioning which may impose constraints on his worldview. Explaining the effortlessness of his vision, he remarks: "[I am] a poet in life, because life is poetry" ("[я] поэт в жизни, потому что жизнь есть поезия").[259] Thus, Oblomov asserts the role of poetry in everyday country life characterized by languid simplicity. Despite Stolz's suggestion that Oblomov is a Romantic, Oblomov's vision is in fact anti-romantic, as the utter emotional stasis he has in mind has little to do with the Romantic ideal of emotional engagement with the quiet vibrancy of life in nature. His inability to apply narratives of progress, such as those dictated by pragmatic realist texts irrevocably differentiates Oblomov from Aleksandr.

Earlier in this section, I suggested that Oblomov's early professional experiences mirror those of Petr Aduev. Petr's emphasis on business and financial gain is not entirely alien to Oblomov and finds its expression in his plans for the organization and management of his estate:

> Он понимал, что приобретение не только не грех, но что долг всякого гражданина частными трудами поддерживать общее благосостояние. От этого большую часть узора жизни, который он чертил в своем уединении, занимал новый, свежий, сообразный с потребностями времени план устройства имения и управления крестьян.
>
> He understood that acquisition was not a sin, but that it was the duty of every citizen to help raise the general welfare by honest labor. That's why the greatest part of the pattern of line which he drew in his seclusion was devoted to a fresh plan for reorganization of the estate and dealing with the peasants in accordance with the needs of the times.[260]

[258] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 177. Magarshack, 178.

[259] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 178.

[260] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 4, 65. Magarshack, 71.

His idea of converting individual gain into general welfare updates Petr's philosophy of financial and individual ascent to the social sphere of the 1850s, marked by a preoccupation with the individual's role in the realization of civic responsibility. However, Oblomov abandons this philosophy, which he sees as fundamentally alienating to the individual and turns to humanism. Oblomov's resistance to all forms of social discipline and rational organization leaves him constantly questioning the ideological agendas which are presented to him in turn by his visitors. Thus, he treats Volkov's dandyism, Sud'binskii's careerism and Penkin's journalistic didacticism with the same degree of dismissive skepticism. This technique of the disavowal of other characters' ideologies finds its direct predecessors in Petr's ironic negation of his nephew's various Romantic ideologies as well as Aleksandr's own rejection of his early aspirations.

The pattern of recognizing the futility of one's effort is shared by Oblomov not only with Aleksandr but also with Petr himself. The Epilogue of *An Ordinary Story* finds Petr aged and weakened, questioning the outcomes of his pursuit of commerce, wealth, and order. As a common leitmotif of the critique of bourgeois materialism, his physical degeneration represents the foibles of the excessive pursuit of wealth and status, and is accompanied by a moral and spiritual quandary.[261] He paces his apartment in search of answers to no avail, seemingly trapped in a state of perpetual self-doubt ("он был как будто в недоумении").[262] As a way of treating his poor physical and psychological condition, a doctor advises him to go abroad. As a shadow

[261] Earlier in the novel, Goncharov invokes Balzac's *The Magic Skin* (*La Peau de chagrin*, 1831) in connection with the Aduevs' trajectories, connecting their eventual physical and spiritual decay with that of Balzac's hero Raphaël de Valentin. Valentin's ascent into high society through the pursuit of wealth and influence is mediated by a magical talisman, which shrinks with the fulfillment of each desire. At the end of the novel, the talisman is nearly gone, mirroring Valentin's own demise.

[262] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 453.

of his former resolute self, Petr indecisively consults his wife, whose condition has also deteriorated, and is unable decide where the two of them should travel to recuperate. Confronted by Lizaveta Aleksandrovna's perplexity at his temporary irresoluteness and the abandonment of his career, Petr angrily retorts that he does not want to live by reason alone ("не хочу жить одной головой").[263] When Aleksandr appears and resumes the line of questioning established by Lizaveta Aleksandrovna, Petr assesses his life's trajectory as "my business is done; fate will not let us go on… Done is done!" ("моя карьера кончена! Дело сделано: судьба не велит идти дальше").[264] His comments about the futility of living a rational existence mirror Oblomov's aforecited statement to Penkin on the detrimental nature of narratives conceived solely "from the head". Thus, Oblomov's failure to pursue a calculated and progressive model of the self stems from his Aduevian prescience that such a path is as fruitless as any he may endeavor to create. With this in mind, Oblomov's comment to Penkin reflects his internalization of the experience of the generation of 1840s Russian intellectuals who were disillusioned by their own exclusive reliance on rationality and pragmatism.

Although only *An Ordinary Story* has traditionally been read as a novel about the conflict between Romantic and Realist worldviews, *Oblomov* to an extent also addresses that conflict through Oblomov's internalization of Aduevian narratives. Aleksandr's transition from youthful idealism to the pragmatism of his later years represents his abandonment of the Romantic narrative and the duplication of his uncle's life trajectory. Petr's reconsideration of his lifelong insistence on rationality results in his realization of the incompleteness of his life's narrative.

[263] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 462.

[264] Goncharov, *PSS*, T. 1, 468. Hoover, 205.

This realization propels Petr into irresoluteness and inaction, which are the key features of Oblomov's behavior. In replicating his uncle's life, we can expect that he too will eventually sink into the languor of Oblomovism. By appropriating the narrative models of both the nephew and the uncle, Oblomov is aware of the futility of those models from the very beginning. Unlike the Aduevs, who continuously, and ultimately, fruitlessly struggle for a progressive narrative, Oblomov uses his sense of inertia to pursue a narrative of lethargy and inaction.

Publication of the narratives of self-fashioning discussed in this chapter coincided not only with fluctuations in the social sphere, but also with recurrent periods of financial crises and reforms. Over the course of the 1840s and 1850s, the silver ruble was established as the monetary standard, resulting in the devaluation and eventual collapse of the main unit of currency, the paper *assignatsiia*. The mid-nineteenth century was thus characterized by an uncertainty as to which signs had value, and what value to ascribe to them. Advice literature and novels of formation took on the task of formulating for their audiences the desirable mechanisms of social mobility and self-fashioning in this ambivalent context, yet ultimately reflected the existential and ideological anxieties of the writers that produced them. The uncertainty over the value of money, and consequently the value of the commercial and consumer activities it financed cast a shadow over narratives of self-formation based on the pursuit of *chiny i den'gi* in the urban spaces dominated by high society and the middle groups. Goncharov's fashion feuilleton and novels of formation reflect this tendency, and reveal that integration into the machinery of bourgeois capitalist society entails both a formation and a destruction of the self. Fashion in his prose becomes symptomatic of a system that discredits old personality types and advertises new ones. The heroes in Goncharov's bildungsromans thus embody the paradigmatic trajectory of urban success, in that they are fashionable commodities tossed aside once they are

deemed to be out of style. As Goncharov illustrates in both *An Ordinary Story* and *Oblomov*, this constant cycling between the "fashionable-unfashionable" poles in personality and ideology ultimately results in spiritual, moral, and creative bankruptcy, rather than progress; precisely those features deemed most desirable in the fulfillment of the modern self set the stage for its ruin.

Chapter Three

What Is to Be Done?: Ideology and Consumption in the Age of Great Reforms

Все, традиционно существовашее и принимавшееся ранее без критики, пошло в переборку. Все, – начиная с теоретических вершин, с религиозных воззрений, основ государственного и общественного строя, вплоть до житейских обычаев, до костюма и прически волос.

Everything that had existed traditionally and had formerly been accepted without criticism had to be reconsidered; everything, from lofty theories, to religious views, to fundamentals of state and society, all the way to everyday customs, clothing, and hairstyles.

Nikolai Annenskii[265]

Современники искали в [романе Чернышевского] не художественных красот, а указаний на то, как должен действовать и мыслить "новый человек."

Contemporaries looked to [Chernyshevsky's novel] not for artistic beauty, but for instruction in how the "new man" should behave and think.

Elizaveta Vodovozova[266]

In the aftermath of the Crimean War, Russian society found itself facing precarious circumstances; the nation's finances had been ruined, autocratic and bureaucratic structures held a progressively tenuous grasp on their subjects, popular discontent mounted, and intellectual and cultural institutions readily embraced reformist and radical voices from a range of social backgrounds. What historians call the "sixties" began in 1855 with Russia's military defeat and

[265] Cited in T.A. Bogdanovich, *Liubov' liudei shestidesiatykh godov* (Leningrad: Academia, 1929), 6.

[266] E.N. Vodovozova, *Na zare zhizni: memuarnye ocherki i portrety*, T. 2 (Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1964), 189.

the death of Nicholas I, ushering in a sense of relief and the anticipation that with Alexander II's accession, the autocracy would undertake major political and social reforms, as well as curtail the repressive practices introduced after the 1848 revolutions. Despite the inconsistencies in and fragmentation of the regime's new policies pertaining to the social, judicial, educational, financial, administrative, and military systems, the concessions made therein went far enough to mark the 1860s as a turning point in Russian cultural history, a time when new principles of private and public conduct emerged from fashionable political and social ideologies, and became widely disseminated in literature and the press.[267] This era of rapid development of cultural institutions witnessed a proliferation of schools and universities, as well as the rise of journalism, which sought to consolidate public opinion and educate an expanding readership.[268] The general sentiment of the sixties was that of a period of liberation, enlightenment, and spiritual renewal; the social reforms (the emancipation of the serfs in particular) undertaken during this time were understood as symbolic events that paved the way for what, in the idiom of the day, was termed a "transfiguration of all life" (*preobrazhenie vsei zhizni*).[269] Articulating the all-encompassing vision for this transformation, Nikolai Annenskii, a contemporary of these events and member of the populist movement, commented that state and society, ethical and aesthetic conceptions, and

[267] For an extended discussion of the implementation and socio-economic outcomes of the Great Reforms see Terence Emmons, *The Russian Landed Gentry and the Peasant Emancipation of 1861* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967); W. Bruce Lincoln, *Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy, and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb: Norther Illinois UP, 1990); Ben Eklof, *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994).

[268] Quantitative and qualitative assessments of literacy among the various social strata during this period are provided by Jeffrey Brooks in *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861-1917* (Chicago: Northwestern UP, 2003) and "Readers and Reading at the End of the Tsarist Era," in *Literature and Society in Imperial Russia, 1800-1914*, ed. William Mills Todd (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1978).

[269] Bogdanovich, 6.

everyday practices all merited equal attention and reassessment in the reform era.[270] Ultimately, this would result in the transfiguration of the human being and the rise of the "new people" (*novye liudi*), who would not only be politically engaged, socially conscious, and morally upright in their everyday private and public conduct, but would also serve as enlighteners and models for the rest of society, down to their physical appearance, costume, and consumption habits.

Although representatives of nearly all social and political trends appeared united in a general desire for reform and for the liberalization of public life, the period of the Great Reforms marked the transition between two cultural generations, known in Russian intellectual history as the "men of the forties" and the "men of the sixties," or between the romantics, immersed in the philosophical tradition of Idealism, and the realists, dedicated to Positivism and Materialism.[271] The radical ideology and behavior of *novye liudi*, as embodied in practice by the non-noble intelligentsia (*raznochintsy*), exercised considerable influence on the intellectual sphere, which consequently became preoccupied with the contrast between the past and the future, between what was and what should be. This group of university-educated, professional intellectuals of various social origins shared a sense of alienation from their class roots and a spirit of opposition to the existing order, fluctuating between the social modalities of formal structure and informal,

[270] Annenskii's comments represent the typical view of the period held by the liberal and radical intelligentsia alike. Nikolai Shelgunov, a revolutionary democrat and frequent contributor to *The Contemporary* (*Sovremennik*, founded in 1836) and *Russian Word* (*Russkoe slovo*, founded in 1859) recalled this pervasive sentiment decades later: "Не было в шестидесятые годы ни одной области ведения, куда бы не заглянула критическая мысль и не было ни одного общественного явления, которого бы она не коснулась. Земля и небо, рай и адъ, выражаясь фигурально, – вопросы личного счастья, вопросы счастья общественного, изба мужика, дом вельможи, – все было осмотрено и исследовано критическою мыслью" [Nikolai Shelgunov, "Vnutrenee obozrenie," *Dielo, zhurnal literaturno-politicheskii*, vol. 3 (1881), 161].

[271] An extensive discussion on the general characteristics and historical development of this ideological split is beyond the scope of this chapter. Paradigmatic socio-cultural histories are provided in Martin Malia, *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812-1855* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1961); Eugene Lampert, *Sons Against Fathers* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1965); Isaiah Berlin, *Russian Thinkers* (New York: Penguin, 1979); Abbot Gleason, *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s* (New York: Viking Press, 1980).

self-defined community, while pursuing novel aesthetic, philosophical, and practical avenues of thought and action.[272] The *raznochintsy* both lived and represented modernity, embracing the blurred class categories and social differences in their ideological and public self-fashioning, while struggling with the limitations this blurring posed to the construction and performance of coherent everyday practices befitting progressive personalities and civic role models. Seeking to identify and implement stable conditions for Russia's future development, while staving off the moral and spiritual shortcomings of the modern age, the "men of the sixties" denied everything not based on pure and positive reason, on sensory data and practical considerations. In their view the notion of reality (*deistvitel'nost'*) engaged a conception of the world as "the orderly world of nineteenth-century science, a world of cause and effect, a world without miracle, without transcendence even if the individual may have preserved traditional religious faith," and a conception of man as a corporeal being living and acting in the public sphere.[273] A true realist rejected "ideality" (*ideal'nost'*) in approaching human relations and everyday life, instead favoring rationalism, practicality, political action, and an unshakable belief in science and education as guarantees of economic, moral, and social progress.[274] Recalling the fundamentally

[272] Historians have noted that *raznochintsy* employed negative definitions of the self in order to delineate a new discursive identity that set them apart from both the uncultivated groups in society, as well as the state and monarchy. Elise Kimerling Wirtschafter points out that the net effect of this self-definition is one of a dual social identity: "In becoming 'outsiders,' they effectively altered formal structures and thus functioned as 'insiders' who lived within the evolving social order" [*Social Identity in Imperial Russia* (Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997), 168]. See also Michael R. Katz and William G. Wagner, "Chernyshevsky, *What Is to Be Done?* and the Russian Intelligentsia" in Nikolai Chernyshevsky, *What Is to Be Done?*, trans. Michael R. Katz (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989), 2-7; and, more broadly on this process, V. O. Kliuchevskii, *Istoriia soslovii v Rossii* (Petrograd: Literaturno-izdatel′skii otdel Komissariata narodnogo prosveshcheniia, 1918).

[273] Rene Wellek, "The Concept of Realism in Literary Scholarship," *Concepts of Criticism* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1963), 241.

[274] Irina Paperno, *Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior* (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1988), 7-8.

objective and pragmatic thrust of intellectual activity during the 1860s, Nikolai Shelgunov remarked: "задача критической мысли шестидесятых годов заключалась в том, чтобы определить, при каких условиях развитие [общественных, производительных и умственных] сил может идти наиболее успешно и при каких условиях может развиваться наивысшее личное и общее благо."[275] In advertising the programmatic principles of a future society based on materialist epistemology, utilitarian ethics, socialism, and radicalism to a growing readership and educated audience, critics and writers of the period turned to the aesthetics of realism, offering to society fictional models for emulation in everyday life.

While the groundwork of literary realism had been established in the 1840s in the philosophical and creative circles gathered around, among others, Mikhail Bakunin, Vissarion Belinsky, and Aleksandr Herzen, the nature of its relationship to empirical reality and the conduct of everyday life became the central issue of journalistic and literary polemics over the course of the 1850s and 1860s.[276] Disavowing the complete aestheticization of life and the inherent primacy of art, radical critics proclaimed that the intention of realism was the direct and precise representation of social reality, as close to the empirical object as possible.[277] In addition, realism espoused a demonstrably didactic effect, and its practitioners wanted it to have a direct impact on reality: literary characters and plots were claimed to have been derived from "life

[275] Shelgunov, 162. "The fundamental task of critical thought in the sixties was to delineate the conditions in which the development of [social, industrial, and intellectual] forces could fruitfully proceed, and the conditions in which the highest individual and general welfare could develop."

[276] The journalistic origins of Realism as a literary movement mid-century are addressed in greater detail in Chapters 1 and 2 of this dissertation.

[277] Paperno has noted that the continuity and succession of intellectual circles between the generations of the 1840s and 1860s results in an incomplete rejection of romanticism and idealism in art, philosophy, and everyday life of the *raznochintsy*: "It is not surprising, therefore, that romantic consciousness was a tangible (though at time vehemently denied) presence, a substratum of the consciousness of the realist" (Paperno, 7).

itself" and thereafter, "returned to reality" and offered to society as examples of ideological correctness and progressive virtues.[278] Literature of this period readily absorbed and incorporated elements of contemporary scientific and social thought, rendering it a credible analytical, objective, and prescriptive source of current and future trends, as well as a major force in the development of society. Writers and literary critics emerged as mediators between the literary texts and their actualization in reality as all-encompassing guides to life. The concept of type obviated any contradiction between the programmatic principle of unmediated mimesis and the awareness that literature is an artistic construct, creating a literary model that "possesses remarkable power to organize the actual life of a reader, who, through familiar configurations of a [sociological category] that lies behind the text, recognizes himself in the world of a literary text."[279] Moreover, literary typologies of thought and behavior aimed at defining future cultural practices and social conventions, and outlined the mechanisms by which new modes of self-fashioning could be acquired, assimilated, and propagated in the modern age.[280]

Nikolai Chernyshevsky's *What Is to Be Done?* (*Chto delat'?*, 1863) emerged on the literary scene as a sweeping program of thought and behavior that sought to reorganize not only the readers' ideological, moral, and social conduct, but also their everyday private existence. As Elizaveta Vodovozova, a feminist activist and critic subsequently noted in her memoirs,

---

[278] Paperno, 9.

[279] Paperno, 9.

[280] Among others, M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin commented on the crucial role typologies played in the 1860s: "Литература провидит законы будущего, воспроизводит образ будущего человека. […] Типы, созданные литературой, всегда идут далее тех, которые имеют ход на рынке […]. Под влиянием этих новых типов современный человек, незаметно для самого себя, получает новые привычки, ассимилирует себе новые взгляды, приобретает новую складку, одним словом — постепенно вырабатывает из себя нового человека" (*Sobranie sochinenii v dvadtsati tomakh*, T. 7 [Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1965], 463). See also N.V. Shelgunov, "Russkie idealy, geroi i tipy," *Shestidesiatye gody*, N.K. Piksanov, ed. (Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1940), 175-176.

contemporaries did not seek aesthetic merits in the novel, but a guidebook to the tastes, style, and manners befitting the disciples of the new ideology.[281] Chernyshevsky deliberately designed the *novye liudi* of his text as universal types for reproduction in real life: "Недавно родился этот тип и быстро распложается. […] И так пойдет до тех пор, уж не будет этого отдельного типа, потому что все люди будут этого типа […]."[282] Contemporaries, later critics and scholars uniformly acknowledge that readers of Chernyshevsky's novel interpreted it as a catechism of both revolutionary and everyday activity, some even undertaking to turn the fictional situations of the novel into real life. Recalling the aftermath of the novel's publication, Aleksandr Skabichevskii noted the growing popularity of communal labor and living enterprises, particularly those organized around sartorial trades: "всюду начали заводиться производительные и потребительные ассоциации, мастерские, швейные, сапожные, преплетные, прачечные, коммуны для общежития, семейные квартиры с нейтральными комнатами и пр."[283] Similar applications of the text included Vasilii Sleptsov's establishment of a residential commune in 1863, the organization of a laundry cooperative by a certain Mme Garshina in 1864, and the launch of several sewing workshops and clothing boutiques in Saint Petersburg staffed with female workers, many of whom were of lower-class origins or

[281] Paperno notes that according to some sources, rumors circulated that "the censors had permitted the novel's publication in the hope that such a highly inept work of art would ruin Chernyshevsky's reputation," and that its lack of moral and aesthetic values would prove a useful antidote to nihilism (Paperno, 27). For an extended overview of critical responses about the novel's aesthetics at the time of its publication, see Andrew M. Drozd, *Chernyshevskii's 'What Is to Be Done?': A Reevaluation* (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2001), 16-19; and N.G. Pereira, *The Thought and Teachings of N.G.Chernyshevskii* (Paris: Mouton, 1975), 84-85.

[282] N.G. Chernyshevsky, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 15 tomakh*, T. 11 (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1939), 147. "This type appeared quite recently but now it's propagating quickly. […] And so it will continue until such time as this special type will cease to exist because all people will be of this type" (Katz, 212).

[283] A.M. Skabichevskii, *Literaturnye vospominaniia* (Moskva: Agraf, 2001), 291. "Industrial and consumer guilds; sewing, shoemaking, printing, and laundry cooperatives; residential communes; and family apartments with separate rooms for couples were established everywhere."

rehabilitated prostitutes.[284] According to Richard Stites, the novel "was a Bible for all advanced Russian women with aspirations toward independence, whether they thought and acted as organized feminists, as revolutionaries, or as 'nihilist' women"; Vera Pavlovna, the text's proto-feminist heroine, embodied freedom of choice in love, marriage, and career, and modeled the full development of the mind and personality of women through the pursuit of learning and pleasure.[285] Moreover, revolutionaries such as Nikolai Ishutin and Dmitrii Karakozov utilized its ideas to attract both radical and non-radical nihilists to their circles, and consciously styled themselves as the ascetic Rakhmetov, the type of "extraordinary man" (*osobennyi chelovek*) that Chernyshevsky envisioned would ultimately populate all of Russian society.[286]

Despite the apparently overwhelming veneration for the novel's instruction in the ideology and methodology of rational and productive social organization, its applications consistently met with challenges and controversies that revealed the literary model's real-life limitations and emphasized the ambiguities encoded in the text itself between public image and private conduct. As contemporaries and scholars suggest, cooperative and communal experiments failed due to vast differences in the educational level and political awareness of their participants; the latent rigidity of the class system reinforced by such enterprises; and the incomplete synthesis of progressive social theory based on the unrestrained and universal pursuit

[284] For more examples of residential communes, see Richard Stites, *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia* (New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1978), 108-111. For cooperative business enterprises created for and by women, see Stites, 118-121. For Saint Petersburg projects specifically, see Vodovozova, 199-209.

[285] Stites, 89.

[286] Claudia Verhoeven extensively covers the link between the image of the revolutionary in the novel and Karakozov's self-fashioning as a terrorist and assassin in *The Odd Man Karakozov: Imperial Russia, Modernity, and the Birth of Terrorism* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2009). See especially the chapter titled "The Real Rakhmetov: The Image of the Revolutionary after Karakozov." Rakhmetov most prominently appears in Chernyshevsky's novel as the titular hero of the chapter "The Extraordinary Man" ("Osobennyi chelovek," Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 195-210.)

of freedom, work and pleasure, with its everyday manifestations of individual self-indulgence and consumption.[287] Drawing and expanding upon these points, this chapter offers an alternative reading of Chernyshevsky's novel that traces the complex relationship between ideological commitment and the conduct of everyday life, and exposes the text's ostensibly contradictory promotion of revolutionary socialism through mores, tastes, and practices of bourgeois capitalism. I focus on several key episodes that combine the motifs of progress and liberation through collective work in the sartorial trades, with Chernyshevsky's materialist epistemology, utilitarian aesthetics, and the principles of educated consumerism; these include the concluding chapter featuring a mysterious nihilist-consumer figure, Vera Pavlovna's engagements in organizing sewing cooperatives, and scenes illustrating the etiquette of personal indulgence in the new social order. Despite the scanty nature of fashion references as such, these episodes nonetheless actively engage with the polysemous nature of the fashion system, foregrounding the dynamic tension between social freedom and individual subjugation, and conversely, between social subjugation and individual freedom that serves as its organizing feature.[288] Although scholars have traditionally viewed these scenes as merely demonstrative of the author's ideological views and practical advice as to the conduct of the new people, my analysis in this chapter suggests that Chernyshevsky's exploitation and critique of the fashion system in the novel simultaneously disciplines the reader and promotes the consumption of fashionable wares including literature and ideology, while highlighting those aspects of the *raznochintsy's* lives that resisted absorption by the latter. Rather than detracting from the novel's cultural influence, the

[287] Paperno, 29; Stites, 111-113; Vodovozova, 208-209.

[288] For an extended discussion of this mechanism, see my Introduction and Georg Simmel, "Fashion," *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 62.6 (1957), 541-544.

tension between the moral imperatives and private desires of its protagonists contributed to its role in addressing contemporaries' ambivalence about the relationship between ideological commitment and the conduct of everyday life.

Chernyshevsky's Fashion Feuilleton

Although Chernyshevsky's journalistic activity in the early 1850s largely revolved around the publication of literary and socio-scientific reviews in *Notes of the Fatherland*, it also included a limited association with the journal *Fashion: A Magazine for High Society* (*Moda: Zhurnal dlia svetskikh liudei*, 1851-1861). Under the editorial control of V.N. Riumin, a prominent Saint Petersburg military officer, and his wife, who had far-reaching connections among the high society set, storeowners, and artists, the journal transformed from a purely fashion-oriented publication for a primarily female readership into a literary publication that reported on the city's cultural and social scenes. Taking advantage of the censors' decision to abandon narrow definitions of what constitutes elements of a fashion magazine, the Riumins broadened their publication program to include discussions of current socio-political topics such as the role and participation of women in educational and labor enterprises, allowing them to cater to all aspects of women's lives while expanding the market for their publication to include readers of the middle ranks.[289] Chernyshevsky's engagement with the journal encompassed three

[289] Christine Ruane, *The Empire's New Clothes: A History of the Russian Fashion Industry, 1700-1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 91-93. Until mid-century, government censors determined the number and content of fashion magazines, relegating them to the domain of largely elite readers and their tastes. By the 1850s, a multifaceted and increasingly competitive fashion press emerged on the publishing scene, providing its readers not only with fashion plates and reporting on French and Russian styles, but also with patterns and practical advice for embroidery and needlework, articles pertaining to etiquette and taste, advertisements, and stories featuring the latest technological advancements such as the washing machine.

eclectic articles for which scholars have confirmed his authorship: a review of the Academy of Arts' annual exhibition, a biographical sketch of soprano Henriette Sontag, and a fashion feuilleton with the generic title "Fashionable Society" (*Modnyi svet*), which offers a cautionary tale about women's role as consumers.[290] The story follows an unnamed married couple as they set out for an afternoon outing, and while waiting for the carriage visit the DeLisle (*Delil'*) fashion boutique on Nevsky Prospect to inspect the shop's acquisitions from the Great Exhibition of 1851 in London.[291] Delighting in the range of products from around the world, including Russian-made silk and wool textiles, furs, leather goods, and decorative objects, the wife comes upon an exquisite velvet gown, which she dubs a "velvet poem" (*barkhatnaia poema*). Informed that the item has already been sold and apparently overcome by her passion for beautiful clothing, she faints, leaving her husband to race around the store buying the most expensive goods he can find in order to restore her to health and bring back her "smile of pleasure" (*legkaia ulybka udovol'stviia*). Although the couple ultimately leave DeLisle with an abundance of extravagant purchases, the wife's regret at the loss of the velvet outfit remains unmitigated. Her role as a consumer of luxurious wares enhances the husband's social status by indicating that neither is engaged in any form of productive labor, serving as a public display of

[290] The articles were respectively published as "Godichnaia vystavka Akademii khudozhestv," *Moda*, vol. 23 (1853), 181-182; "Zontag," *Moda*, vol. 15 (1854), 123; and "Modnyi svet," *Moda*, vol. 20 (1853), 177-179 (Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 16, 667-669). See also Adol'f Demchenko, *N.G. Chernyshevskii: Nauchnaia biografiia, 1828-1858* (Sankt Peterburg: Petroglif, 2015), 344-345.

[291] The Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations opened in London's Hyde Park on May 1, 1851. It was house in the Crystal Palace, an enormous palatial greenhouse designed for the occasion by Joseph Paxton. During the five and a half months of its tenure, more than six million people visited the Crystal Palace where exhibitors from thirty-two nations, including Russia, displayed their wares. For typical coverage of the general history and import of the Great Exhibition and Crystal Palace, see Jeffrey A. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1999); Jeffrey A. Auerbach and Peter H. Hoffenberg, eds., *Britain, the Empire, and the World at the Great Exhibition of 1851* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); and John R. Davis, *The Great Exhibition* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1999).

their discretionary economic power. Her obsession with the velvet gown's sartorial splendor to the exclusion of equivalent interest in items from the Great Exhibition emblematizes a willful denial of education, industry, and technology, and the consequent affirmation of bourgeois tastes and mores. In emphasizing the connection between sensual desire and consumer culture, Chernyshevsky's story critiques female consumerism, which makes women particularly susceptible to physical and moral failings, and dependent on men for physical and material well-being, as well as for the enforcement of rational thought and action. Within this scheme, women are merely delicate objects of display, inscribed with patriarchal expectations and the libidinal economy, and restricted from an active and productive public presence in the marketplace and the workplace. On the other hand, by linking the experience of shopping with that of the exhibitionary space of the Crystal Palace, he suggests that consumption and spectacle may be harnessed for purposes of enlightenment and progress, but must first be organized according to rational principles and social discipline.

Chernyshevsky pursues the notion that engagement with the fashion system can be rehabilitated as a fruitful avenue in the process of women's emancipation in an 1863 letter to his cousin, Evgeniia Pypina. Upon learning that Pypina had begun auditing lectures at the Imperial Military Medical Academy in Saint Petersburg, he encourages her to pursue a formal degree and become a medical practitioner, rather than merely amusing herself with the acquisition of knowledge.[292] Alternatively, he instructs her to engage in the building of a literary career, disregarding any initial misgivings about the quality of her own writing, and instead focusing on

[292] "Если это серьезно, то лучшего ничего и не нужно, — только пусть же будет серьезно, чтобы получить диплом на звание медика и заняться медицинскою практикою — играть в посещение лекций не стоит: они вообще не так умны и интересны, чтобы годились для развлечения." (Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 14, 482).

the material outcomes of her labor, which he argues are ennobling in their own right as a means to an end. Recalling his own association with the journal *Fashion: A Magazine for High Society* decades earlier, Chernyshevsky imposes a utilitarian framework on fashion writing, suggesting that Pypina approach her literary efforts in the same manner:

> У кого есть состояние, может делать только то, что ему нравится; у кого нет состояния, печатает не для славы, а по житейской надобности, работает не из удовольствия, а из необходимости. Это не унижает. […] Было время, я — я не умеющий отличить кисею от барежа, — писал статьи о модах в журнале «Мода» и не стыжусь этого. Так было нужно, иначе мне нечего было бы есть.
>
> Men of means can do as they please; those who lack status publish not for glory, they work not for pleasure, but out of everyday necessity. There is nothing degrading in this. […] There was a time when I, unable to distinguish worsted gauze from muslin, wrote articles about fashion in the journal *Fashion*, and I am not ashamed of it. I did it out of necessity, otherwise I would have starved.[293]

Two moves in this excerpt are of special value. First, Chernyshevsky emphasizes the relational nature of writing, which reflects the author's everyday material and social circumstances and the judgments he consequently makes; within this model, a fashion column provides a lesson in social causality, and becomes a guide to the nature of the interaction between an individual and his environment. Secondly, the privileging of literary endeavors' material benefits over their artistic form or value signals a shift from a romantic to a pragmatic vision of the artist, and consequently, to a view of art as a trade in which both sexes can participate as professionals. Within Chernyshevsky's system of utilitarian aesthetics, the sphere of art embraces everything in reality that is of quotidian interest, seeking to reproduce, structure, and facilitate the individual's lived experience. Rather than dismissing fashion writing as entirely without merit,

[293] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 14, 482.

Chernyshevsky uses it as an object lesson in female emancipation through labor force participation and financial independence. The notion that an act of personal fulfillment simultaneously serves an important social function unifies the material and moral poles of the progressive personality, a point Chernyshevsky formulates in his philosophical writings and revisits in his novel.

Chernyshevsky's self-professed ignorance in matters of fashion acquires special ideological motivation in the social atmosphere of the 1860s. Although rigid class divisions had been relaxed during the 1840s, with universities and government service professions allowing entry to those not born into the gentry, the *raznochintsy*'s lack of experience in the mores and tastes of traditional polite society made them pariahs even among those who supported the democratization of educated Russian society.[294] As stylistic considerations repeatedly prevailed over ideological ones in aristocratic salons and literary circles, the new intelligentsia embraced social inadequacy, making their general lack of refinement and ascetic, slovenly dress the recognizable tropes of a new code of conduct and a new group identity. Nihilist style in particular relied on the "aestheticization of the ascetic," that is, on the conscious sartorial and behavioral manifestation of ideology in everyday practice: "simple dress; long hair for young men and short for young women; informal address, brusque manners, dirty fingernails and walking sticks; sometimes wide-brimmed, flattened, black Fra Diavolo hats or otherwise Polish caps, and dark blue tinted glasses."[295] Rejecting the studied conventions of interpersonal relations, nihilists tended to be direct to the point of rudeness, thus blurring the traditional

[294] For specific anecdotes involving gentry writers such as Panaev, Tolstoy, and Turgenev derisively commenting on the origins and manners of *raznochintsy* writers (including Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, and Herzen) and the latter's responses, see Paperno, 76-79.

[295] Verhoeven, 114.

divisions among estates and narrowing the gap of social difference. Their sartorial ethos in particular signaled a redefinition of gender relations, from the exchange of hair length standards among men and women, to the *nigilistka*'s repudiation of elaborate hairstyles and gowns, crinolines, corsets, and personal decorative items; the defeminization of appearance indicated the new women's desire to be useful and autonomous, underscoring their rejection of leisure, sexual objectification, and the tyranny of domestic life.[296] Nadezhda Stasova, a philanthropist and feminist activist confirmed the importance of fashion in reflecting and shaping the social movements of the period:

> Вопрос о костюме играл у нас в эту пору очень большую роль. […] Пришло такое время, когда женщины у нас жестоко преследовали за простоту и разумность костюма, за обстриженные волосы, за черное, самое скромное платье, за отсутствие всяких украшений […] чтобы доказать начинающуюся жизнь духом, а не телом.
>
> The question of dress played a very important role in this period. [...] The time had come when Russian women aggressively pursued the simplicity and rationality of costume; short hair; black, modest dress; the lack of any adornment [...] in order to demonstrate [their] new life spiritually, rather than physically.[297]

Stasova's comments also register the inherent paradox of nihilist self-fashioning, which, on the one hand, disparages conventionality and proclaims an ideal of direct reference to reality, a mode

[296] Compare to a typical costume for a society lady in this period, which underlined women's pampered, restrained, and sheltered status, their inability to work, and their passive femininity: "В начале описываемого периода дамы носят по нескольку шумящих крахмальных юбок. Под платьями, снабженными рядами воланов, высокий корсет, стянутый до крайности, чтобы талия была 'в рюмочку.' Он в большом употреблении и даже злоупотреблении, с несомненным вредом для здоровья. На него надевали лиф, заканчивающийся книзу острым шнипом. Чулки у дам нитяные или шелковые, белые; цветные или полосатые предоставляются лицам, не принадлежащим к так называемому обществу. Подвязки, часто на пружинах, носятся ниже колен. Обувь - башмаки без каблуков, с завязками, или из козловой кожи или материи и прюнелевые ботинки. Кожаные сапожки и туфли на безобразно высоких каблуках явились гораздо позже. Шляпки представляют нечто вроде корзиночки, завязанной у самого горла бантом из широких цветных лент" (A.F. Koni, *Vospominaniia o pisatel'iakh* [Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1965], 65).

[297] N.V. Stasova, *Vospominaniia i ocherki* (Sankt Peterburg: Tip. Merkusheva, 1899), 58-59.

of being and expression that is natural and practical. Yet, in consistently advertising its authenticity and elevating the material to the realm of the spiritual, nihilism betrayed its dependence on display and its adoption of the fashionista's modus operandi.[298] Much like their gentry and bourgeois counterparts, the *raznochintsy* had to master the arcana of vestimentary (im)propriety and its inexhaustible nuances, and literature offered not only the commandments of moral conduct, but also a comprehensive description of the external signs and tastes that marked a person who belonged to the new type. Viewed in this light, *What Is to Be Done?* provided an all-encompassing positive lesson in the moral, social, and sartorial discipline of the new age.

Materialist Aesthetics and the Pleasure Calculus

Although aesthetics and ethics are traditionally considered separate philosophical disciplines because of their divergent subject matter, Chernyshevsky sought to formulate and implement a theory of aesthetics that both embodied his materialist and positivistic beliefs, and that transformed art into a tool for radical social transformation. His 1853 doctoral thesis, *The Aesthetic Relation of Art to Reality* (*Esteticheskie otnosheniia iskusstva k deistvitel'nosti*) marked the first of his attempts at a statement of the new materialist aesthetics, which aimed at pointing out concrete ways for attaining a sense of conviction about the world and devising an intellectual practice for understanding, controlling, and ultimately changing reality. Rejecting idealist notions of pure art or metaphysical beauty, which obscure reality and subordinate it to an

[298] Stites has commented that "The costumes and customs of the new culture were assumed, sometimes temporarily, by so many faddists that it was often difficult to tell the nihilist from the *poseur*. The term nihilist was flung about indisciriminately […]. Like many such terms, it was loosely applied and was fluid enough to serve many purposes…" (Stites, 105).

unrealizable ideal, Chernyshevsky proclaimed that reality is superior to the ideal, and that therefore, real life is superior to art. A corollary to this presupposition establishes beauty as a direct expression and physical manifestation of lived experience: "из определения 'прекрасное есть жизнь' будет следовать, что истинная, высочайшая красота есть именно красота, встречаемая человеком в мире действительности, а не красота, создаваемая искусством."[299] Within the scope of this system, the purpose of art is to faithfully reproduce reality (*iskusstvo est' vosproizvedenie deistvitel'nosti*)[300] rather than to impose artificial correctives in pursuit of transcendent or absolute beauty, rendering art a cognitive and didactic tool in human experience. Consequently, literature serves as an intermediary between man and reality, evaluating and explaining the phenomena of real life, thereby making them accessible to human understanding and catalyzing action. Chernyshevsky's materialist aesthetics ultimately seek to describe, explicate and resolve the basic predicaments of human experience, imposing objective strategies of scientific observation and argumentation on a range of mundane matters, including appearance, costume, and consumption.[301] Unsurprisingly, his progressively-minded contemporaries such as Shelgunov and Vodovozova cited above, located in his anti-aesthetics the confirmation of art as an instrument of universal enlightenment, and of literature as the medium through which the writer communicated his methodology of economic, intellectual, and social development. Consequently, his programmatic novel came to be consumed as any

[299] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 2, 14. "From the definition 'beauty is life,' it will follow that true, the highest, beauty, is the beauty that man meets with in the world of reality and not the beauty created by art." Translation from *N.G. Chernyshevsky: Selected Philosophical Essays*, trans. M. Grigoryan (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953), 292.

[300] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 2, 78.

[301] As Paperno points out, no topic was outside of the realm of literary representation and analysis: "[he] frequently introduced everyday problems with personal connotations, such as marital relations, extravagant spending and even digestion into his [texts]" (Paperno, 165).

fashionable consumer item, as Vodovozova recalled: "я знала нескольких, продавших все наиболее ценное из своего имущества, чтобы только купить этот роман, стоивший тогда 25 рублей и дороже."[302] While the acquisition of Chernyshevsky's novel contributed to the *raznochintsy*'s self-fashioning process and affirmed their commitment to social progress, it also exposed their materialistic, rather than materialist tendencies, and revealed their ambiguous status as producers of a new order and as self-indulgent consumers. Ironically, it was precisely the intelligentsia's ascetic self-limitation, and dedication to the rigorous work of improving the individual and the world around him, that aroused the desire to pursue material and commercial diversions ostensibly unsanctioned by ideology.

In addition to materialism, Chernyshevsky drew on utilitarianism[303] to explain human behavior and refute religious and idealist conceptions of morality and free will. The resulting theory of rational egoism formulated in the 1860 philosophical tract *The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy* (*Antropologicheskii printsip v filosofii*) allowed him to reconcile individual impulses and desires with the collective interests of the community. Commencing from the supposition that man must be regarded as a single being having only one nature, Chernyshevsky rejects the division of human characteristics according to their material or moral qualities and their elevation to the realm of the absolute, despite the constitutive and philosophically antithetical presence of both qualities: "при единстве натуры мы замечаем в человеке два различные ряда явлений: явления так называемого материального порядка

[302] Vodovozova, 199. "I knew some individuals who sold all of their most precious possessions in order to buy the novel, which at the time cost 25 rubles and more."

[303] In formulating his materialist epistemology, Chernyshevsky relies on the quantitative conceptions of utility formulated by Jeremy Bentham, John Stewart Mill, and Robert Owen. For more on the influence of British social thought on Chernyshevsky's philosophical development, see Pereira, 38-39 and Andrzej Walicki, *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1979), 194-198.

(человек ест, ходит) и явления так называемого нравственного порядка (человек думает, чувствует, желает).”[304] The “anthropological principle” rests in the notion that man is an indivisible being, and only as such can he represent an absolute value to other men; consequently, all aspects of the individual’s activity reflect the features of his entire being, which must in turn be regarded in its natural connection with the entire social organism.[305] This principle underpins the idea that every human act or impulse arises as the direct realization of the calculus of pain and pleasure, and that self-interest is the governing force in human behavior: “человек поступает так, как приятнее ему поступать, руководится расчетом, велящим отказываться от меньшей выгоды или меньшего удовольствия для получения большей выгоды, большего удовольствия.”[306] Thus, determinism and reason rule human life, beginning with perception and ending with action. Conflicts between competing individuals and social groups are easily resolved by maximizing the pleasure of the largest number of people, since that in turn brings the greatest benefit to society. Chernyshevsky concluded that rational egoism spurred the progressive person to work toward the creation of socioeconomic, political, and cultural institutions that ensured that personally pleasurable and socially desirable action coincided for each individual. Despite this emphasis on the pursuit of pleasure and personal gain, true pleasure could only be discovered in progressive activities, and assertions about the primacy

[304] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 7, 241-242. “While there is unity in man’s nature, we see in man two categories of phenomena: phenomena of what is called a material order (a man eats, walks), and phenomena of what is called a moral order (a man thinks, feels, wishes)” (Grigoryan, 72).

[305] “Принцип этот состоит в том, что на человека надобно смотреть как на одно существо, имеющее только одну натуру, чтобы не разрезывать человеческую жизнь на разные половины, принадлежащие разным натурам, чтобы рассматривать каждую сторону деятельности человека […] в его натуральной связи со всем организмом” (Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 7, 293).

[306] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 7, 285-286. “Man acts in the way that gives him most pleasure. He is guided by self-interest, which causes him to abstain from a smaller gain, or a lesser pleasure, in order to obtain a larger gain or a greater pleasure” (Grigoryan, 125).

of self-fulfillment gave way to calls for ascetic self-limitation and stoic self-control.[307] While Chernyshevsky's novel contributed to the articulation of this message and the edification of readers in disciplined self-indulgence, it also reflected the difficulty of eliminating the desire for purely personal self-fulfillment from everyday life and the practical limitations of the new ideology.

Disciplined Consumption and the Consumption of Discipline

In *What Is to Be Done?*, Chernyshevsky creates a hierarchy of exemplary *raznochintsy*, whose rational self-interest drives the struggle for personal and social improvement. The novel's main heroes, Lopukhov and Kirsanov, represent prototypical new men driven by a staunch belief in science, materialist philosophy, and socialist political economy; leaving behind their bourgeois origins, both attend medical school, engage in theoretical discussions about the transformation of society, and sublimate their romantic love and sensual desire into undertakings in women's emancipation and cooperative labor. Even higher on the masculine hierarchy stands Rakhmetov, a descendant of wealthy aristocrats who becomes a self-disciplined ascetic and incorruptible militant, and whose devotion to the cause of revolution provides a model for emulation in real life. The novel's heroine, Vera Pavlovna, represents the outstanding image of the new woman, who escapes the oppressive mores of her middling family through a fictitious marriage to Lopukhov[308] and ultimately achieves complete emancipation by engaging in a

[307] Konstantine Klioutchkine, "Between Sacrifice and Indulgence: Nikolai Nekrasov as a Model for the Intelligentsia," *Slavic Review* 66.1 (2007), 56.

[308] For more on the origins and cultural import of the fictitious marriage the novel, see Paperno, 133-136.

sewing enterprise and medical studies, while also finding fulfillment in romantic endeavors and her second marriage to Kirsanov. This range of intelligentsia types of both genders provided positive models of self-fashioning for the *raznochintsy*, and outlined the various pathways to individual liberation, enlightenment, and social change.

While these characters unequivocally serve as exemplars of male and female progressive personality, their pursuit of pleasure seems at odds with the novel's ideological message. Despite professing to a modest existence and the abandonment of the tastes and mores of her parents, Vera Pavlovna appears throughout the text indulging in material and sensual pleasures that supplement her work and her studies. Having settled into her marriage to Lopukhov, she repeatedly luxuriates: "Вера Павловна, проснувшись, долго нежится в постели; она любит нежиться;" and "Вера Павловна после обеда нежится на своем диванчике; у диванчика сидит муж и любуется на нее."[309] Chernyshevsky employs the reflexive verb "to luxuriate" (*nezhit'sia*) in its various grammatical forms no fewer than ten times to describe her domestic activities and everyday martial arrangements; this rhetorical association paradoxically grows in frequency as she fully renounces her family, establishes her cooperative business, and immerses herself in emancipatory ideologies. Furthermore, the composition of these scenes combines imagery typical of bourgeois domesticity with the visual tradition of the odalisque, serving as a powerful symbol of Vera Pavlovna's incomplete break with traditional middle-class pursuits on the one hand, and her comfortable disregard for social conventions on the other. Her apparently dissolute and irrepressible consumption habits culminate in her epicurean love of cream,

[309] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 135, 173. "Upon awakening, Vera Pavlovna lies in bed for a long time luxuriating; she loves to do so;" and "After supper Vera Pavlovna can stretch out luxuriously on her own little sofa. Her husband sits alongside admiring her" (Katz, 199, 245).

summed up as "tea is merely a pretext for cream" ("чай только предлог для сливок").[310] Much as her penchant for "luxuriating," her indulgence in cream (*slivki*) occurs throughout the text, serving as a semiotic marker of social and economic emancipation that Vera Pavlovna sets as her goal from the novel's opening pages: "Как вкусен чай, когда он свежий, густой и когда в нем много сахару и сливок! Вовсе не похож на тот спитой, с одним кусочком сахару, который даже противен. Когда у меня будут свои деньги, я всегда буду пить такой чай, как этот."[311] Although the creamy drink in this early scene functions primarily as a bribe to secure Vera Pavlovna's consent to an arranged marriage for economic gain, signifying her mother's unscrupulous intentions and the vulgarity of bourgeois life, it ultimately comes to mark a sensual, consumer indulgence that can be balanced and transformed by utilitarian discipline and rational ideology. Vera Pavlovna's status as a consummate consumer culminates in scenes detailing her enjoyment of comfortable furniture and her passion for fashionable shoes, which she elevates to the level of ritual: "[И]ногда долго занимается она и одною из настоящих статей туалета — надеванием ботинок: у ней отличные ботинки; она одевается очень скромно, но ботинки ее страсть."[312] Rather than dismissing these pursuits as frivolous or immoral, the text presents them as necessary counterweights to progressive activity and inevitable stepping-stones on the path to liberation and social change, particularly for the female subject.

---

[310] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 136. Katz, 200.

[311] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 18. "Tea tastes so good when it's fresh and strong, especially when it's mixed with lots of cream and sugar. Not at all like the watery tea with one small lump of sugar – that's awful. When I am able to afford it on my own, I shall drink tea like this." (Katz, 58).

[312] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 135. "She sometimes spends a very long time on one particular item in her wardrobe – her shoes. She has wonderful shoes. In general, her wardrobe is very modest, but shoes are her passion" (Katz, 199).

Mirroring Vera Pavlovna's sybaritic pursuits, Kirsanov and Lopukhov conspicuously smoke, which at the turn of the 1860s was associated with liberation; the new men smoked publically in order to display their freedom from social constraints.[313] However, the two smoke cigars, which signals the kind of gentry hedonism reprehensible in a progressive person, as explicated in the narrator's passing reference to Rakhmetov's preference for expensive cigars: "дурных сигар он не мог курить, — ведь он воспитан был в аристократической обстановке. Из четырехсот рублей его расхода до ста пятидесяти выходило у него на сигары."[314] These material pleasures of the *novye liudi* in the novel, female and male alike, evoke mutually contradictory experiences in the same subject, who ambivalently cycles between the poles of a socialist activist-intellectual and a capitalist mass consumer. Rather than disavowing these transgressions of ideology in everyday practice, Chernyshevsky frames them as integral elements of the utilitarian pleasure calculus:

> У человека, проводящего жизнь как должно, время разделяется на три части: труд, наслаждение и отдых или развлечение. Наслаждение точно так же требует отдыха, как и труд. В труде и в наслаждении общий человеческий элемент берет верх над личными особенностями: в труде мы действуем под преобладающим определением внешних рациональных надобностей; в наслаждении под преобладающим определением других, также общих потребностей человеческой природы.
>
> A man who lives his life as he should, divides his time into three parts: work, pleasure, and rest or recreation. Pleasure demands rest, just as much as work does. Both in work and pleasure the general human component predominates over individual peculiarities. In work, we act under the predominant motive of external, rational necessities; in pleasure, under the predominant motive of other, equally general necessities of human nature.[315]

[313] Klioutchkine, 47-48.

[314] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 202. "He couldn't tolerate bad cigars; after all, he was raised in aristocratic surroundings. Out of his 400-ruble income, almost 150 went for cigars." (Katz, 282).

[315] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 229. Katz, 315.

Pleasure here is subjected to an ethos of utilitarian discipline and balanced with rational social engagement. Progressive action thus paradoxically becomes constitutive of comfort and sensual pleasure, as consumer activities invented in the service of individual self-indulgence lead to socially beneficial outcomes and vice-versa. Viewed through this lens, scenes in the novel depicting the individual protagonists' consumer practices must be read alongside those depicting emancipatory and collective activities, as the pursuit of self-interest through material pleasures becomes channeled toward the improvement not only of the self, but also of general welfare.

In scientifically cataloging the protagonists' consumerist pleasures, *What Is to Be Done?* reproduces the structural conventions of the fashion feuilleton and textual advertising.[316] This generic correspondence manifests itself most readily in scenes recounting the surprisingly many shopping excursions in the text. When purchasing wine and sweets for his proposal to Vera Pavlovna, Lopukhov immediately turns to the prominent Saint Petersburg vintner Denker, where he obtains walnut cake, maraschino liqueur, and bitter orange vodka, which he "prescribes" at the dinner celebration in his capacity as a doctor.[317] Vera Pavlovna's persistent passion for shoes is made apparent early in the novel, as she shops at the bequest of her mother for feminizing, sexually appealing ensembles that will attract a suitor: "Верочка […] больше всего радовалась тому, что мать наконец согласилась покупать ботинки ей у Королева: ведь на Толкучем рынке ботинки такие безобразные, а королевские так удивительно сидят на ноге."[318] The

[316] I discuss these structural features in Chapter 1 of this dissertation.

[317] "Это очень полезно, особенно вот этой, горькой померанцевой. Я вам говорю как медик" (Chernyshevsky, PSS, T. 11, 87).

[318] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 15. "Most of all she was delighted that her mother at long last had agreed to start buying her shoes at Korolev's. Shoes from the flea market were so ugly, while those from Korolev's fitted one's feet so beautifully" (Katz, 54).

reference to Korolev's exclusive shoe salon located on Nevsky Prospect across from the Anichkov Palace functions as a real life detail that imparts authenticity and historical actuality to the scene, serving as a practical illustration of Chernyshevsky's materialist aesthetics. Yet, this detail also mimics the textual advertising of the fashion press, providing readers with the requisite information for the acquisition of the fashionable item that so prominently features in Vera Pavlovna's progressive lifestyle. This descriptive technique subsequently directs readers to a series of establishments along Nevsky Prospect's shopping district, including A.M. Ruzanov's perfumery and toiletry shop in Gostinyi Dvor and Weichmann's bespoke clothing boutique, encouraging the conspicuous consumption of luxury wares.[319] Notably, however, these two sites respectively accommodate the shopping habits of Maria Alekseevna, Vera Pavlovna's avaricious, ignorant, and morally suspect mother, and of Julie Letellier, a French demimondaine dependent on the patriarchal libidinal economy for her subsistence. Whereas Gostinyi Dvor, with its trading rows and bargaining practices underscores Maria Alekseevna's fundamental Russian backwardness, Weichmann's western-style *magazin*, connotes the politeness, refinement, and display of both Russian aristocratic culture and the new retail environment, underscoring Julie's status as an enlightened, yet ideologically dubious consumer.[320] Thus, textual advertisements promoting particular shops and shopping districts throughout the novel reflect the particular protagonist's ideological orientation, and read as advice columns to would-be revolutionaries on all matters pertinent to disciplined and tasteful self-fashioning. The number and variety of retail spaces referenced in the text also underscore the contrast between the old and the new, patriarchy

[319] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 97, 25.

[320] An extensive history of clothes shopping in the nineteenth century is provided in Ruane, 115-149.

and emancipation, and consumption and production, and illustrate the discipline of modern retail technologies and the mass consumer market. While the *novye liudi* of the novel ultimately orient themselves toward the arcade space of the Passazh (I discuss the structural and sociological features of this space in the following section), their commitment to authenticity and the organic integration of thought and everyday life translates into self-indulgent pleasures manifested as consumer impulses, aligning their habits with the bourgeois and middle-class readers the novel intends to edify.

The ambiguous status of consumption in the realm of the new people is further complicated by the novel's main metaphor of social progress, the sewing cooperative. This fictional enterprise ostensibly reinforced contemporary readers' ideas on education, economic independence, and the moral imperative of helping women attain personal emancipation, while illustrating the socially beneficial outcomes of the progressive personality's commitment to finding pleasure in labor. Vera Pavlovna's cooperative begins as a limited profit-sharing operation and grows into a residential producers' and consumers' commune administered and staffed by women of various rank and origins, who gradually learn about self-reliance through readings of progressive literature. Historically, the sewing trades were a public expression of those moral qualities that defined women's femininity and domesticity, giving a tangible expression of feminine virtues. Sewing was seen as fundamental to gentry and non-noble women's education alike, and would by mid-nineteenth century become a prominent feature of vocational training programs that strove to meet the growing consumer demand for fashionable women's clothing.[321] In literature, as Olga Matich points out, "sewing became the emblematic

[321] For more on the role of sewing in women's education and vocational training, see Ruane, 44-53.

lower-class female profession, whose practitioner was the object of economic and sexual exploitation;" the seamstress was typically a fallen woman whose life ends in ruin.[322] *What Is to Be Done?* revises this narrative, inscribing the sewing collective as the site of respect for female agency and labor, and as a symbol of technological progress and modern social organization.[323]

From its very inception Vera Pavlovna's collective combines utopian socialist principles with the conditions of capitalist socioeconomic structure, resulting in a fusion of ideology and commerce that propels the enterprise's subsequent development. Looking to build a clientele for her fledgling dressmaking establishment, Vera Pavlovna seeks out Julie Letellier, modeling her wares and asking for her recommendation, connections, and orders among the gentry set. Praising the former's "skill and good taste" (*masterstvo i vkus*), Julie advises that the key to success will be the establishment of an "elegant shop" (*pyshnyi magazin*) on Nevsky Prospect, which Vera Pavlovna confirms is her ultimate goal.[324] As business expands, the workshop adds an in-house bank, purchasing agency, apartments for seamstresses and their families, and begins purveying ready-made clothes in subsidiary venues: "[М]астерская завела свое агентство продажи готовых вещей […] — отдельного магазина она еще не могла иметь, но вошла в сделку с одною из лавок Гостиного двора, завела маленькую лавочку в Толкучем

[322] Olga Matich, "28 Nevsky Prospect: The Sewing Machine, the Seamstress, and Narrative," *Petersburg/Petersburg: Novel and City, 1900-1921* (Madison: UWP, 2010), 248.

[323] Ruane suggests that although the novel aimed at legitimating women's participation in the work force, it ultimately reaffirms women's work as a separate category: "While Vera's activities after marriage establish her as a new woman, her sewing skills establish her as a real woman in the eyes of the reading public. […] Vera maintains a fundamental connection with the domestic ideal and the virtues it represents through her work as a dressmaker. While this domestic ideal applied to the workpace is held up as a model for the future, none of the male characters ever participates in this new kind of work" (Ruane, 57).

[324] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 115.

рынке."[325] Because of the collective's successful operation, Vera Pavlovna creates a network of dressmaking shops across the city, culminating in the establishment of the upscale *magazin* "Au bon travail. Magasin des Nouveautés," whose name refers to utopian socialist principles of labor on the one hand, and links her shop with the forerunner of the Parisian department store Bon Marché on the other.[326] Chernyshevsky's scientific outline of the sewing collective's evolution serves not only as an instructional manual for female emancipation, but also closely reflects the changing nature of Russian consumer culture in this period, which witnessed the decline of tailors' and dressmakers' ateliers, and the rise of fashion shops (*modnyi magazin*) and retail complexes. Vera Pavlovna's enterprise grows from a small, private, word-of-mouth operation, into a series of shops in Saint Petersburg's trading rows, and finally into a specialty store in the fashionable shopping district, signaling a complete embrace of new industrial technologies and modern retailing techniques. This development illustrates a fusion of socialist principles and bourgeois consumerism and advertises it as key to the practical success of ideology in real life.

It is not only the sewing cooperative's evolution, but also its structural composition that highlights the paradoxical link between Chernyshevsky's ideology and consumer culture. At the peak of its development, the sewing workshop appears as a multi-use/multi-level building, consisting of a reception area, meeting hall, workrooms, common areas, restaurant, clothing

[325] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 132. "The workshop established its own agency for selling ready-made clothes… Although they didn't have a separate store, they'd entered into an agreement with one of the shops in the Shopping Arcade; they also had a small stand in the flea market" (Katz, 195).

[326] "Au bon travail" recalls the French utopian socialist belief in the right to work (*le droit au travail*), proclaimed in such works as Louis Blanc's *Le Socialisme: Droit au travail* (1848) (Katz, 379, n. 267). Originally a novelty goods store named Au Bon Marché, the future department store was transformed in the 1850s by its new owner, Aristide Boucicaut, who introduced new retail practices to the establishment, including an expanded inventory of a variety of goods, fixed prices, browsing, sales, and returns (Pamela Klaffke, *Spree: A Cultural History of Shopping*, [Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2003], 42).

shop, and apartments.[327] Its rational organization not only supplies all the necessities for the productive fulfillment of the utilitarian calculus in everyday life, but also creates a space of collective sociality that unifies labor, leisure, and pleasure, further nurturing the desire for the pursuit of individual and therefore social improvement. These architectural features also figure prominently in the urban retail spaces of the arcade and department store, which combine workshops, stores, meeting spaces, and apartments to create sites of display and consumption that stoke the public's consumerist desires and invite its vicarious participation in gazing, evaluating, and acquiring.[328] Vera Pavlovna's Fourth Dream (*Chetvertyi son Very Pavlovny*) confirms this structural connection, as she envisions the Crystal Palace as the ultimate expression of the future of utopian architecture and social organization. Although an exhibition and not a marketplace, the Crystal Palace of 1851 introduced visitors to the concept of browsing and exposed them to a plethora of merchandise, carefully grouped and displayed, thus mimicking the experience of everyday shopping and filling the minds of the masses with images of cultural wares, practical goods, and new technologies crucial to modern self-fashioning. Following this model, Vera Pavlovna's dream presents new technologies of being, with a particular focus on the nature of the clothed body, now ostensibly freed from the confines and elaborate ornamentation of bourgeois style:

> [К]ак роскошна одежда женщин; […] преобладает костюм, похожий на тот, какой носили гречанки в изящнейшее время Афин, — очень легкий и свободный, и на мужчинах тоже широкое, длинное платье без талии, что-то вроде мантий иматиев, видно, что это обыкновенный домашний костюм их, как это платье скромно и прекрасно! Как мягко и изящно обрисовывает оно формы, как возвышает оно грациозность движений!

[327] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 286-288.

[328] Detailed architectural descriptions of Russian shopping centers in the 19th century are beyond the scope of this chapter. For more on this see Brumfield, 167-178; Ruane, 124-132.

> The women are dressed so elegantly. […] The most popular costume is like what Grecian women wore during the elegant Athenian period. It is very light and loose-fitting. The men wear long, wide tunics without waists, like cloaks or togas. Apparently, it's their ordinary domestic wear. How modest and lovely! It outlines their bodies so elegantly and exquisitely; it enhances the grace of all their movements.[329]

The loose-fitting shifts and tunics recall the practical fashions of the nihilists and signify and unity of stylistic form and function that points to progressive implications for the redefinition of gender relations. While this freedom of dress rejects hierarchical and statutory signs of distinction, it reinforces a system of differentiation and management of signs determined by ideological norms that privilege practicality, modesty, and an organic unity of thought and action. The characteristically ascetic, uniform style of the new people thus communicates their commitment to the moral economy, tastes, and manners mandated by utilitarian epistemology, effectively entrapping them in the consumption of material forms that confirm their distinction as progressive individuals. Setting their activities in the Crystal Palace, Chernyshevsky's new people fashion a cultural identity for display and consumption.

Rather than merely serving to illustrate the methodology of social progress and Chernyshevsky's materialist epistemology in practice, the sewing cooperative's structural connection to exhibitionary and retail spaces signals an important moment in his economic doctrine. Noting the spread of capitalist enterprise, business property, and capital accumulation caused by the industrial boom of the 1860s, Chernyshevsky grew concerned about the effects technological progress would have on the laborers. In contrast to liberal economists who advocated thrift and postponed consumption, he asserted the primacy of distribution over

[329] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 282. Katz, 376-377.

production, arguing that any expansion in national wealth and capital production must increase the supply of available goods to the producer.[330] His advocacy of demand-side economics permeates the novel, manifesting itself as the persistent call to consumer engagement, and the synthesis of self-interest, revolutionary activity, and social progress. This mechanism is nowhere more apparent that in the text's concluding pages, which present the reader with a series of allegorical scenes on the theme of revolution, as well as the ultimate artistic synthesis of Chernyshevsky's social and political ideas.

Tellingly titled "Change of Scene" (*Peremena dekoratsii*), the final chapter signals a change in both ideology and everyday practical matters, which opens with mysterious "lady in mourning" (*dama v traure*) uttering the rallying cry "To the Arcade!" (*V Passazh!*).[331] Built between 1846 and 1848 on Nevsky Prospect, the Passazh shopping arcade housed 104 establishments, including clothing retailers, hotels, coffeehouses, billiard halls, an anatomical museum, a cabinet of wax figures, panoramas and dioramas, workshops, and private apartments.[332] The arcade's rows of stores in a large, covered, multistoried space invited consumers to shop no matter the weather, and catered to a clientele of various ranks and levels of cultivation, providing them with the opportunity to browse and gaze at the displays; this mediated participation proved to be the democratic element in modern consumerism. Among the notable shops in the Passazh was a bookstore run by Aleksandr Serno-Solov'evich, one of Chernyshevsky's reverent followers and member of the revolutionary Land and Liberty (*Zemlia i*

[330] "Цель производства для трудящегося есть употребление произведенных ценностей, а для капиталиста сбыт их и в другие руки для выигрыша через обмен. Мерилом производства для трудящегося служат надобности его собственного употребления […]" (Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 7, 49).
[331] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 336.

[332] V.A. Zelensky, *Passazh Sankt-Peterburg, 1848-1998* (Sankt-Peterburg: ArtDeco, 1998), 29-43.

volia) organization. In this context, the lady in mourning's decisive directive "To the Arcade!" signifies the simultaneous call for consumerism and ideology, further complicating the temporal confusion and the ensuing narrative breakdown evident at the end of the novel.[333] Adding to the ambiguity of the scene is the lady in mourning's costume, which has transformed from the previously puzzling black mourning dress ("Но что ж это дама буйных саней вся в черном? Траур это или каприз?") to an elegant, brightly-colored, and lavishly accessorized outfit: "теперь она была уже не в трауре: яркое розовое платье, розовая шляпа, белая мантилья, в руке букет."[334] While this overtly feminine and contrived stylistic choice sharply contrasts with the austere and unstructured fashions of the new people Vera Pavlovna encounters in her dream, its brilliant pink coloring emphasizes the lady in mourning's distinctive status as the highest form of female virtue and emancipation, and underscores her role as a leader and model for emulation. Within this scheme, the proper practice of progressive ideology involves an active engagement with the disciplined mass consumption of capitalism, and that discipline is most readily apprehended in the modern retail establishments of the new age. Commenting on the novel's ambivalent conclusion, Herzen noted that Chernyshevsky "boldly ends [it] in a phalanstery, a brothel" ("Он оканчивает фаланстером, борделью — смело.").[335] His critique underscores the text's muddled message, which on the one hand offers practical guidance in the application of utopian socialism as the antidote to society's ills, yet also promotes self-indulgence and the

[333] Although the events of the final chapter are dated as taking place on "4 April 1863," Chernyshevsky, a believer in apocalyptic predictions, calculated that the time at which the prophecy of revolution would be fulfilled was, in fact, 1865 (Katz, 273, n. 163).

[334] Chernyshevsky, *PSS*, T. 11, 329, 336. "But why is the lady from the rowdy sleigh dressed all in black? Is she in mourning, or is it just a whim?" and "Only now she was no longer in mourning; she was wearing a bright rose-pink dress, a rose-pink hat, and a white mantilla, and she was holding a bouquet of flowers in her hand" (Katz, 433, 444).

[335] Aleksandr Herzen, *Sobranie sochinenii v 30-ti tomakh*, T. 29:1 (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1954), 168.

pursuit of sensual stimuli. The reference to the phalanstery[336] conjures up not only images of the self-contained and self-sufficient communal enterprises like Vera Pavlovna's sewing collective, but also the structurally and functionally identical spaces of the exhibitionary complex, the department store, and the arcade, which edify, stimulate, and discipline the social body.

In propagandizing Chernyshevsky's plans for effecting radical social change, *What Is to Be Done?* resorts precisely to the types of narrative strategies, imagery, and ideas that were antithetical to the writer's core views on social progress. The foregrounding of the fashion system, with the culture of consumption as its constitutive element, combines in the novel with principles of rational progressivism, and suggests a vision of the individual as being driven by a variety of impulses, only some of which can be controlled through education and social discipline. Chernyshevsky's text, then, offers an early model of the modern self as an embodiment of inherently contradictory personal aspects in an increasingly complex social environment. In the context of the 1860s, such a subject was liberated from the confines of traditional social structures but found himself constrained by and unable to adhere to the new ideology in everyday life. The nascent culture of mass consumption provided a fruitful mechanism not only for the practical integration of ideology and self-indulgence, but also for the reintegration of the intelligentsia and its utopian projects into Russian society.

[336] French utopian socialist Charles Fourier conceived of the phalanstery as a rationally organized building designed for a self-contained community of mixed class and gender, in which human passions and sensual pleasures would be redirected into wholesome channels like labor and emancipation, or act in concert with complementary passions to achieve ends beneficial for the whole society.

Chapter Four

Anna Karenina, "Banana Karenina," and Commodified Subjectivity

Formulated over a period of fifteen years, Leo Tolstoy's polemical essay *What is Art?* (*Chto takoe iskusstvo*?, 1897) represents an attempt at a synthesis of the writer's encounters with Western aesthetic philosophy, his own artistic practice, and general ideas about the role of art in modern society. Tolstoy rejects aesthetic theories that conceive of art solely through the categories of the sublime and the beautiful, as those categories ultimately represent a subjective and transient response to objects that engender physical pleasure. Instead, he posits an aesthetics predicated upon the Christian principle of universal brotherhood, rendering art an indispensable part of organic life and a means of communion (*sredstvo obshcheniia*) among its producers and consumers.[337] Because any human product claiming to be art requires social investment and labor that extend beyond the artist himself, it must be judged according to its action and effects rather than its intrinsic qualities. Consequently, Tolstoy's treatise suggests a two-pronged approach to the evaluation of artistic products: one that judges art along the genuine-counterfeit axis, and a complementary one that judges art along the good-bad axis.[338] In dismissing the notion that secular or religious art is only considered to be true and good if it expresses absolute truth or morality, Tolstoy suggests to critics, artists, and audiences that the moral, theme, and

[337] Leo Tolstoy, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 90 tt.*, T. 30 (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 1951), 63.

[338] "И потому для общества, среди которого возникают и поддерживаются произведения искусства, нужно знать, всё ли то действительно искусство, что выдается за таковое, и всё ли то хорошо, что есть искусство, как это считается в нашем обществе…" [Tolstoy, PSS, T. 30, 33]. See also Caryl Emerson, "Tolstoy's Aesthetics" in *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*, Donna Tussig Orwin, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 243.

topic of a work of art do not determine its value. Rather, the value of successful art lies in its communicative function and in its potential to unify mankind in a community of aesthetic experience: "art, together with speech, is a means of communication (*orudie obshcheniia*), and therefore also of progress – that is, of mankind's movement forward towards perfection."[339] In Tolstoy's model, *obshchenie* – signifying both communion and communication, constitutes the central achievement of good art.

For art to be effective, Tolstoy argues, both its production and reception must occur through the transmission of feelings (*chuvstva*), rather than through the transmission of thoughts or words (*mysli*, *slova*).[340] The source of art's simplicity and temporality lies in its capacity to unite its audience through clear and genuine communication, and the artist's ability to create works of art that "infect" their recipients by forging an emotional link between artist and audience: "art is that human activity which consists in one man consciously (*soznatel'no*) conveying to others, by certain external signs, the feelings he has experienced, and in others being infected (*zarazhaiutsia*) by those feelings and also experiencing them."[341] Tolstoy's deliberate use of the epidemiological metaphor reinforces the notion that art plays a decisive role in shaping the health of both the individual and the social body through immediate and

[339] Translation from Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, *What is Art?* (London: Penguin, 1995), 123. "Искусство, вместе с речью, есть одно из орудий общения, а потому и прогресса, т.е. движения вперед человечества к совершенству" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 30, 151).

[340] "Особенность же этого средства общения, отличающая его от общения посредством слова, состоит в том, что словом один человек передает другому свои мысли, искусством же люди передают друг другу свои чувства" (Tolstoy, PSS, T. 30, 64).

[341] Pevear and Volokhonsky, 40. "Искусство есть деятельность человеческая, состоящая в том, что один человек сознательно известными внешними знаками передает другим испытываемые им чувства, а другие люди заражаются этими чувствами и переживают их" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 30, 65).

involuntary, albeit consciously structured engagement.[342] By repeatedly classifying art as a communicative endeavor that "infects," suggesting that it elicits a visceral response in the recipient, Tolstoy foregrounds art's transformative effect on the subject itself, which through the process of "infection" communes with a range of other subjects. However, as scholars of Tolstoy's aesthetics have noted, this unification does not simply result in homogenization, amalgamation, or loss of identity, but a reaffirmation of individuality and mutual tolerance.[343] Of the three criteria he posits as fundamental for successful works of art – clarity (*iasnost'*), particularity of the feeling transmitted (*osobennost' chuvstva*), and sincerity (*iskrennost'*) of the artist, the latter two in particular stress the "individualizing, not the homogenizing, aspects of the artistic effect."[344] This tension between harmonious unity and individual difference in the production and reception of art finds parallels in conceptualizations of the consumption of fashion, which is defined as a process marked by the inseparable mechanisms of union and segregation, assimilation and distinction. Despite their divergent disciplinary, ethical, and aesthetic approaches, Tolstoy and theorists of the fashion system both point to the intrinsically communicative features of their objects of study; the organizing principle in the experience of art and fashion involves a dynamic negotiation between the self and the world.[345] Moreover, both art

[342] For a more detailed discussion of this metaphor see Emerson, 238-239.

[343] Emerson, 244.

[344] Emerson, 245. Emerson also points out that "the *osobennost'* (the 'particularity' or definitiveness) of the artist [is] explained by the Russian root *osob-*, the individualizing principles, that quality which makes each of us what we uniquely are" (Emerson, 244).

[345] See Roland Barthes, *The Language of Fashion* (New York: Berg, 2006); Jean Baudrillard, "Fashion, or The Enchanting Spectacle of the Code," *Symbolic Exchange and Death* (London: Sage, 1993); Georg Simmel, "Fashion," *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 62.6 (1957).

and fashion function as representations of mankind's will to progress, and provide avenues for the individual's psychic engagement with the relational nature of modernity.

Although *What is Art?* does not explicitly reveal Tolstoy's attitudes on the representational system of fashion, his comments on decorative arts offer a conceptual reference point for his views on objects that occupy the ostensibly incompatible spheres of art and commodities. In distinguishing between genuine (*nastoiashchee iskusstvo*) and counterfeit (*poddel'noe iskusstvo*) art, Tolstoy argues that the former requires no special ornamentation or method, while the latter relies on decoration and convention in eliciting a response in the recipient:

> Искусство нашего времени и нашего круга стало блудницей. И это сравнение верно до малейших подробностей. Оно так же не ограничено временем, так же всегда разукрашено, так же всегда продажно, так же заманчиво и губительно. […] Настоящее искусство не нуждается в украшениях, как жена любящего мужа. Поддельное искусство, как проститутка, должно быть всегда изукрашено.
>
> The art of our time and circle has become a harlot. And this comparison holds true in the smallest details. It is, in the same way, not limited in time, is always in fancy dress, is always for sale; it is just as alluring and pernicious. […] Genuine art has no need for dressing up, like the wife of a loving husband. Counterfeit art, like a prostitute, must always be decked out.[346]

This model defines genuine art as free from the whims of the marketplace, suggesting that only such art can gain universal appeal by remaining unconstrained by the programmatic views of a particular class or structure of power. Genuine art represents the contemporary cultural norms of the artist's time and place, and endeavors to unify its recipients in a common aesthetic experience. The conflation of counterfeit art with the image of the prostitute betrays Tolstoy's

[346] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 30, 178. Pevear and Volokhonsky, 150.

disapproval of the commodification and institutionalization of artistic production, as well as his rejection of the artifice and immorality he views as characteristic of the art of the upper classes.[347] Yet, in spite of this seemingly absolute disavowal, Tolstoy acknowledges in his discussion of decorative arts that even those objects produced for ornamentation and the marketplace may possess qualities of genuine art, as long as their artistic content "consists in the feeling (*chuvstvo*) of admiration, of delight, which the artist experienced in the combining of lines or colors and with which he infects (*zarazhaet*) the viewer."[348] Rather than using such objects to restore the category of "beauty" to the evaluation of art, Tolstoy instead reiterates the importance of the "infectious" quality in judging and experiencing products that may not readily fall under the categories of good or genuine art. The focus of his aesthetics is on the psychological and social dynamics of the artistic experience, rather than merely on the qualities of the product. Within this scheme even a commodity may attain the status of effective art, as long as it generates a community united in its experience of it.

Many scholars have observed that Tolstoy's often-contradictory views on art and aesthetics receive clearer and more practical articulation in his novels than in his theoretical

[347] Prostitution was a common metaphor for the rise of nineteenth-century urbanism, symbolizing commodification, mass production, and the rise of the masses. The prostitute was equally romanticized and condemned in the prose of the period, as her libidinal activities represented the break with nature and engagement in a sterile, artificial existence that appeared as key features of urbanization. Tolstoy's condemnation of this figure dovetails with the overarching themes of *Anna Karenina*, as it champions family life and domesticity, and a return to the countryside and agricultural activity as sources of rational social organization.

[348] Pevear and Volokhonsky, 135. "Содержание искусства всякого рода украшений состоит не в красоте, а в чувстве восхищения, любования перед сочетанием линий или красок, которые испытал художник и которыми он заражает зрителя." (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 30, 164).

statements.[349] In her reading of *Anna Karenina*, Amy Mandelker argues that the novel "problematizes the theme of visual representation to critique the aesthetic category of the beautiful, the framed, the embodied, and the feminine."[350] Examining Tolstoy's oeuvre and aesthetics as a unified artistic philosophy, Mandelker suggests that *Anna Karenina* conflates the problem of representation (particularly as it applies to the tropes of realist literature) with the woman question[351] and its associated social conventions, resulting in a text that emphasizes the visual aspect (such as paintings and images of female beauty) as a source of narrative structures and meta-textual commentary. The novel thus abounds in ekphrastic moments – verbal descriptions of visual works of art and of the characters' spectatorship of art – which arrest narrative progression and alert the reader to the problem of embodied and represented subjectivity.[352] In employing the device of portraiture, Tolstoy engages the Western novelistic tradition of framing as it applies in particular to female subjectivity. Throughout the novel he frames Anna Karenina literally (in three portraits) and figuratively (through the other characters' perceptions of her, as well as through Anna's contemplative self-portraits), rendering her an object that engenders voyeuristic pleasure and inspires consumption. As Mandelker points out, this technique underscores Anna's status as a represented character within a work of art, and

[349] See John Bayley, *Tolstoy and the Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Amy Mandelker, *Framing Anna Karenina: Tolstoy, the Woman Question, and the Victorian Novel* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993); Gary Saul Morson, *Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in "War and Peace"* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987).

[350] Mandelker, 4.

[351] Although the theme of oppressed or superfluous women had already received literary treatment during the 1840s, it was only in the aftermath of the Crimean War that the issue of women's education and emancipation ("the woman question") became the focus of active sociopolitical debate among the Russian intelligentsia, as well as the topic of literary works aimed at challenging and transforming the social order that continued to promote the subjugation of women.

[352] Mandelker, 92.

provides the means by which the novel prompts the reader to consider the meta-aesthetic implications of the constructions of the feminine self, as well as of modern subjectivity in general.[353] Subjectivity thus emerges as a constant negotiation between the self and the world, agency and representation, being and branding – a process that makes itself most apparent at the intersection of visual and consumer culture.

Drawing and expanding upon Mandelker's assertion that Anna's framing alternately defines and deconstructs her status as a commodity, spectacle, art object, and subject, this chapter examines the ways in which sartorial references contribute to the construction and critique of commodified subjectivity in the novel. Rather than cataloguing the many and various incarnations of costume, fashion, and ornamentation in the novel, my analysis focuses on several parallel passages that combine the visual frame with the sartorial one, thereby blurring the line between subject and object, and between fashion as a form of communication and fashion as a form of pleasure. In tracing the economies of the self that emerge in *Anna Karenina*, I turn to the "labyrinth of connections" (*labirint stseplenii*)[354] that unites the representations of various characters in the novel, and examine the mechanism by which sartorial signification "infects" those representations and guides the reader's experience of the commodified subject. As I aim to show, this dynamic association of consumption and communication, through which individual

[353] Mandelker, 101, 110.

[354] The emphasis on indirect and symbolic linkages is frequently used in studies of *Anna Karenina* to account for the novel's main structural principle; Eikhenbaum's comments are illustrative of this scholarly trend: "Роман держится не сцеплением событий самих по себе, а сцеплением тем и образов и единством отношения к ним" (Boris Eikhenbaum, *Lev Tolstoy: Semidesiatie gody* [Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1974], 127). Internal connection and unity of attitude toward them emerge as the essence of art not only in aesthetic tracts such as *What Is Art*, but also in Tolstoy's private correspondence such as his April 23/26, 1876 letter to N.N. Strakhov: "[...] Для критики искусства нужны люди, которые бы показывали бессмыслицу отыскивания мыслей в худож[ественном] произвед[ении] и постоянно руководили бы читателей в том бесконечном лабиринте сцеплений, в кот[ором] и состоит сущность искусства, и к тем законам, кот[орые] служат основан[ием] этих сцеплений" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 62, 269).

subjectivity attains meaning only in the context of a unified system of signification emerges out of the novel's engagement with the fashion system and its foregrounding of the commodity's liminal status as a commercial and artistic object. The latter portion of this chapter briefly comments on Joe Wright's 2012 cinematic adaptation, whose theatrical chronotope, lavish production design, and aggressive cross-marketing with high fashion and ready-to-wear brands appear to counter the novel's structural principles, symbolic networks, and timeless themes, as well as Tolstoy's conceptions of good or genuine art. Rather than assessing the film's relative successes and failures as an adaptation, I suggest that Wright's exaggeration of the novel's material realities, fetishization of costume, and artificial staging in fact represent the logical conclusion of the text's commodification of the subject. That is, he markets the novel's message as a realized metaphor, whereby costume both prescribes the protagonists' identities and functions as pure spectacle, remaining independent of the structures of narrative and character for signification. Wright's adaptation thus emerges as a consumer product unto itself, capable of both absorbing and imposing meaning for a contemporary audience.

Sources of Fashion, Display, and Framing in Tolstoy's Novel

In assessing the nature of Tolstoy's aesthetics in *Anna Karenina*, scholars have focused on the mimetic nature of his writing, and the ways in which material realities of everyday life come to organize the novel's symbolic networks. In her essay "Literature in Search of Reality" (*Literatura v poiskakh real'nosti*), Lidiia Ginzburg examines descriptive overabundance as one of the hallmark devices of Realist prose, and identifies "inessential signs" (*nesushchestvennye priznaki*) that do not have any immediate impact on the plot as nonetheless crucial to creating the

illusion of real life through symbolic connotations.[355] Ginzburg's example of this phenomenon is Anna's small red bag (*krasnyi meshochek*), which appears in decisive moments throughout the novel, most notably as a temporary foil to her final act of suicide.[356] Analyzing the mechanism by which symbolic meaning is conferred upon the object, Barbara Lonnqvist points out that the bag evolves from a mere travel accessory on Anna's journeys between Moscow and Petersburg to a dynamic repository of the novel's central conflict between self-indulgence and morality, between material pleasures and spiritual pursuits.[357] The bag's red color alternately hides Anna's flush of pleasure and exposes her blush of shame during the first encounter with Vronsky, eventually coming to signify the full weight of her internal struggle: "The red bag, having followed Anna on her journey of passion, has become a symbol of her earthly, bodily existence, and only when she has freed herself of it is she ready to go."[358] This ostensibly insignificant sartorial item motivates the novel's dramatic moments, and its various incarnations – from a small bag (*meshochek*) during Anna's first journey to Moscow, to a traveling bag (*dorozhnyi meshok*) following her confession to Karenin, to a paradoxically sentient object (*meshok, vzdorgnuv na pruzhinakh*) during her final journey – not only mimic the heroine's psychological

[355] "Несущественные признаки, не служа непосредственно фабульному движению или развитию магистральных тем произведения, имеют, однако, с этими событиями и темами символическую связь, неизбежно порождаемую контекстом." (Lidiia Ginzburg, *Literatura v poiskakh real'nosti: stat'i, esse, zametki* [Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987], 22).

[356] "Она хотела упасть под поравнявшийся с ней серединою первый вагон. Но *красный мешочек*, который она стала снимать с руки, задержал ее, и было уже поздно: середина миновала ее. […] И ровно в ту минуту, как середина между колесами поравнялась с нею, она откинула *красный мешочек* и, вжав в плечи голову, упала под вагон на руки и легким движением, как бы готовясь тотчас же встать, опустилась на колена." (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 348. Italics are my own.)

[357] Barbara Lonnqvist, "Anna Karenina," *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*, Donna Tussig Orwin, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 82.

[358] Lonnqvist, 89.

and emotional transformations, but also engage the novel's internal symbolic connections. Similarly, Donna Orwin highlights the metaphorical and narrative significance of the glove Anna removes while delivering her opinion during a conversation that takes place in Betsy Tverskaya's salon, on the matter of passionate love and whether it justifies infidelity: "Here, as elsewhere in Tolstoy's fiction, the glove removed symbolizes a departure from conventional sexual mores."[359] Moreover, Vronsky interprets Anna's playing with the glove in the context of her aphorism "эсли сколько голов, столько умов, то и сколко сердец, столько родов любви," deeming her receptive and sympathetic to his pursuit of her; this moment reinforces and propels one of the novel's chief thematic threads, which is the conflict between individual desire and universal morality.[360] Thus although ornamental objects, accessories, and other elements of sartorial signification typically function as static features that merely add color to a Realist textual tableau, in *Anna Karenina* they serve as dynamic reflections of the characters' emotional, psychological, and philosophical states, and contribute to the text's symbolic linkages and narrative progress.

Despite Tolstoy's philosophical misgivings about the artistic value of commodities, consumer objects, and their representation, the generic sources of his novel necessitated a constructive approach to their deployment in his text. Genres that have garnered significant scholarly attention as generative sources of Tolstoy's novel are the society tale, the physiological sketch, and the etiquette book. In his monumental study of Tolstoy's creative process in the 1870s, Eikhenbaum points out that with *Anna Karenina* the author returns to the old themes of

[359] Donna Tussig Orwin, *Tolstoy's Art and Thought, 1847-1880* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 180.

[360] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 146. "If there are as many minds as there are men, then there are as many kinds of love as there are hearts" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 138).

literature concerning the nobility, and that his text exhibits a close kinship with the novels of family, love, and adultery of the 1830s and 1840s. More specifically, Eikhenbaum notes the similarities between the narrative design of Tolstoy's novel and Pushkin's society tale fragment "The guests assembled at the dacha…" (*Gosti s"ezzhalis' na dachu*, 1828), in which the guests speculate on the future of an adulterous society lady, and which concludes with her being abandoned by her lover and contemplating suicide. Expanding upon the themes, images, and concepts in Pushkin's prose, Tolstoy moves beyond the social and psychological typologies of the society tale and the *physiologie*, creating fluid (*tekuchie*) and changeable (*izmenchivye*) characters whose intimate traits are common to all mankind and readily encountered by the reader.[361] Unlike the writers of the Natural School, Tolstoy avoids endowing his characters with definite and immutable traits that reveal themselves in their every action, word, external characteristic, or even in their last name.[362] Within his aesthetic system, material realia of everyday life, including sartorial markers, contribute to the organic connection of disparate episodes in the novel, and allow for a greater depth of psychological analysis that aims to account for the contradictions in individual and social consciousness.

In his analysis of society tale elements in *Anna Karenina*, W. Gareth Jones suggests that although the genre's dramatic motivation stems from the clash between individual aspirations and oppressive social mores, Tolstoy is "less interested in the freeing of the individual from

[361] "[Люди Толстого] не типы и даже не вполне характеры: они 'текучи' и изменчивы, они поданы интимно – как индивидуальности, наделенные общечеловеческими свойствами и легко соприкасающиеся. ... Толстовский принцип интимности и 'текучести,' резко отличающий его психологический реализм от реализма других писателей, восходит к Пушкину – как развитие и дозревание его метода" (Eikhenbaum, 151).

[362] "Не только Чичиков, Хлестаков, Плюшкин, Ноздрев, но и Раскольников, и Свидригайлов, и Смердяков, и Карамазовы носят свои фамилии не как случайные условия обозначения, а как характерные и характеризующие их прозвища. … Для героев Толстого характерны не фамилии (которые большей частью незначительны или прямо неудачны), а имена…" (Eikhenbaum, 151).

Society than in the restoration of a good society in which individuals could thrive."[363] Jones contends that Tolstoy aims to present his reader with the practical model of an alternative high society, based on older noble traditions steeped in simplicity that contravene the ever-changing tastes and conventions of the modern gentry; to that end, Tolstoy adopts and upends the setting and style of the society tale. Princess Miagkaya emerges as one of the representatives of that alternative, as her plain appearance and direct manner render her an outcast whose presence highlights the artifice and moral bankruptcy of the other guests in Betsy's salon. As elsewhere in Tolstoy's texts, her unprepossessing physical features and careless attire connote moral probity; the narrator's introduction underscores this quality: "[Т]олстая, красная, без бровей и без шиньона, белокурая дама в старом шелковом платье. Это была княгиня Мягкая, известная своею простотой, грубостью обращения и прозванная *enfant terrible*."[364] The simplicity of her appearance starkly contrasts the rich, exacting self-presentation of the ambassador's wife (*chernyi barkhat, chernye rezkie brovy*), and the gleaming, plush décor of Betsy's salon, which mimics the prototypical setting of a society tale.[365] Miagkaya occupies a liminal position in the

[363] W. Gareth Jones, "Tolstoy's Alternative Society Tales," *The Society Tale in Russian Literature from Odoevskii to Tolstoy*, ed. Neil Cornwell (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998), 108.

[364] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 141. "A fat, red-faced, fair-haired woman with no eyebrows and no chignon, in an old silk dress; this was Princess Miagkaya, well known for her simplicity of manner, and nicknamed the *enfant terrible*" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 133. Italics are in the original.).

[365] "Почти в одно и то же время вошли: хозяйка с освеженною прической и освеженным лицом из одной двери и гости из другой в большую гостиную с темными стелами, пушистыми коврами и ярко освещенным столом, блестевшим под огнями свеч белизною скатерти, серебром самовара и прозрачным фарфором чайного прибора. Хозяйка села за самовар и сняла перчатки. Передвигая стулья и кресла с помощью незаметных лакеев, общество разместилось, разделившись на две части, — у самовара с хозяйкой и на противоположном конце гостиной — около красивой жены посланника в черном бархате и с черными резкими бровями" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 140). The glittering, sumptuous details that characterize Betsy's salon underscore that this is the domain of high society tastes and conventions. The velvet adorning the ambassador's wife contributes to this image, as the fabric had since the 17th century been considered a marker of wealth, luxury, and good taste (R.M. Kirsanova, *Kostium v russkoi khudozhestvennoi kul'ture* [Moskva: Bol'shaia russkaia entsiklopediia, 1995], 30). Her sharply-defined brows function as a physical manifestation of the expectation that rules of social conduct be strictly observed both in appearance and demeanor.

drawing room, belonging neither to the circle gathered around Betsy, nor the one gathered around the ambassador's wife, and it is from this position that she exercises her rhetorical and moral authority: "Эффект, производимый речами княгини Мягкой, всегда был одинаков, и секрет производимого ею эффекта состоял в том, что она говорила хотя и не совсем кстати, как теперь, но простые вещи, имеющие смысл."[366] This authority is invoked in a subsequent scene depicting a croquet match, during which Betsy reprimands Anna for her intentional failure to understand and participate in the conventions of society conversation (*cosy chat*), likening her to an *enfant terrible* (*uzhasnyi rebenok*), and consequently, to Miagkaya.[367] Anna's self-presentation here, consisting of dress that becomes her (*tualet, kotoryi idet k nei*) and is appropriate for the occasion, belies her discursive renunciation of polite conduct, figuratively placing her in the liminal position inhabited by Miagkaya, and on the margins of the social circle known as "The Seven Wonders of the World" (*Les sept merveilles du monde*) that the narrator deems "an imitation of an imitation of something" (*podrazhanie podrazhaniu chemu-to*).[368] The manifestations of Miagkaya's simplicity and authenticity in Anna underscore the novel's instructive character and reify the infectious nature of sincere and genuine interaction as encoded in costume and rhetoric, which contrasts with the formulaic and satirical undertones that govern the relations of high society. By highlighting the decline of being into having, as evidenced by the simulative nature of *svet*, Tolstoy enters into a critique of contemporary social engagement and consumer culture. Narrative elements of the society tale not only aid in structuring Tolstoy's

[366] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 142. "The effect produced by Princess Miagkaya's talk was always the same, and the secret of it consisted in her saying simple things that made sense, even if, as now, they were not quite appropriate" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 135).

[367] "Это вы захватываете область княгини Мягкой. Это вопрос ужасного ребенка" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 314).

[368] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 311.

novel as an account of upper class mores, but also as commentary on the nature of a society in which spectacle and the representation of lived experience have come to supplant genuine social relationships.

The notion that *Anna Karenina* is intended not only as a chronicle of everyday life (*bytopisanie*), but also as "a demonstration of the right way to live, and a demonstration intended for active emulation" garners analytical attention in Catriona Kelly's history of Russian advice literature.[369] Kelly finds that Tolstoy's texts abound in traces of the "novelized conduct book," that is, a book whose novelistic elements and aesthetic features dramatize a set of accepted norms for private and public conduct. She points to the extended scene in which Dolly Oblonskaya, Kitty Levina, and Princess Shcherbatskaya use a new method of cooking jam as a compelling example of this phenomenon, whereby a seemingly mundane, but nonetheless socially codified activity evokes concerns such as the domestic economy, the handing down of cultural patterns, and the contribution of collective memory to the maintenance of harmony.[370] In Kelly's estimation, this "demonstration of food preparation as a craft, as a collective activity, and as a quintessential instance of good house management, is totally different in effect from other food-related scenes in the novel, which revolve around consumption, as opposed to production."[371] Rather than merely illustrating culinary prudence and sustainable living, this

[369] Catriona Kelly, *Refining Russia: Advice Literature, Polite Culture, and Gender from Catherine to Yeltsin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 133.

[370] This scene and the jam "theme" occupy an entire chapter in the latter part of the novel (Part VI, Chapter 2), illustrating the important role that advice literature as a device plays in elucidating some of the overarching themes of the text. Although the scene bears limited resemblance to an actual cookbook (which would, for instance, include greater detail about quantities, proportions, and methodology), its "recipe" provides a model for family practices and advice for household management.

[371] Kelly, 135.

episode provides a model of authentic and moral behavior that leads to an organic communion of subjects and a restoration of social relations unmediated by commodities.

Tolstoy's deployment of advice literature with a particular focus on matters of style, taste, and sartorial conventions, comes to the fore in several scenes involving Levin's participation in and perception of high society circles. Much like Miagkaya, Levin embodies alternative self-fashioning, as his simple self-presentation and plain rhetoric appear out of place in the city, where he is dismissed as a feckless provincial landowner: "Он же был помещик, занимающийся разведением коров, стрелянием дупелей и постройками, то есть бездарный малый, из которого ничего не вышло, и делающий, по понятиям общества, то самое, что делают никуда не годившиеся люди."[372] In the gentry set's assessment, Levin's practical engagements underscore his lack of elegance and distinction; he halfheartedly and unsuccessfully endeavors to contravene this view by donning occasion-appropriate attire mandated by social etiquette. Upon arriving in Moscow to propose to Kitty, Levin meets with Stiva, who embarrasses him by commenting on the formal nature of his clothing: "Как же ты говорил, что никогда больше не наденешь европейского платья? — сказал он, оглядывая его новое, очевидно от французского портного, платье. — Так! я вижу: новая фаза."[373] Levin's bespoke (rather than ready-to-wear) suit made by a French tailor who would have been considered the authority on the latest high society fashions, leads Stiva to deduce Levin's plan to visit Kitty's family, and to infer that it is only under such circumstances that Levin would don

[372] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 26. "He was a landowner, occupied with breeding cows, shooting snipe, and building things, that is, a giftless fellow who amounted to nothing and was doing, in society's view, the very thing that good-for-nothing people do" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 22).

[373] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 22. "'Didn't you say you'd never put on European clothes again?' he said, looking over his new clothes, obviously from a French tailor. 'So! I see – a new phase'" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 19).

the conventional "European" style that does not become him, yet which connotes acquiescence to aristocratic etiquette.[374] The subsequent dinner scene reveals Levin's view of sartorial conventions as he observes Stiva's flirtation with a Frenchwoman, whom he evaluates as an artificial and mimetic object: "[E]му оскорбительна была эта француженка, вся составленная, казалось, из чужих волос, *poudre de riz* и *vinaigre de toilette*."[375] Although he accedes to the rules of conduct in fashionable society, Levin ultimately finds them false and dehumanizing, retreating into the realm of genuine social relations at his provincial estate. Here, the donning of his signature sheepskin coat (*tulup*) or fur jacket (*polushubok*) signifies a reaffirmation of the self and its engagement in the productive, organic life of the countryside.[376] Levin's frustration with sartorial discipline causes a delay on his wedding day, as his servant struggles to find a pressed and proper shirt that will complete the master's wedding costume consisting of a dark suit with a deceptively casual, open-front waistcoat topped by a tailcoat:

[374] Although the Russian ready-to-wear industry took over a significant segment of the buying public by the third quarter of the nineteenth century, ready-made wear for men and women already began appearing in urban centers as early as the mid-1840s. These styles attracted a substantial working class, bourgeois, and lower gentry clientele, while the upper aristocracy remained faithful to the artisanal excellence of tailors, who remained on the cutting edge of sartorial tastes and trends. For a detailed history of this industry, see T.S. Aleshina, "K istorii proizvodstva gotovogo plat'ia v Moskve v seredine XIX-nachale XX v.," *Trudy Gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo muzeia*, vol. 67 (1988), 133-147.

[375] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 37. "This Frenchwoman, who seemed to consist entirely of other people's hair, *poudre de riz* and *vinaigre de toilette*, was offensive to him" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 33. Italics are in the original.).

[376] After his failed marriage proposal to Kitty, Levin returns from Moscow to his estate, and is transported literally and figuratively: "[K]огда 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. […] С бодрым чувством надежды на новую, лучшую жизнь он в девятом часу ночи подъехал к своему дому" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 98-99). Recounting his first encounter with Karenin, Levin recalls that his *polushubok* nearly got him thrown off the train, but that his high-flown language and intelligent conversation compensated for the deceptive simplicity of his attire, with Karenin ultimately insisting that Levin remain in his private compartment ("Кондуктор, противно пословице, хотел по платью проводить меня вон, […] но я поторопился начать умный разговор, чтобы загладить свой полушубок" [Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 406].)

"Рубашка, надетая с утра, была измята и невозможна с открытой модой жилетов."[377] Although the richly appointed crowd of wedding guests and Kitty's luxurious Parisian gown reinforce this discipline and the attendant air of communal consumption, Levin ultimately finds release and validation in Kitty's "innocent truthfulness" (*nevinnaia pravdivost*), which he identifies in her "in spite of her attire" (*nesmotria na prigotovlennuiu pyshnost' nariada*).[378] That is, it is precisely her deliberate framing as the paragon of bridal taste and etiquette for the visual consumption of the wedding party that paradoxically "infects" Levin with the sense of her genuine nature, and of the potential for domestic bliss. Rather than simply mocking pretension in customs and manners in these scenes, Tolstoy provides a positive counter-image of *russkii byt*. Levin's perspective thus represents a counterpoint to the etiquette manuals and fashion columns that present clothing as constituting proprieties and manners, and that train their readers in the art of converting sartorial capital to social capital. The evocation of advice literature in this context points to the overarching problem of constructions of the self in a society increasingly preoccupied with consumption and display, where commodities mediate social relations between

[377] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 15. "The shirt, worn since morning, was wrinkled and impossible with the now fashionable open-front waistcoat" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 449).

[378] The wedding guests are described as an amalgamated crowd reduced to sartorial markers of status, which demonstrate the group's conditioned observance of proper custom and social conventions: "На правой стороне теплой церкви, в толпе фраков и белых галстуков, мундиров и штофов, бархата, атласа, волос, цветов, обнаженных плеч и рук и высоких перчаток, шел сдержанный и оживленный говор, странно отдававшийся в высоком куполе" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 14). Following this trend, Kitty's wedding costume is both ornamental and informative: "[Левин] смотрел на ее высокую прическу с длинным белым вуалем и белыми цветами, на высоко стоявший сборчатый воротник, особенно девственно закрывавший с боков и открывавший спереди ее длинную шею, и поразительно тонкую талию, и ему казалось, что она была лучше, чем когда-нибудь, — не потому, чтоб эти цветы, этот вуаль, это выписанное из Парижа платье прибавляли что-нибудь к ее красоте, но потому, что, несмотря на эту приготовленную пышность наряда, выражение ее милого лица, ее взгляда, ее губ было все тем же ее особенным выражением невинной правдивости." (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 14). The flowers, veil, and gown suggest not only the extent of her fortune, but also indicate her good breeding; the modest cut of her gown in particular reveals the ascetic luxury that would have been used as one of the measures of good taste during this period. For more on the semiotics of decoration, see Philippe Perrot, *Fashioning the Bourgeoisie: A History of Clothing in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 87-123.

individuals, thereby generating a seemingly endless circulation of communion and communication.

In considering the mechanism by which Tolstoy constructs and critiques commodified subjectivity in *Anna Karenina*, the fashion plate emerges as an important intergeneric and interpretive device, yet one that scholars of the novel have not addressed.[379] The interplay of art and fashion has been substantially examined in the context of French literature and art, with Valerie Steele, among others, suggesting that the fashion plate is a minor art form crucial to modern self-fashioning in nineteenth-century Paris.[380] Fashion as a mode of self-creation has always been a process of collective, rather than individual definition, with idealized figures in fashion illustrations offering instruction in how to "look the part." The imagery of the fashion plate celebrated artifice and ideal beauty, creating new and contemporary models of male and female subjects while chronicling the ephemeral nature of modern urban life; the fashion plate was designed to be both aesthetically appealing and informative. Steele points out that every element in a fashion print, including the composition, the use of space, the setting, and the position and type of figures, was "subordinate to the goal of showing off the clothes to the best advantage and creating an image of fashionable beauty" to be bought and sold.[381] The number of figures in a fashion plate was on average two or three, with little interaction between them in order to display as much of each costume and emphasize its salient qualities; the setting, in turn,

[379] As I point out earlier in this chapter, Mandelker's study of representation and framing in the novel considers the influence of portraiture, figure painting, and sculpture, as well as the ekphrastic tradition in Western literature; Mandelker does not discuss any commercial or popular genres in her work.

[380] Valerie Steele, *Paris Fashion: A Cultural History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 99. See in particular the chapters titled "The Picture of Paris," "Art and Fashion," and "Le High Life."

[381] Steele, 113.

gave an indication of the social occasion for which the clothes were designed, and implicitly, of the spaces that circumscribed the men's and women's respective domains. The virtually interchangeable figures formed flat and occasionally interlocking silhouettes, providing a multi-angle view of the design features that made the costume particularly *á la mode*, and of the various socially-sanctioned activities that could take place in a single setting. While the fashionable stylization of the body applied to both genders, sexual segregation of men's and women's prints was the norm well into the 1850s, with women emerging as the primary consumers of the fashion print and its representations of the spectacle of modern life.[382] As a veritable arena of spectacular realities, fashion illustration brought together fashion producers, consumers, and spectators, thus coalescing the categories of being, having, and appearing, and promoting the image of the self as a commodified piece of art.

Although the fashion plate dealt with a restricted set of themes, its technique, presentation, and subject matter permeated high art and contributed to the rise of artistic modernism. Mark Roskill's article, "Early Impressionism and the Fashion Print," demonstrates the influence of fashion illustration on Claude Monet's work, concluding that the painter "[used] conventions of pose and expression found in the contemporary fashion media as a means of descriptive presentation."[383] Monet's paintings stress the upright, static character of the poses and the lack of psychological contact between the figures despite their physical closeness,

[382] Steele notes that fashion illustrations with exclusively male figures belonged to the provenance of tailors' trade publications (Steele, 116). In addition, the last quarter of the nineteenth century witnessed a rise in the publishing of men's fashion press, which now took on a satirical and pornographic form and tone, featuring humorous captions and centerfolds in risqué styles such as underwear and corsets, or sprawled across the page in various stages of undress (Steele, 120).

[383] Mark Roskill, "Early Impressionism and the Fashion Print," *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 12:807 (June 1970), 395.

allowing the costumes to stand out from the background and become a focus of interest in their own right. Much like in the fashion plate, the central (usually female) figure presents the viewer with a perfect panorama of the construction and arrangement of her fashionable costume, inviting approbation and imitation, scrutiny and judgement. John Rewald notes a similar phenomenon in Paul Cézanne's works, who used fashion prints as pretexts for his own paintings representing the character and the diversions of the contemporary urban female subject: "[H]e thought nothing of copying the insipid ladies in these plates, infusing them with a strange and dramatic power."[384] Following the structural conventions of the fashion plate, Impressionist painters communicated tacit imperatives of taste, propriety, and conscience, while promoting engagement with a material world of consumption and leisure that equally governed the public and the private spheres. Their visions of modernity rejected the existence of the eternally beautiful in art, propagating the representational and the transitory as constitutive of the modern self. By employing and transforming the language of fashion into high art, the Impressionists represented the contemporary cultural norms that increasingly championed the merging of the discursive and the visual.[385] As I aim to show in the subsequent sections, this technique of fashion-cum-art informs and structures Tolstoy's critique of commodified subjectivity in *Anna Karenina*, and motivates his examination of spectatorship and representation as fundamental mechanisms of communion and communication in modern society.

---

[384] John Rewald, *The History of Impressionism* (New York: MoMA, 1973), 208.

[385] Although Tolstoy expresses a distaste for Impressionist art in *What Is Art?*, suggesting that it is too intellectual and academic to be fully appreciated, its visual techniques and artistic intent in fact capture his views on the experience of genuine art and the "infectious" feelings that the artist transmits to the spectator (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 30, 103-104). For a socio-historical analysis of artistic intent and viewer experience of Impressionist art in the late-19th and early-20th centuries, see T.J. Clark, *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999).

Spectacular Realities and Masculine Commodities

The phenomenon of spectacle as reflective and constitutive of social organization and everyday experience in the era of industrialization has received significant scholarly attention in the European context, but notably less so in the Russian one.[386] The theoretical underpinnings of the concept of spectacle originate in Guy Debord's *The Society of the Spectacle*,[387] which theorizes the implications for capitalist society of the progressive shift within production towards the provision of consumer goods and services, and the ensuing "colonization" of everyday life: "The spectacle is the stage at which the commodity has succeeded in total colonization. Commodification is not only visible, we no longer see anything else; the world we see is the world of commodity."[388] This new phase of commodity production finds its loci in the industries of recreation, fashion, advertising, and display, and involves the restructuring and commercialization of free time, private life, leisure, and personal expression. In a "spectacular society," social relations become mediated by images, with disparate groups coming together through a collective affective experience of those images.[389] The visual representation of reality as spectacle – constituted and mediated by commodities – regulated and supplanted the personal, private, and everyday spheres of activity in the nineteenth century, creating a common culture

[386] See, for instance, Clark, *The Painting of Modern Life*; Perrot, *Fashioning the Bourgeoisie*; Vanessa R. Schwartz, *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-de-Siècle Paris* (Berkeley: UC Press, 1999); and Elizabeth Wilson, "The Invisible Flâneur," *New Left Review*, vol. 1:191 (1992), 90-110.

[387] The work was originally published in 1967. All references are to the following edition: Guy Debord, *Society of the Spectacle*, trans. Ken Knabb (London: Rebel Press, 2000).

[388] Debord, 21.

[389] "The spectacle is not a collection of images; it is a social relation between people that is mediated by images" (Debord, 7). This mechanism echoes Tolstoy's conceptualization of communion through the simultaneously subjective and collective experience of genuine art described earlier in this chapter.

and a sense of shared participation in the public sphere. Moreover, the commingling of private and public in ever-shifting representational contexts necessitated the internalization of discipline and social controls; that is, as modern life became a marketable mass of images that mixed classes and classifications, the instruction and ordering of society occurred through the communal consumption of the spectacle in its numerous incarnations.

In Tolstoy's novel, normative sociality necessitates an active and consistent engagement in matters of style, taste, and display, which in turn influence an individual's practical, philosophical, and emotional pursuits. While Levin represents an alternative sociality that rejects such engagements as false and superficial,[390] Stiva and Vronsky consume and participate in various forms of vestimentary discourse, and fashion themselves as masculine commodities for public display. The opening chapters of the novel prominently trace Stiva's everyday routine, which proceeds nearly mechanically despite his wife Dolly having been made aware of his affair with the governess. Rather than expressing the propriety, reserve, and self-control required not only by the immediate circumstances of his life, but also by the standards of fashionable dress,[391] Stiva's domestic costume and posing in the opening scene communicate his self-indulgent and materialist pursuits. The old aristocratic attributes of harmonious wastefulness and idleness come to the fore as he reclines on the Morocco-leather sofa (*saf'iannyi divan*) and reaches for the

[390] One of Levin's strongest statements on the issue emerges in a conversation with Dolly, during which she attempts to explain to him Kitty's choice of Vronsky as a consequence of his visual appeal and self-presentation. Levin dismisses this as the capricious choice of a consumer: "[Т]ак выбирают платье или не знаю какую покупку, а не любовь" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, Т. 18, 285).

[391] Austerity in men's clothing, which included the abandonment of color, adornment, and non-utilitarian accessories, and the adoption of severe cuts that simultaneously flattered and disguised the male form, took hold in the mid-19 century, and continued to be fashionable into the beginning of the 20th century. This style, which upheld the ideal of functional and hygienic dress, embodied the ideological justification for and social legitimacy of the bourgeoisie (Perrot, 29-34).

gilded embroidered slippers (*obdelannye v zolotistyi saf'ian tufli*) and dressing gown (*khalat*).[392] The sumptuous details of his attire and the deliberate posing reminiscent of an odalisque correspond in content and composition both to a fashion plate set in a boudoir and Orientalist painting, rendering Stiva a living advertisement for the mingling of Western and Eastern sensibilities, and an object of visual pleasure. His trendsetting status receives confirmation during preparations for a hunting trip, when Vasenka Veslovsky concludes that the combination of Stiva's tattered clothes and superior hunting gear represents "true hunter's dandyism" (*nastoiashchee okhotnich'e shchegol'stvo*), which is a look he intends to emulate in order to achieve Stiva's brand of aristocratic masculinity: "[С]иявш[ий] своею элегантною, откормленною и веселою барскою фигурой."[393] Dazzled by Stiva's shabby chic style, Veslovsky pegs his future social success on the symbolic implications of his own appearance rather than on interpersonal relationships, and the two relate to each other in this scene largely via their shared experience of the stylized spectacle of the hunt and old aristocratic comportment. Tolstoy's consistent use of language pertaining to glitter and light in association with Stiva in these scenes underscores his status as the embodiment of spectacle.[394] Furthermore, as the narrator confirms, Stiva's commitment to display influences not only his material choices, but

[392] "[Стива] проснулся […] на сафьянном диване. Он повернул свое полное, выхоленное тело на пружинах дивана, как бы желая опять заснуть надолго, с другой стороны крепко обнял подушку и прижался к ней щекой […]. [З]аметив полосу света, […] он весело скинул ноги с дивана, отыскал ими шитые женой (подарок ко дню рождения в прошлом году), обделанные в золотистый сафьян туфли и по старой, девятилетней привычке, не вставая, потянулся рукой к тому месту, где в спальне у него висел халат" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 3-4).

[393] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 149. "He understood it now, looking at Stepan Arkadyich, shining in those rags with the elegance of his well-nourished, gentlemanly figure, and decided that before the next hunting season he would be sure to set himself up in the same way" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 575).

[394] Throughout the novel, as in the examples given above, terms such as *blestiashchii, svetlyi, siiaiushchii,* etc. are used to describe Stiva's appearance and personality.

also his spiritual and ideological ones, rendering him into a passive recipient of social discipline: "Степан Аркадьич не избирал ни направления, ни взглядов, а эти направления и взгляды сами приходили к нему, точно так же, как он не выбирал формы шляпы или сюртука, а брал те, которые носят. А иметь взгляды ему, жившему в известном обществе, […] было так же необходимо, как иметь шляпу."[395] Within aristocratic circles, fashion and ideology achieve equal footing as commodity-images of unidentifiable origin (*sami prikhodili*) that come to organize social relations by stimulating cultural homogenization and hindering critical thought. As a consummate consumer, Stiva comfortably surrenders to the aesthetic and philosophical determinism of his consumption practices, which shape not only his integrated participation in the world around him, but also his commodified self-presentation.

Vronsky's initial appearances in the novel occur through the prism of other characters' perceptions of him, that is, through a series of discursive tableaus that subject him to the disciplining gaze of spectacular society. Both Stiva and Princess Shcherbatskaya conflate Vronsky's personal and professional qualities, and evaluate him in nearly identical terms, using the categories and vocabulary of desirable comportment that elicit the typologies of the society tale and the fashion feuilleton. Stiva praises Vronsky as "один из самых лучших образцов золоченой молодежи петербургской. […] Страшно богат, красив, большие связи, […] образован и очень умен; это человек, который далеко пойдет."[396] Vronsky's wealth,

[395] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 9. "Stepan Arkadyich chose neither his tendency nor his views, but these tendencies and views came to him themselves, just as he did not choose the shape of a hat or frock coat, but bought those that were in fashion. And for him, who lived in a certain circle, […] having views was as necessary as having a hat" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 7).

[396] Tolstoy, PSS, T. 18, 43. "Vronsky is one of the finest examples of the gilded youth of Petersburg. […] Terribly rich, handsome, big connections, […] he's both cultivated and intelligent. He is a man who will go far" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 39).

upbringing, and career also stoke Princess Shcherbatskaya's desires, albeit for a suitable son-in-law: "Очень богат, умен, знатен, на пути блестящей военно-придворной карьеры и обворожительный человек. Нельзя было ничего лучшего желать."[397] These assessments are notably devoid of sartorial detail, but it is precisely that lack that highlights these figures' internalization of commodity culture and its codes of fashionable conduct, superseding the need for material markers of status. Vronsky is thus evaluated as an objective representation of aristocratic culture, whose abstract "gilding" and "shine" communicate the superficial elegance associated with *au courant* high society. Prince Shcherbatsky affirms Vronsky's status as a pure commodity, dismissing him as an artificial, mass-produced dandy (*frantik, na mashine delaiut*); this industrial metaphor alludes to not only the technological advances in the production of clothing, but also to the pervasive regimentation of social life brought about through consumption.[398] Even the inception of Vronsky's liaison with Anna poses insignificant challenge to this machinery, which forces him to divert his private passions into uninterrupted expressions of fashionable sociality and the fulfillment of public duty: "[В]нешняя жизнь его неизменно и неудержимо катилась по прежним, *привычным рельсам* светских и полковых связей и интересов. […] Он чувствовал себя обязанным поддерживать установившийся на него взгляд."[399] In the estimation of high society, their affair is doomed from the start because it

[397] Tolstoy, PSS, T. 18, 48. "Very rich, intelligent, well-born, a brilliant military-courtly career, and a charming man. One could wish for nothing better" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 22).

[398] "А это франтик петербургский, их на машине делают, они все на одну стать, и все дрянь." (Tolstoy, PSS, T. 18, 49).

[399] Tolstoy, PSS, T. 18, 182-183. Italics are my own. "Though the whole of Vronsky's inner life was filled with his passion, his external life rolled inalterably and irresistibly along the former, habitual rails of social and regimental connections and interests. […] He felt it his duty to maintain the established view of himself" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 173).

represents an indulgence in pure passion and sentiment, rather than in the calculated conversion of emotional capital into social capital and personal advancement.[400] As the spectacle provides the mechanism for all social relations, it requires the integration not only of the private and public spheres, but also a reconciliation of the internal and external life of its participants.

The surveilling discipline of spectacular society ultimately fixes Vronsky into the ideal image of modern aristocratic masculinity. In a series of vignettes that recall Stiva's consumption habits and aspirations, Vronsky locates his double in a foreign prince who visits Petersburg and takes advantage of "Russian pleasures" in the process. The prince embodies the fashionable duality of gentlemanly rigor and aristocratic overindulgence; while his health and physical fitness represent the bourgeois ideals of functionality, hygiene, and self-discipline, his expenditure of wealth and consumption of "national pleasures" as a form of communication represent the cultivated wastefulness and leisure of high society.[401] In charge of organizing the prince's tour, Vronsky becomes burdened by the task of entertaining the foreign visitor whose dissolute lifestyle and self-indulgent public conduct reflect Vronsky's own image: "[T]o, что он видел в этом зеркале, не льстило его самолюбию. Это был очень глупый, и очень самоуверенный, и очень здоровый, и очень чистоплотный человек, и больше ничего. Он был джентльмен… Вронский сам был таковым и считал это большим достоинством

[400] Vronsky's mother views the liaison as a "desperate Wertherian passion" (*Verterovskaia otchaiannaia strast'*) that resembles nothing of the "brilliant, graceful liaison" (*blestiashchaia, gratsioznaia sviaz'*) that elevates a man's status in high society (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 184). Members of Vronsky's regiment initially envy the conspicuousness of his affair precisely because they think it will elevate his status through association with a highly-positioned official like Karenin (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 183).

[401] "Принц пользовался необыкновенным даже между принцами здоровьем; и гимнастикой и хорошим уходом за своим телом он довел себя до такой силы… Принц много путешествовал и находил, что одна из главных выгод теперешней легкости путей сообщения состоит в доступности национальных удовольствий." (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 373).

[…].”[402] In this scene he glimpses the dehumanizing effects of instantaneous rather than mediated pleasure, and the leveling effect of commodity culture that repackages ethical and aesthetic categories into pure representation. The prince’s unfettered self-presentation paradoxically represents the conservative and disciplining effects of the commercial material world, which promotes social relationships constituted through images, thereby eliminating the impulses for genuine social engagement or critique. The notion that Vrosnky is merely a two-dimensional figure in circulation with other images of fashionable aristocratic sociality receives ultimate confirmation during his Italian sojourn with Anna. The two take up residence in an old palazzo, which by its very appearance (*samoiu svoeiu vneshnost’iu*) inspires an apparent transformation in Vronsky, from a displaced landowner-courtier, to an amateur artist and patron of the arts who has renounced material pleasures and social convention for love.[403] The narrator characterizes this transformation as “an agreeable delusion” (*priiatnoe zabluzhdenie*), emphasizing its diverting and transitory nature. Vronsky’s engagement with the aesthetic realm becomes subsumed by the commercial representation of that engagement, as he converts his fascination with the ideals of medieval Italian life into sartorial markers: “[О]н даже шляпу и плед через плечо стал носить по-средневековски, что очень шло к нему.”[404] This conditioned merging of the ideal and the real, of genuine art and mass culture, affirms the

[402] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 374. “What he saw in that mirror was not flattering to his vanity. This was a very stupid, very self-confident, very healthy and very lceanly man, and nothing more. He was a gentleman… Vronsky was like that himself and considered it a great virtue…” (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 355).

[403] “[П]алаццо этот, после того как они переехали в него, самою своею внешностью поддерживал во Вронском приятное заблуждение, что он не столько русский помещик, егермейстер без службы, сколько просвещенный любитель и покровитель искусств, и сам — скромный художник, отрекшийся от света, связей, честолюбия для любимой женщины” (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 33).

[404] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 34. “He even began wearing his hat and a wrap over his shoulder in a medieval fashion, which was becoming to him” (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 467).

spectacle as constituting modern selves and mediating the relationships between them. In Tolstoy's novel, the public masculine world's dependence on the exhibition of status and distinction results in an endless circulation of commodity-images, which enforce existing paradigms of social power and maintain the status quo.

Anna on Display

Tolstoy's representation of the pervasive ethos of spectacle and consumption that characterize the urban society circles in his novel reaches its peak complexity in a series of parallel scenes that negotiate Anna's status as a commercial and aesthetic object, and place her at the center of the debate about the nature of feminized consumer culture. By the 1850s and 1860s, feverish economic growth and the loosening of class distinctions allowed Russian women to exercise a greater public presence in the workplace and the marketplace, heightening the divisions implicit in the artistic and social constructions of femininity that had been in place since the early decades of the century. As the separate feminine and masculine, private and public spheres coalesced, the transcendental innocence of the model wife and mother enshrined in domesticity became muddled by the demand that women act as proxies for their male counterparts' social status, and reinforce their own lack of engagement in productive activity by appearing in beautiful and expensive clothing.[405] At the same time that women were being encouraged to partake of the commercial material world, some critics condemned the moral and

[405] See Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007); Christine Ruane, "Clothes Shopping in Imperial Russia," *The Empire's New Clothes: A History of the Russian Fashion Industry, 1700-1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); and Richard Stites, *The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism, and Bolshevism, 1860-1930* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).

spiritual bankruptcy of fashionable display.[406] The dual femininity that arose as a consequence of the contradictory demands of distinction and morality figured prominently in fashion press and illustration, which promoted images of the exhibitionist but passive woman as the embodiment of fetishistic desire and visual pleasure.[407] Female images thus not only prescribed models of fashionable sociality, but also functioned in relation to the male and female spectators' appropriations or rejections of those models as part of their own representational system.

In describing Anna's appearance at the ball, Tolstoy rhetorically renders the compositional conventions of figurative art and the fashion plate, simultaneously presenting Anna as a work of art within a frame, and a fashionable commodity available for inspection, imitation, and consumption. Kitty's gaze reinforces the representational nature of Anna's costume and provides the framework for its signification:

> Анна была не в лиловом, как того непременно хотела Кити, а в черном, низко срезанном бархатном платье, открывавшем ее точеные, как старой слоновой кости, полные плечи и грудь и округлые руки с тонкою крошечною кистью. Все платье было обшито венецианским гипюром. На голове у нее, в черных волосах, своих без примеси, была маленькая гирлянда анютиных глазок и такая же на черной ленте пояса между белыми кружевами. Прическа ее была незаметна. Заметны были только, украшая ее, эти своевольные короткие колечки курчавых волос, всегда выбивавшиеся на затылке и висках. На точеной крепкой шее была нитка жемчугу. […] [Кити] теперь увидала ее совершенно новою и неожиданною для себя. Теперь она поняла, что Анна не могла быть в лиловом и что ее прелесть состояла именно в том, что она всегда выступала из своего туалета, что туалет никогда не мог быть виден на ней. И черное платье с пышными кружевами не было видно на ней; это была только рамка, и была видна только она, простая, естественная, изящная и вместе веселая и оживленная.

---

[406] Tolstoy prominently adopts this standpoint in "The Kreutzer Sonata" (*Kreitserova sonata*, 1889), in which he connects the enticing qualities of women's fashions and their deployment for the manipulation of men's sexual desire.

[407] Scholars suggest that the origins of this feminine duality stem from the late 18th-century phenomenon of the Great Masculine Renunciation, when men renounced the desire for exhibitionism in their own attire and so transferred the effects of display and the sexualization of the body through clothes onto the increasingly decorated woman. See J.C. Flügel, *The Psychology of Clothes* (New York: International Universities Press, 1971) and James Laver, *Costume and Fashion: A Concise History* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1995).

> Anna was not in lilac, as Kitty had absolutely wanted, but in a low-cut black velvet dress, which revealed her full shoulders and bosom, as if shaped from old ivory, and her rounded arms with their very small, slender hands. The dress was all trimmed with Venetian guipure lace. On her head, in her black hair, her own without admixture, was a small garland of pansies, and there was another on her black ribbon sash among the white lace. Her coiffure was inconspicuous. Conspicuous were only those willful ringlets of curly hair that adorned her, always coming out on her nape and temples. Around her firm, shapely neck was a string of pearls. […] [Kitty] saw her now in a completely new and, for her, unexpected way. Now she understood that Anna could not have been in lilac, that her loveliness consisted precisely in always standing out from what she wore, that what she wore was never seen on her. And the black dress with luxurious lace was not seen on her; it was just a frame, and only she was seen – simple, natural, graceful, and at the same time gay and animated.[408]

The striking detail of Kitty's vision in this scene mimics that of the fashion print, reducing Anna to a collection of vestimentary markers superimposed on a sculpted figure. While the combination of black velvet and single string of pearls communicates the ascetic luxury expected of the wife of a highly-positioned government official and the *comme-il-faut* moderation prescribed in the fashion press, the lace, flower, and ribbon decorations place Anna squarely into the realm of elegant, yet superficial opulence that characterizes Betsy's circle, "society proper" (*sobstvenno svet*). Indeed, the black velvet gown is seen again on the ambassador's wife, as she engages in small talk and malicious gossip that circumscribe the triviality of that circle's engagements. The seamless blend of art and artifice in Anna's presentation leads Kitty to admire the ostensibly natural and harmonious qualities of her coiffure[409] and toilette, and to conclude that her elaborate look merely complements, rather than constitutes her true character; that is,

[408] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 84-85. Translation from Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, *Anna Karenina* (London: Penguin, 2000), 78-79.

[409] The emphasis on elaborate headdress and hair decoration in this period prompted many female consumers to augment their natural hair with "scalpettes" or "frizettes" to which additional accessories could be attached (Laver, 191).

Kitty mistakes Anna's constructed visual identity for an exercise in individuality and freedom from the constraints of high society norms. Nonetheless, it is precisely the studied sartorial framing that conditions Kitty's perceptions, and shapes her interaction with Anna into one of spectatorship and voyeuristic pleasure.

While Anna appears as commodity-image of feminized consumer culture and its potential moral shortcomings, Kitty emerges as its contrasting double, whose genuine nature supersedes the trappings of fashion's artifice. Although the cut of her dress imparts a "cold, marble-like quality" (*kholodnaia mramornost'*) characteristic of sculpture, this quality manifests itself as a feeling (*chuvstvo*), rather than as scaffolding for her self-presentation, as in Anna's case. Even the gloves she dons, which contribute to the seemingly sculpted nature of her torso, enhance, rather than change the form of her arms.[410] The narrator focuses on Kitty's own experience of her ball toilette, which becomes part and parcel of her character, rather than imposed from without: "[Кити] в своем сложном тюлевом платье на розовом чехле, вступала на бал так свободно и просто, […] как будто она родилась в этом тюле, кружевах, с этою высокою прической, с розой и двумя листками наверху."[411] Despite the apparent extravagance of the gown's tulle and lace, these details are rendered as organically reflective of Kitty's youth, lightness, and innocence, which emerges in spite of, rather than because of her attire, as Levin will later note during their wedding. Whereas Anna's "natural" look reflects the libidinal economy of fashionable high society, Kitty's attire underscores her moral probity and

[410] "Пуговицы все три застегнулись, не порвавшись, на высокой перчатке, которая обвила ее руку, не изменив ее формы" (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 77).

[411] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 82. "[Kitty] was now entering the ballroom, in her intricate tulle gown over a pink underskirt, as freely and simply, […] as if she had been born in all this tulle and lace, with this tall coiffure, topped by a rose with two leaves" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 77).

commitment to genuine human principles.[412] Tolstoy ultimately champions her grounded brand of femininity as a protest against the modern technologies of spectatorship and display. The contrasting, yet interlocking visions of Anna and Kitty in the ball scene follow the compositional logic of the fashion plate, and display not only the salient features of their respective costumes, but also the conflicting images of femininity that accompanied the rise of consumer culture.

Elements of Anna's ball costume recur in scenes that reinforce her self-conscious presentation as an aestheticized object. Entering into a labyrinth of sartorial connections, lace detailing in particular prefigures Anna's downfall by pointing to the premeditated quality of her look, appearing in Karenin's contemplation of her portrait, and subsequently in Vronsky's observation of her at the opera. Having learned of Anna's liaison and written her a letter requiring her to continue their marital life as before, Karenin attempts to pursue his usual evening's diversions, but becomes distracted by his wife's portrait: "Невыносимо нагло и вызывающе подействовал на Алексея Александровича вид отлично сделанного художником черного кружева на голове, черных волос и белой прекрасной руки с безымянным пальцем, покрытым перстнями."[413] The black lace functions as a frame within the already framed image, enhancing the "unfathomable gaze" (*nepronitsaemye glaza*) that signifies Anna's erotic appeal and public transgression, which are unacceptable, and therefore unintelligible to her husband. Just as in the scene at the races, where Karenin fails to discern his

[412] Dolly remarks upon the existence of this economy during a visit with Anna at Vronsky's estate, identifying the simplicity of Anna's dress as purely representational, and not reflective of the garment's literal and moral cost: "Анна переоделась в очень простое батистовое платье. Долли внимательно осмотрела это простое платье. Она знала, что значит и за какие деньги приобретается эта простота." (Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 192).

[413] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 300. "The sight of the black lace on her head, her black hair and the beautiful white hand with its fourth finger covered with rings, splendidly executed by the painter, impressed him as unbearably insolent and defiant" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 284).

wife in a crowd of fabrics and accessories – "[О]н смотрел прямо на нее, но не узнавал жены в море кисеи, лент, перьев, зонтиков и цветов,"[414] – here too his vision becomes obscured by the spectacle of sartorial signification. Rather than engaging with the impenetrability of Anna's inner life represented in the portrait, Karenin turns to resolving a complication that has arisen in his official life, retreating into the rational, productive activities he believes generate real interaction and mutual understanding. The notion that mystery is a formative category in his perception of Anna as a subject marks her status as a pure commodity, recalling Karl Marx's conceptualization of the commodity as a "mysterious thing" that symbolizes to its consumers a certain set of structural relations in society and culture.[415] Despite his rejection of the society of the spectacle, Karenin nonetheless accepts its logic, unwittingly interpreting his wife's self-presentation as signifying her engagement with the culture of consumption and display, and her resultant status as a fallen woman. His failure to see beyond the sartorial frame that accompanies his wife paradoxically enhances its effects, reinforcing Anna's role as a mere representation of her husband's station, and as a repository of male desire and social discipline. It is in this regard that Karenin insists on the continuation of marital life, as despite her commodified subjectivity, Anna still retains some capacity for symbolic investment.

As in the ballroom scene and in the portrait contemplated by Karenin, sartorial detail again functions as the framing device at the opera. This scene amplifies the features Karenin sees in the portrait, and replicates Karenin's previous role and reactions in Vronsky's experience of Anna. As Anna readies herself for the theater in defiance of her position as a fallen woman,

[414] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 18, 218. "He looked straight at his wife, but did not recognize her in that sea of muslin, ribbons, feathers, parasols and flowers." (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 207).

[415] For a more detailed discussion of Marx's concept of the commodity, see my Introduction.

Vronsky finds himself simultaneously captivated and confounded by her conscious presentation as an object to be admired and desired:

> Он серьезным взглядом посмотрел на нее, но она ответила ему тем же вызывающим, не то веселым, не то отчаянным взглядом, значение которого он не мог понять. […] Анна уже была одета в светлое шелковое с бархатом платье, которое она сшила в Париже, с открытою грудью, и с белым дорогим кружевом на голове, обрамлявшим ее лицо и особенно выгодно выставлявшим ее яркую красоту.
>
> He gave her a serious look, but she answered with the same defiant look, something between cheerful and desperate, the meaning of which he could not fathom. […] Anna was already dressed in a light-colored gown of silk and velvet with a low-cut neck that had been made for her in Paris, and had costly white lace on her head, which framed her face and showed off her striking beauty to a particular advantage.[416]

While the fabric, the cut, and the lace styling of Anna's toilette mirror the one in which she appears at the ball, the specification of the gown's provenance as Parisian, that is as originating from the "capital of style," simultaneously highlights its commercial and symbolic qualities by communicating the wearer's unabashed and uneconomical, yet distinguished consumption. After pursuing Anna to the opera, Vronsky scans the brightly-lit space, trying to locate her in the equally iridescent high society circle metonymically occupying the theater boxes (*raznotsvetnye zhenshchiny*, *mundiry*, *siurtuki*); among the crowd of "real men and women" (*nastoiashchie muzhchiny i zhenshchiny*); and even on stage, in the gleam of the singer's bare shoulders and diamonds (*blestia*, *obnazhennye plecha*, *brillianty*).[417] Framed by the proscenium of her opera box, Anna upstages the diva as Vronsky assesses the nature of her beauty: "Вронский вдруг увидал голову Анны, гордую, поразительно красивую и улыбающуюся в рамке кружев.

[416] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 114. Pevear and Volokhonsky, 542.

[417] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 117-118. Pevear and Volokhonsky, 545-546.

[…] [О]н совсем иначе теперь ощущал эту красоту. В чувстве его к ней теперь не было ничего таинственного, и потому красота ее, хотя и сильнее, чем прежде, привлекала его, вместе с тем теперь оскорбляла его."[418] What he sees in her self-conscious portrait is the presentation of feminine beauty without barriers to the libidinal knowledge he has of her; his aesthetic experience of her is empty, superficial, and devoid of mystery, echoing Tolstoy's metaphor of counterfeit art as a prostitute. Rather than pointing to an alternative, progressive reading of feminized consumer culture, Vronsky's rejection of Anna as the embodiment of fetishistic desire and visual pleasure paradoxically reinforces the idea that in the space of contemporary urban society, the woman herself becomes a commodity that is mass produced, objectified, and discarded once she is worn(-out).

In negotiating Anna's status as art and object, Tolstoy highlights the ambivalence of the modern subject, and the communal communicative mechanisms that endow it with meaning. His use of sartorial signification throughout the novel points not only to the rigidity and discipline of dominant social structures, but also to fashion's logic of differentiation and substitution. In this regard, Tolstoy's approach to subjectivity (female subjectivity in particular) in this text is post-modern *avant la lettre*, since the subject's construction relies on the play of different fashion discourses that generate its meaning, rather than its fixed relation to paradigmatic representations of gender and power. Anna's downfall, then, as framed by vestimentary discourse, can be read in the context of the planned obsolescence that defines the fashion system's compulsion to produce new and innovative meanings; as soon as one is exhausted, another takes its place. This endless

[418] Tolstoy, *PSS*, T. 19, 118. "Vronsky suddenly saw Anna's head, proud, strikingly beautiful, and smiling in its frame of lace. […] But his sense of this beauty was quite different now. His feeling for her now had nothing mysterious in it, and therefore her bauty, though it attracted him more strongly thatn before, at the same time offended him" (Pevear and Volokhonsky, 546).

circulation of meanings emblematized late nineteenth-century Russian society and culture, and Tolstoy emphasizes the resulting ambivalence involved in the production of commodities, including art, literature and the self.

Banana Karenina

Tolstoy's novel has served as the inspiration for cinematic adaptations for over a century, provoking extensive commentary from critics and scholars about the text's most salient features.[419] These analyses have typically focused on the problem of "faithfulness," that is, the fidelity of the cinematic rendering to its literary source, and a host of related issues such as the ways in which the film situates itself and its audience in relation to the original literary work, and the ways in which it seeks to stand alone or even replace the novel as a cultural product.[420] Discussing his feature film adaptation, director Joe Wright notes that its visual motifs evoke the culture of spectacle and display that defined late-nineteenth century social life, and that figures prominently in Tolstoy's novel. Rather than shooting the film on location in various palaces and estates around Russia, Wright deliberately sets the action on a studio set built to look like a decrepit theater, emphasizing the drama and artifice of seeing and being seen: "[Russian] high

[419] To date, *Anna Karenina* has been adapted over a dozen times by Russian and foreign filmmakers. The first adaptation was a 1911 French production by director Maurice André Maître; the first Russian version followed in 1914, directed by Vladimir Gardin.

[420] For scholarly assessments, see Irina Makoveeva, "Cinematic Adaptations of *Anna Karenina*," *Studies in Slavic Cultures*, vol. 2 (January 2001), 111-134; and Catharine T. Nepomnyashchy, "Adaptation in Contexts: A Tale of Two *Annas*," *Tolstoy on Screen* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 317-337. For typical assessments by film critics, see Graham Fuller, "Anna Karenina," *Film Comment*, vol. 48:6 (November/December 2012), 72; and A.O. Scott, "Infidelity, Grandly Staged," *The New York Times*, 15 November 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/16/movies/anna-karenina-from-by-joe-wright-with-keira-knightley.html (Accessed 29 July 2016).

society. The way they spoke French, and read French etiquette books, and tried to behave like French people. And I found this kind of idea that a whole society, or a whole section of society, was performing for each other very interesting, and so that was why I chose to set it on a stage."[421] Much as in the novel, the theatrical frame not only provides a setting where knowledgeable fashion performers and spectators interact, but it also structures the participation of the viewer outside of the cinematic frame, prompting active engagement with the covert, codified discourse of the commodity-images presented on screen. Wright's choice of overt theatricality thus foregrounds the fetishistic attraction of fashion as the key instrument in generating the pleasure and discipline of spectatorship.

The costuming of Wright's film closely follows the sartorial choices of the novel's protagonists, in order to both recognize their role as signifiers of that society's extreme superficiality and to revel in their aesthetic qualities. Costume designer Jacqueline Durran was given the brief that "the costumes should be 1870s in shape, but have the architectural simplicity of 1950s couture."[422] The latter part of this directive has special value, as it suggests the imposition of a rigid structure on the clothed body that limits its libidinal potential, while adding another frame to the premeditated theatrical chronotope. Yet, the reference to "1950s couture" invokes the revolutionary "New Look" propagated by eminent Parisian designers during the postwar period, featuring an exaggerated feminine silhouette draped in luxurious fabrics that symbolized hopes for a more prosperous future and aroused consumerist desire.[423] The film's

[421] SDSA, "Joe Wright: Anna Karenina," *Set Décor*, http://www.setdecorators.org/?name=Joe-WrightANNA-KARENINA&art=directors_chair_joe_wright_AK (Accessed 29 July 2016).

[422] Amanda Foreman, "Poise and Passion," *Vogue*, vol. 202: 10 (October 2012), 336.

[423] "Soft, rounded shoulders emphasized the breasts; waists were heavily corseted; hips were padded. Skirts were billowing, reaching almost to the ankle" (Laver, 256).

costume design thus presents its audience with fetishized objects that simultaneously repress and render visible the implied desire, and invites the viewers to participate in transforming the falsified wearing[424] on screen into its everyday material equivalents by encouraging the narcissistic contemplation of themselves in those garments.

The film's opening scenes establish fashion's role in animating the narrative and organizing its symbolic universe, while pointing to the potential for its replication in real life. The camera follows Stiva and Anna in as they engage in parallel sequences of toilette, highlighting the activity of dressing and clothing in action. Stiva's indulgence in sensual pleasures is illustrated in a virtual *pas de deux* with his barber with close-ups of his fleshy face being massaged, followed by full body shots of his day suit in hunter's green, and his formal evening attire consisting of a dark suit with a rose-gold brocade waistcoat topped by a tailcoat. Anna is seen being dressed by her maid, with the camera focusing on her various body parts as they become enveloped in multiple layers of lace chiffon undergarments, corseting, a lavender silk taffeta dress, and gleaming diamond jewelry. While the lavender color directly references Kitty's vision of Anna in the novel, the structured sumptuousness of Anna's opening costume, and the metonymic pacing of the sequence renders the cinematic Anna a virtual mannequin for the film's fashions. This function is reinforced during the parallel ballroom and opera sequences, in which Anna wears the same taffeta-and-tulle gown and diamond camellia flower necklace; Durran changes the color of the gown between the two scenes, with black communicating

[424] The term falsified wearing refers to a model (not representative of the everyday human but suggestive of a fictive ideal either of humanity or the look or both), styled in a premeditated fashion, and placed before the camera to enact a staging that anticipates the "real" wearing; yet, when the garment is "really" worn, it is always in the shadow of the representation because the representation offers the ideal conditions (Adam Geczy, *Fashion's Double: Representations of Fashion in Painting, Photography, and Film* [London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016], xx).

Anna's status as a calculated *femme fatale*, and white signaling her downfall and inability to hide from social ostracism. Perhaps unsurprisingly, "the two Alexeis" – Vronsky and Karenin – appear throughout the film adorned in a range of neutral and greys,[425] not only mimicking the various stages of Anna's relationship with each of them, but also pointing to the ambiguous boundary between her "black" and "white" states. The chunky necklace hangs prominently about her neck, literally encrusting her in a circle of passion, desire, and indulgence signified by the crystal camellias.[426] The stark monochromatic coloring adds to Anna's powerful image while overshadowing the soft pastels of the other characters, adding to her literal and figurative attraction as a source of aesthetic and spectatorial pleasure, and highlighting fashion's ambivalent role in concealing and revealing. Contributing to the atmosphere of observation and scrutiny are shots of Anna reflected in mirrors lining the ballroom walls, as well as in the pocket mirrors and binoculars of the opera audience. In these scenes, the multiplied gaze of the camera and the spotlight train on Anna and the details of her costume, emphasizing the editorial quality of the image, and its capacity for uniting viewers in a common experience of fashion.

The art direction and costuming highlight the developing relationship between Kitty and Levin, while advertising the salient qualities of their character through recurring color motifs and fabrics. Throughout the film, Levin dons heavily textured leather, velvet, and wool in bronzed, earthy tones, as well as embroidered cotton and linen tunics, suggesting his intimate connection to nature, the countryside, and productive labor. During his opening meeting with Stiva to

[425] Combinations of eggshell, steel, and charcoal are featured in a multiplicity of fabric combinations, including wool, linen, silk brocade, and fur.

[426] The camellia evokes Alexandre Dumas, fils' *The Lady of the Camellias* (*La Dame aux Camélias*, 1848), which tells the tragic love story between the demimondaine prostitute Marguerite and the bourgeois writer Armand. Marguerite is nicknamed *la dame aux camélias* because she wears a red camellia when she is menstruating and unavailable for carnal pleasures, and a white camellia when she is available to her lovers.

discuss his impending proposal, Levin appears wrapped in a russet sheepskin coat with a dark brown floppy hat; Stiva recommends replacing these with "new boots, coat, and a *proper* hat," that is, with "Western clothes," that will signal his full commitment to the display and spectacle of high society, and render him worthy of Kitty. Although Levin begrudgingly obliges, turning himself into "a capitalist" in Koznyshev's subsequent evaluation, his society attire nonetheless retains features of his signature costume by continuing the color scheme in accessories such as a gold-toned necktie and brocaded bronze vest. At the beginning of the film, his look directly contrasts with Kitty's signature style, which features floaty tulle, silk, and muslin dresses in various permutations of pastel pink, baby blue, and white, with delicate lace and ribbon detailing.[427] Mimicking the portrayal in the novel, her cinematic toilette underscores her childlike innocence and ethereal nature, and functions as an organic extension of her individual qualities. As Kitty and Levin reach an understanding of shared values and a future life, the details of their respective costume also converge, sublimating sensuality and physical love to vestimentary discourse. In the scene where the two struggle to confess their mutual love, and resort to spelling out the sentiment using alphabet blocks, the confluence of their attire – she is in a pale role gold silk dress with a bowed shawl collar, and he wears a yellow gold waistcoat with a bowed necktie – prefigures their eventual communion and heightens the melodramatic moment. This parallel costuming maintains and reinforces their status as paragons of naturalness and purity, while inviting the viewer to indulge in the emotion and sensuality encoded in the clothes.

[427] In his conversation with Stiva, during which romantic success is conflated with correct sartorial choices, Levin wistfully explains the initial division in costuming and temperament that separates him from Kitty: "Kitty is of the heavens, an angel, and I am of the earth."

Wright's deliberate framing of *Anna Karenina* as a fashion film seeks to unite readers of Tolstoy's text with fans of costume dramas and consumers of fashion in the tasteful spectatorship of canonical literature. Paradoxically, this hypermodern visual technique recalls nineteenth-century mechanisms of consumer discipline, as it aims to cultivate the tastes of the mass public and encourage excess consumption in the service of social distinction. The film's marketing campaign reinforced this message by highlighting Durran's collaborations with contemporary designers, and the availability of those designs to the mass market. Chanel designed the suite of diamond and pearl jewelry that lent a "more baroque or more period or more feminine look [to the film],"[428] with a companion contemporary collection that featured as its representative piece the "Camellia necklace" Anna wears at the ball and the opera. This collaboration arose from the production team's previous links to the fashion label: Keira Knightley, who plays Anna, had been the face of Chanel perfume and makeup since 2007, and Wright directed an ad for a Chanel men's fragrance in 2011 starring Brad Pitt. These associations lend the film's costuming an added air of spectacle and glamour, as they combine Hollywood's high-profile players with the aesthetic legitimacy of a classic high fashion line. Banana Republic's range of styles for men and women also sought to capture the sumptuous elegance of the period, using brocade and velvet mixed with lace and chiffon, in rich jewel tones and black. Simon Kneen, Banana Republic's creative director noted that the goal of the affordable collection was to "portray a classic sense of luxury without requiring a full look that may feel 'costumey'."[429] By rejecting the artifice of costume, his comments highlight the importance of an organic interplay between fashion and

[428] Foreman, 336.

[429] Elizabeth Snead, "Banana Republic's 'Anna Karenina' Collection Channels 19th Century Russia," *The Hollywood Reporter* (October 25, 2012), http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/fash-track/banana-republics-anna-karenina-collection-383138 (Accessed 5 September 2016).

everyday life, and the inherently communicative role of attire. Both collaborations rely on stoking a sensual link with the spectacle of nineteenth-century fashion, and in doing so unite the film's producers and consumers in a singular experience motivated by a shared "feeling" of the novel and its period. Wright's film and its attendant consumer products thus support the novel's image of the (post-)modern subject, who deploys fashion as a means of communication and the creation of new selves. In doing so, the film exploits the dynamic tension between representation and communication, and despite its deliberate artifice fulfills Tolstoy's mission of genuine art.

Conclusion

My study of the interplay of fashion and the literary process in this dissertation has been framed in terms of the fashion system, encompassing both the established practices of the institutions that process fashion as it makes its way from creators to consumers, and the symbolic order deriving from the combinations and substitutions of fashion signs. The underlying trope informing my argument has been that of a relatively distinct center whose innovations and modifications diffuse toward a periphery conceived of both in hierarchical and horizontal terms, and which at times ostensibly merges with that periphery. In pursuing the diffusion of style, taste, and mores, my study has highlighted the polymorphism and polycentrism of the fashion system, exposing a range of fashion discourses in the fledgling modernity of nineteenth-century Russia.

In Chapter One, I traced the ways in which the writer-editors of *The Contemporary* deployed notions of fashion and the fashionable to promote ideas about the socially transformative nature of literature to members of the urban and the provincial gentry, as well as to members of the service classes. Combining tropes and structures of the feuilleton, the society tale, and the physiological sketch with those of the fashion column allowed these authors to propagate ideologies of civic engagement and philosophies of social consciousness, of the type that had been championed by contemporary thinkers such as Belinsky and that had been occasionally suppressed by government censorship. Utilizing a "scientific" approach to description, plot, and characterization in literary narratives, a writer's task was to acquaint the progressive forces of Russian society with the myriad sources and incarnations of social ills, which could consequently be addressed and ameliorated through the combined efforts of writers

and the reading audience. However, as I illustrate in my chapter, the writer-editors of *The Contemporary*, engaged in generic hybridization not only for purposes of civic engagement, but also to maintain and enhance their own socio-economic status: they packaged Belinsky's social ideology into a form that will be intelligible to any gentry reader, producing a hybrid genre that devised to promote the literary journal itself as a consumer item and the various fashionable products advertised therein. This mechanism thus not only provided edification in fashionable material and philosophical tastes for a varied readership, but specifically promoted further distinction of an already distinguished group of people, the gentry. Much as in Panaev's hybrid texts, in which the rigidity of society life entraps urban dwellers despite the apparent whirlwind of constantly changing fashionable occasions and objects, gentry audiences of literary journals and their fashion columns became increasingly isolated from other readers by the very texts ostensibly designed to broaden their social vistas. In providing aspirational pursuits for some readers, while endowing others with further signs of distinction, the fashion column in this period at once contributed to convergence and divergence of social groups, signaling the social upheavals that would occur in the latter part of the century.

Chapter Two serves as a case study of mid-century self-fashioning in a society increasingly driven by the acquisition, consumption, and display of both wealth and symbolic capital. Goncharov, a member of the nascent bourgeoisie and participant in the progressive gentry circles gathered around the *The Contemporary*, offers in his fashion feuilleton and novels of formation how-to manuals for upward social mobility of the middling classes and the urban-minded provincial elites. Relying on modalities of written fashion, his texts articulate anxieties about social change and modernity, and problematize the mechanisms by which the individual subject is constructed, deconstructed, and often destroyed in the pursuit of progress; precisely

those features deemed most desirable in the fulfillment of the modern self set the stage for its ruin. Goncharov's narratives are at once personal and indicative of broader aesthetic and social trends in this period, with fashion emblematic of nascent modernity that discredits past typologies and philosophies, but only offers blurred visions of the nature of alternative subjectivities and lines of thought. Therefore, his texts ultimately exhibit an aesthetic and an ideological stasis, which are both crucial to making high gentry tastes intelligible to the provincial gentry and the bourgeoisie, while rearticulating the cultural hegemony of the ruling classes, reinforcing the social split while attempting to bridge it.

In Chapter Three, Chernyshevsky's novel suggests a possibility of social change at a watershed period in Russian history through the programmatic establishment of sartorial cooperative businesses and the disciplining of the educated consumer. Consumption is presented in the novel as a socially productive and personally fulfilling occupation when done collectively, particularly as it represents the ultimate conversion of labor into pleasure. However, much like the writers and critics of the preceding decades, Chernyshevsky is unable to break with the hegemony of cultural elites dominating the cultural tastes and habits, particularly with respect to the fashion system, and in promoting a restrained consumerist impulse balanced with socially responsible behavior, he affirms the disciplined mass consumption of bourgeois capitalism. As I demonstrate in the chapter, the ultimate confirmation of this mechanism is presented in the novel's final pages, with their image of a revolutionary female consumer that harkens back to the pre-1848 era and its notions of class, gender, and ideology. Rather than breaking with traditional power structures in his text, Chernyshevsky simply restructures, repackages, and rebrands them for the progressive era, illustrating that the deployment of the fashion system transforms ideology into a consumer item.

The final chapter foregrounds the ways in which Tolstoy's engagement with discourses of fashion problematizes the progressive dimension of *Anna Karenina*, as his heroine appears as a fashionable object that is to be literally and figuratively consumed by the other characters of the novel and by the novel's readers. Tolstoy relies on familiar narrative structures of the society tale and the motif of the fallen woman, transformed through the prism of the fashion column and the fashion sketch to produce a commodified female subject, thereby reinforcing normative mechanisms of gender, class, and power. The ultimate expression of the commodified female subject is provided in the novel's most recent film adaptation, whose release had been coupled with apparel and jewelry lines made available for broad consumption; these are simulacra of the novel's cultural capital now purveyed to contemporary masses. The film adaptation, then, hints at the possibility that legitimate culture is within reach of all: now everyone can not only become familiar with *Anna Karenina* as a cultural product that endows its readers and viewers with cultural capital, but also become Anna Karenina by donning the material wares and engaging in a society of consumption motivated by the film. Ultimately, however, it is this latter mechanism that the notion that socio-cultural distinctions are largely fixed, since the audience watching the film is comprised of complicit consumers who expect cultural products to have a clear market value that is intelligible and transparently communicated to others.

My dissertation illustrated that fashion's recurrence as a narrative apparatus stems from its cyclical nature – that which is recognized as fashionable loses its distinctive value in that very moment and becomes unfashionable, therefore must be "repackaged" until it can be recognized as fashionable again by the appropriate social groups, and then repackaged and reappropriated by other groups –, and the relatively fixed dichotomies of meaning within which it operates (old/new, expensive/cheap, visual/practical). The motif of fashion contains within itself the

mechanisms for masking the dominance of hegemonic cultural and social narratives, and can therefore be used to purvey those very narratives to audiences across social and cultural groups. Adherence to mechanisms of the fashion system simultaneously produces both greater social cohesion and greater individual subjugation, despite these mechanisms' functioning and being expressed as interruptions of the prevailing system.

Bibliography

Aleshina, Tatiana. “K istorii proizvodstva gotovogo plat’ia v Moskve v seredine XIX-nachale XX v.” *Trudy Gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo muzeia* 67 (1988), 133-147.

Arndt, Walter, trans. *Pushkin Threefold: Narrative, Lyric, Polemic, and Ribald Verse*. New York: Dutton, 1972.

Auerbach, Jeffrey A. *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999.

Auerbach, Jeffrey A. and Peter H. Hoffenberg, eds. *Britain, the Empire, and the World at the Great Exhibition of 1851*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Bakhtin, M.M. “The *Bildungsroman* and Its Significance in the History of Realism.” In *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin: UT Press, 1986.

Balzac, Honoré de. *Traité de la vie éleganté*. Paris: Bossard, 1922.

Barthes, Roland. *The Fashion System*. Berkeley: UC Press, 1990.

——. *The Language of Fashion*. New York: Berg, 2004.

Bartlett, Djurdja. *FashionEast: The Spectre that Haunted Socialism*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. London: Sage, 1993.

Bayley, John. *Tolstoy and the Novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Belinsky, V.G. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 13-ti tomakh*. Vols. 1, 8-9. Moscow: Izdatel’stvo AN SSSR, 1953.

Berlin, Isaiah. *Russian Thinkers.* New York: Penguin, 1979.

Biblioteka dlia chteniia, 1847-1848.

Bogdanovich, T.A. *Liubov’ liudei shestidesiatykh godov*. Leningrad: Academia, 1929.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1984.

——. *The Field of Cultural Production*. New York: Columbia UP, 1993.

Brevik-Zender, Heidi. *Mode and Modernity in Late-Nineteenth-Century Paris*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.

Brooks, Jeffrey. "Readers and Reading at the End of the Tsarist Era." In *Literature and Society in Imperial Russia, 1800-1914*, edited by William Mills Todd, 97-150. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1978.

——. *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861-1917*. Chicago: Northwestern UP, 2003.

Bulgarin, F.V. *Vidok Figliarin: pis'ma i agenturnye zapiski F.V. Bulgarina v III otdelenie*, edited by A.I. Reitblat. Moscow: NLO, 1998.

Butkov, Iakov. *Povesti i rasskazy*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1967.

Chernyshevsky, N. G. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 15tt.* Vols. 2, 7, 11, 14, 16. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1939.

——. *Selected Philosophical Essays*. Translated by M. Grigoryan. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953.

——. *What Is to Be Done?* Translated by Michael R. Katz. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989.

Chistova, I.S. "Belletristika i memuary Vladimira Solloguba." In *V.A. Sollogub: Povesti. Vospominaniia*. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1988.

Christa, Boris. "A 'Buttoned-Up' Hero of his Time: Turgenev's Use of the Language of Vestimentary Markers in *Rudin*." In *Turgenev and Russian Culture*, edited by Joe Andrew, 127-134. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008.

Clark, T.J. *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999.

Cornwell, Neil. *The Society Tale in Russian Literature from Odoevskii to Tolstoy*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998.

Craft, William Brumfield. "From the Lower Depths to the Upper Trading Rows: The Design of Retail Shopping Centers in Moscow." In *Commerce in Russian Urban Culture 1861-1914*, edited by Iurii Petrov, 195-208. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.

Davis, John R. *The Great Exhibition.* Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1999.

Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle*. Translated by Ken Knabb. London: Rebel Press, 2000.

Demchenko, Adol'f. *N.G. Chernyshevskii: Nauchnaia biografiia, 1828-1858*. Sankt Peterburg: Petroglif, 2015.

Derman, Abram Borisovich. *Tvorcheskii portret Chekhova*. Moscow: Mir, 1929.

Dianina, Katia. "The Feuilleton: An Everyday Guide to Public Culture in the Age of Reforms." *Slavic and East European Journal* 47:2 (2003), 187-210.

——. *When Art Makes News: Writing Culture and Identity in Imperial Russia*. Dekalb: NIU Press, 2013.

Dobroliubov, N.A. "Chto takoe oblomovshchina?" *I.A. Goncharov v russkoi kritike: sbornik statei*, edited by M. Poliakov. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1958.

——. *Sobranie sochinenii v deviati tomakh*, Vol. 1. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1961.

Drozd, Andrew M. *Chernyshevskii's 'What Is to Be Done?': A Reevaluation*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2001.

Druzhinin, A.V. "Iz stat'i '*Oblomov*', roman I.A. Goncharova." In *I.A. Goncharov v russkoi kritike: sbornik statei*, edited by M. Poliakov, 169-170. Moscow: Goslitizdat, 1958.

Dwyer, Anne. "Of Hats and Trains: Nikolai Leskov and Fyodor Dostoevsky between Russia and the West." *Improvising Empire: Literary Accounts of the Russian and Austrian Borderlands, 1862-1923*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2007.

Eikhenbaum, Boris. *Lev Tolstoy: Semidesiatie gody*. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1974.

Eklof, Ben. *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994.

Emmons, Terence. *The Russian Landed Gentry and the Peasant Emancipation of 1861*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967.

Esin, Boris I. *Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XIX v.*. Moscow: Vys. shkola, 1989.

Evgen'ev-Maksimov, V.E. *Sovremennik v 40-50 gg.: ot Belinskogo do Chernyshevskogo*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo pisatelei, 1934.

Flügel, J.C. *The Psychology of Clothes*. New York: International Universities Press, 1971.

Foreman, Amanda. "Poise and Passion." *Vogue*, vol. 202:10 (October 2012), 326-372.

Fourier, Charles. *Design for Utopia*. Translated by Julia Franklin. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Frazier, Melissa. *Romantic Encounters: Writers, Readers, and the 'Library for Reading'*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.

Fuller, Graham. “Anna Karenina.” *Film Comment*, vol. 48:6 (November/December 2012), 72.

Gatrell, Peter. *The Tsarist Economy, 1850-1917*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1986.

Geczy, Adam. *Fashion’s Double: Representations of Fashion in Painting, Photography, and Film*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2016.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973

Gerschenkron, Alexander. *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1952.

Ginzburg, L.Ia. “Pushkin i Benediktov.” In *Pushkin: Vremennik Pushkinskoi komissii*. Vol. 2, 148-182. Moscow: AN SSSR, 1936.

——. *Literatura v poiskakh real’nosti: stat’i, esse, zametki*. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel’, 1987.

Gleason, Abbot. *Young Russia: The Genesis of Russian Radicalism in the 1860s*. New York: Viking Press, 1980.

Gogol, N.V. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v chetyrnadtsati tomakh*. Vol. 8. Moscow: AN SSSR, 1952.

Goncharov, Ivan. *Sobranie sochinenii v 8-mi tomakh*, Vols. 1, 4, 7. Moscow: Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1954.

——. *An Ordinary Story*. Translated by Marjorie Hoover. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1994.

——. *Oblomov*. Translated by David Magarshack. London: Penguin, 2005.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Greenleaf, Monika. *Pushkin and Romantic Fashion: Fragment, Elegy, Orient, Irony*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Grigorovich, D.V. *Literaturnye vospominaniia*. Moscow, Gos. izd-vo khudozh. lit-ry, 1961.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.

Haxthausen, August von. *The Russian Empire: Its People, Institutions, and Resources*. Translated by Robert Faire. London: Chapman and Hall, 1856.

Herzen, Aleksandr. *Sobranie sochinenii v 30-ti tomakh*. Vol. 29:1. Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1954.

Iezuitova, R.V. "Svetskaia povest'." In *Russkaia povest' XIX veka: istoriia i problematika zhanra*, edited by B.S. Meilakh. Leningrad: Nauka, 1973.

Ivanova, Natal'ia. "O Chekhove i damskoi mode." *Neva* 1 (2010).

Kahan, Arcadius. *Russian Economic History: The Nineteenth Century*. Chicago University Press, 1989.

Kelly, Catriona. *Refining Russia: Advice Literature, Polite Culture, and Gender from Catherine to Yeltsin.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Kharkhordin, Oleg. *The Collective and the Individual in Russia: A Study of Practices*. Berkeley: UC Press, 1999.

Kirsanova, R.M. *Kostium v russkoi khudozhestvennoi kul'ture*. Moscow: Bol'shaia russkaia entsiklopediia, 1995.

Klaffke, Pamela. *Spree: A Cultural History of Shopping*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2003.

Klioutchkine, Konstantine. *Russian Literature and the Press, 1860-1914*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2002.

——. "Between Sacrifice and Indulgence: Nikolai Nekrasov as a Model for the Intelligentsia," *Slavic Review* 66.1 (2007), 45-62.

Kliuchevskii, V.O. *Istoriia soslovii v Rossii*. Petrograd: Literaturno-izdatel′skii otdel Komissariata narodnogo prosveshcheniia, 1918.

Koni, A.F. *Vospominaniia o pisatel'iakh*. Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1965.

Kuhn, Alfred. "Dobroliubov's Critique of *Oblomov*: Polemics and Psychology." *Slavic Review* 30.1 (1971), 93-109.

Kuleshov, Vladimir Ivanovich. *Otechestvennye zapiski i literatura 40-kh godov XIX veka.* Moscow: MGU, 1959.

Lampert, Eugene. *Sons against Fathers*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1965.

Laver, James. *Costume and Fashion: A Concise History*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995.

Lavrin, Janko. *Goncharov*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

Lehmann, Ulrich. *Tigersprung: Fashion in Modernity*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000.

Liashchenko, Petr. *History of the National Economy of Russia to the 1917 Revolution*. New York: Macmillan, 1949.

Lincoln, W. Bruce. *Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy, and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia*. DeKalb: Norther Illinois UP, 1990.

Lotman, Iu.M. *Besedy o russkoi kul'ture: Byt i traditsii russkogo dvorianstva (XVIII – nachalo XIX veka*. Sankt-Peterburg: Iskusstvo, 1994.

Lotman, L.M. "Proza sorokovykh godov XIX veka." In *Istoriia russkoi literatury v 10 tt.* Vol. 7, 511-570. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1941.

Mackenzie, David and Michael W. Curran, eds. *A History of Russia and the Soviet Union*, 3rd edition. Chicago: Dorsey Press, 1987.

Makoveeva, Irina. "Cinematic Adaptations of *Anna Karenina*." *Studies in Slavic Cultures*, vol. 2 (January 2001), 111-134.

Malia, Martin. *Alexander Herzen and the Birth of Russian Socialism, 1812-1855*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1961.

Mandelker, Amy. *Framing Anna Karenina: Tolstoy, the Woman Question, and the Victorian Novel*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1993.

Martinsen, Deborah A., ed. *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr, 1912.

Matich, Olga. "28 Nevsky Prospect: The Sewing Machine, the Seamstress, and Narrative." In *Petersburg/Petersburg: Novel and City, 1900-1921*, edited by Olga Matich, 238-261. Madison: UWP, 2010.

McLaughlin, Kevin. *Writing in Parts: Imitation and Exchange in Nineteenth-Century Literature.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995.

McReynolds, Louise. *The News under Russia's Old Regime: The Development of a Mass-Circulation Press*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.

Mirsky, D.S. *A History of Russian Literature: From Its Beginnings to 1900*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1999.

Moda, 1853-1854.

Moers, Ellen. *The Dandy: Brummel to Beerbohm*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1973.

Morson, Gary Saul. *Hidden in Plain View: Narrative and Creative Potentials in "War and Peace."* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.

Nekrasov, Nikolai, ed. *Fiziologiia Peterburga*. Moscow: Nauka, 1991.

——. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*. Vols. 13-14. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 1997.

——. *Petersburg: The Physiology of a City*. Translated by Thomas Gaiton Marullo. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2009.

Nepomnyashchy, Catharine. "Adaptation in Contexts: A Tale of Two *Annas*." *Tolstoy on Screen*, edited by Lorna Fitzsimmons, 317-337. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015.

Oksman, Iu.G., ed. *Fel'etony sorokovykh godov: zhurnal'naia i gazetnaia proza I.A. Goncharova, F.M. Dostoevskogo, I.S. Turgeneva*. Moscow: Academia, 1930.

Orwin, Donna Tussig. *Tolstoy's Art and Thought, 1847-1880*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

——, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Otechestvennye zapiski, 1841, 1847-1848.

Panaev, Ivan. *Sobranie sochinenii*. Vols. 1, 2, 5. Moscow: Izdanie V.M. Sablina, 1912.

——. *Literaturnye vospominaniia.* Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia lit-ra, 1950.

——. *Povesti – Ocherki*, edited by A.L. Ospovat and V.A. Tunimanov. Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1986.

Panaeva, Avdot'ia. *Vospominaniia*. Moscow: OGIZ, 1948.

Paperno, Irina. *Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behavior*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1988.

Pereira, N.G. *The Thought and Teachings of N.G.Chernyshevskii*. Paris: Mouton, 1975

Perrot, Philippe. *Fashioning the Bourgeoisie.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

Prendergast, Christopher. *The Triangle of Representation*. New York: Columbia UP, 2000.

Pushkin, A.S. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Vols. 2, 6, 14. Moscow: AN SSSR, 1941.

——. *Eugene Onegin*. Translated by James E. Falen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

Rewald, John. *The History of Impressionism*. New York: MoMA, 1973.

Ribeiro, Aileen. *Fashion and Fiction: Dress in Art and Literature in Stuart England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2005.

Roskill, Mark. "Early Impressionism and the Fashion Print." *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 12:807 (June 1970), 391-395.

Rostopchina, Evdokiia. *Stikhotvoreniia. Proza. Pis'ma.* Moscow: Sovremennaia Rossiia, 1986.

Ruane, Christine. *The Empire's New Clothes: A History of the Russian Fashion Industry, 1700-1917*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Ruud, Charles A. *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.

Ryskin, E.I. *Sovremennik, 1836-1837: ukazatel' soderzhaniia*. Moscow: Kniga, 1967.

Saltykov-Shchedrin, M.E. *Sobranie sochinenii v dvadtsati tomakh*. Vol. 7. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1965.

Schwartz, Vanessa. *Spectacular Realities: Early Mass Culture in Fin-de-Siècle Paris* (Berkeley: UC Press, 1999.

Scott, A.O. "Infidelity, Grandly Staged." *The New York Times* (15 November 2012). Accessed 29 July 2016. http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/16/movies/anna-karenina-from-by-joe-wright-with-keira-knightley.html

Set Decorators Society of America. "Joe Wright: Anna Karenina." *Set Décor*. Accessed 29 July 2016. http://www.setdecorators.org/?name=Joe-WrightANNA-KARENINA&art=directors_chair_joe_wright_AK

Severnaia pchela, 1845, 1847-1848.

Shelgunov, Nikolai. "Vnutrenee obozrenie." *Dielo, zhurnal literaturno-politicheskii*, vol. 3 (1881), 151-165.

——. "Russkie idealy, geroi i tipy." In *Shestidesiatye gody*, edited by N.K. Piksanov, 175-205. Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1940.

Shepard, Elizabeth. "The Society Tale and the Innovative Argument in Russian Prose Fiction of the 1830s." *Russian Literature* 10 (1981), 111-162.

Simmel, Georg. "Fashion." *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 62.6 (1957), 541-558.

Skabichevskii, A.M. *Literaturnye vospominaniia*. Moscow: Agraf, 2001.

Snead, Elizabeth. “Banana Republic's 'Anna Karenina' Collection Channels 19th Century Russia.” *The Hollywood Reporter* (October 25, 2012). Accessed 5 September 2016. http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/fash-track/banana-republics-anna-karenina-collection-383138

Sokolov, D. N. *Svetskii chelovek, ili Rukovodstvo k poznaniiu pravil obshchezhitiia*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. S. Peterburgskogo gubernskogo pravleniia, 1847.

Sollogub, Vladimir. *Sochineniia grafa V.A. Solloguba,*. Vol. 1. Sankt-Peterburg: Izd. A. Smirdina, 1855.

——. *Povesti i rasskazy*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1962.

Sovremennik, 1847-1848, 1850, 1854, 1856-1857.

Stasova, N.V. *Vospominaniia i ocherki*. Sankt Peterburg: Tip. Merkusheva, 1899.

Steele, Valerie. *Paris Fashion*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.

Stites, Richard. *The Women’s Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism, and Bolshevism, 1860-1930*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Todd, William Mills. *Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

——. *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861-1917*. Chicago: Northwestern UP, 2003.

Tolstoy, Leo. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 90 tt.* Vols. 18-19, 30, 62. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel’stvo “Khudozhestvennaia literatura,” 1951.

——. *What is Art?* Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. London: Penguin, 1995.

——. *Anna Karenina*. Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky. London: Penguin, 2000.

Tseitlin, A.G. *I.A. Goncharov*. Moscow: Izd. AN SSSR, 1950.

——. *Stanovlenie realizma v russkoi literature: russkii fiziologicheskii ocherk*. Moscow: Nauka, 1965.

Valentino, Russell Scott. “Paradigm and Parable in Goncharov’s *An Ordinary Story*.” *Russian Review* 58 (January 1999), 71-86.

Vatsuro, V.E. “Belletristika Vladimira Solloguba.” In *Materialy k biografii*, edited by T. F. Selezneva. Moscow: NLO, 2005.

Veblen, Thorstein. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Verhoeven, Claudia. *The Odd Man Karakozov: Imperial Russia, Modernity, and the Birth of Terrorism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009.

Vodovozova, E.N. *Na zare zhizni: memuarnye ocherki i portrety*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1964.

Vries, Jan de. “The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution.” *The Journal of Economic History* 54.2 (1994), 249-270.

Walicki, Andrzej. *A History of Russian Thought: From the Enlightenment to Marxism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1979.

Wellek, Rene. *Concepts of Criticism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1963.

West, Sally. “The Material Promised Land: Advertising’s Modern Agenda in Late Imperial Russia.” *Russian Review* 57 (July 1998): 345-363.

Wilson, Elizabeth. “The Invisible Flâneur.” *New Left Review*, vol. 1:191 (1992), 90-110.

Wirtschafter, Elise Kimerling. *Social Identity in Imperial Russia*. Dekalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1997.

Zapadov, Aleksandr V. *Istoriia russkoi zhurnalistiki XVIII-XIX vekov*. Moscow: Vys. shkola, 1973.

Zelensky, V.A. *Passazh Sankt-Peterburg, 1848-1998*. Sankt-Peterburg: ArtDeco, 1998.