

THE TWAIN SHALL BE OF ONE MIND: TOLSTOY IN "LEAG" WITH ELIZA BURNZ AND HENRY PARKHURST

WILLIAM NICKELL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

In October, 1890, Tolstoy received a letter from America, printed on the stationery of the "New School of Fonografy" and "Spelling Reform Rooms" of New York City, informing him of the following: "Since your work *The Kreutzer Sonata* appeared in America, many people say '*Diana* explains, fulfills, and renders possible the theories of Tolstoy.'" A booklet entitled *Diana, a psycho-fyziological essay on sexual relations for married men and women* was enclosed with the letter for Tolstoy's perusal. Acknowledging receipt of the pamphlet, Tolstoy reported to its publishers that he had written "a small article on its contents" and gave his conditional approval of the presented doctrine: "Although I do not agree with all your views, as you can see from my epilogue to the «Son[ata of] Cr[eutzer]», I find your work very useful and thank you again for communicating it to me." (Tolstoy, PSS LXV, 181)¹ Considering *Diana* to be evidence of the world-wide support for his program for universal chastity, Tolstoy had indeed reviewed the booklet's contents in an article entitled "*Ob otnoshenii mezhdu polami*" ("On the Relations Between the Sexes"),² which was published in the popular weekly *Nedelia*. Included at the end of *Diana* was "A Private Letter to Parents, Fyzicians and Men-Principals of Schools," which Tolstoy singled out for especial praise, paying it the ultimate compliment of translating it himself, and further seeking to get the piece published in a journal. Thus Tolstoy formed an alliance with Eliza Burnz, author of the "Private Letter" and publisher of *Diana*, and with the anonymous author of *Diana*, later to emerge as Henry Parkhurst.

His initial enthusiasm for the pamphlet, however, was soon countered by doubt and anxiety; as Tolstoy suggested in his reply, *Diana's* program of highly sublimated sensualism was not entirely in accord with the views he had expressed in "The Kreutzer Sonata" and its "Postlude," where he had argued against sexual gratification in any form. Parkhurst rejected such stern ascetic principles because he considered them impracticable, and presented an alternative whereby he believed sexual desire could be satisfied through the sublimations of a delicately controlled intimacy--both spiritual and physical. Though *Diana's* advocates believed this program "rendered possible" the practice of abstinence, the satisfactions which it proposed were ultimately unacceptable to Tolstoy. At first he attempted simply to edit out this aspect of the Dianic theory, as he indicated in a letter to A.M. Kalmykova: "В «Диане» есть многое нехорошее, я выбрал то, что, по мне, было хорошо." ("There is much in *Diana* that isn't good; I selected what, in my opinion, was good.") (PSS LXV, 183) His principle of selection, however, did not prove reliable.

¹ The English is Tolstoy's.

²A translation of Tolstoy's "On the Relations Between the Sexes" and Eliza Burnz' letter follow this article.

Tolstoy was later to regret his involvement with *Diana*, fearing that he had not entirely achieved his ends in obscuring its latent sensualism.

Tolstoy was not alone in being confounded by the vagaries of Parkhurst's language; as Parkhurst himself later lamented, "the first edition of 'Diana' had hardly been printed, before it was discovered that the book was liable to misinterpretation." ("Why I Wrote Diana," 8) Parkhurst admitted to difficulty in translating his theories "into conventional language" and confessed that the danger of misapprehension persisted even after attempts to clarify his ideas in later editions.⁽⁸⁾ The novelty of his ideas, which somehow manage to border on both hedonism and asceticism, combined with the elliptical language in which they are described (necessitated by the relatively conservative standards of contemporary discourse), indeed produce a significant potential for misunderstanding. The author's long-standing anonymity, a ruse to which Burnz also resorted (she signed her name "SAXON" in early editions of the pamphlet), only deepened the mystery surrounding the text.

In order to clarify *Diana's* theory, it may be helpful to consider the historical context that produced the pamphlet. American sexual radicalism of the late 19th century is full of eccentricities of the sort characteristic of the social margins which sexual reformers were bound to occupy in that conservative era; Eliza Burnz and Henry Parkhurst, for instance, had no professional training in the field of "fyziology," but had instead made careers as stenographers. Parkhurst was also an inventor and astronomer, while Burnz headed the Leag for Short Spelling (according to whose rules *Diana* was itself printed, as the reader will note below in passages quoted from the text). The idiom in which they spoke of sexual reform was one influenced by an admixture of Spiritualism, communalism, Fourierism, phonography, free love and free speech.

THE AMERICANS: UTOPIAN SEXUALITY IN LATE 19TH CENTURY AMERICA

The unexpected connection between orthography and sexual reform was a result of the introduction of Isaac Pitman's newly developed shorthand method, known as phonography, to an American audience by Stephen Andrews. A radical Fourierist with a pocketful of social reforms in mind, Andrews began utilizing the new orthography in publishing the *Propagandist*, a journal for phonographers which served in large, however, as an organ for Andrews' political views. Henry Parkhurst and Eliza Burnz, counted among his converts to this new method of orthography, would both later display a similar combination of reformist zeal and utopian practicality. Pitman's shorthand system acquired a utopian mien in America, as its advocates saw in it the potential to create a universal writing system that would help to eliminate social boundaries.³ Parkhurst and Theron C. Leland were fellow Fourierists who joined Andrews in promulgating the new writing system, and lessons in phonography are known to have been given at Brook Farm,

³Several of them, including Andrews and Parkhurst, developed their own universal language systems. Andrews' system was called Alwato and is outlined in his *Basic Outline of Universology* (1872).

the well-known Massachusetts commune which adopted a Fourieran program in 1844.⁴ (Guarneri, 286)

In 1850 Andrews joined with yet another typographical enthusiast, Josiah Warren, inventor of the stereotype method of printing, in the organization of Modern Times, a new communal society on Long Island, New York. Warren, an anarchist who had participated in Robert Owen's commune at New Harmony, was concerned primarily with establishing equitable economic relations in the community ("cost the limit of price" was his dictum); Andrews had broader goals in mind, and his propagandizing in the New York papers for "individual sovereignty" and an end to marriage brought to the commune a crowd of followers interested in extending egalitarian principles into the realm of sexual relations.⁵ Within a short period, Modern Times gained notoriety as a center for "free love," a reputation which was reinforced in 1853 by the arrival of Thomas and Mary Nichols, associates of Andrews whose *Nichols Journal* was a mouthpiece for anti-marriage fulminations. According to Thomas Nichols, at Modern Times "Those lived together who chose to do so... The right of the law either to unite or separate was denied, and free love was placed in the same category with all other freedom." (Nichols, 2:42) To Warren's dismay, the Nicholises, in focusing attention on the sexual practices of the commune, brought little more than scandal to the new community, which was under the constant scrutiny of a New York press eager to sensationalize its practices. (Wunderlich, 72-83) A group of New York phonographers--a classification which both Burnz and Parkhurst would have fit at this time--is said to have participated in the commune.

Modern Times was not the only New York community making waves because of its sexual orientation. The most famous of these experimental living arrangements had been established at Oneida, New York, by John Humphrey Noyes in 1848. Noyes founded his commune on the principal of "complex marriage," whereby traditional dyadic sexual relationships were abolished in favor of communal sexual companionship, according to which all members were, with a few exceptions, to make themselves equally available to others for sexual relations.⁶ Crucial to the viability of such relations was the practice of what Noyes referred to as "male continence" (more commonly known by the Latin term

⁴ Charles Fourier's (1772-1837) writings represent one of the major philosophical sources for the ideas that concern us here. He argued for the rational utilization of human desire--as passions ruled the intellect and the body, they should therefore be appropriated into a utilitarian system of governing behavior. The proper society for the fostering of this rationality was the phalanx, a community of 1620 members who would peacably divide labor and profit according to their natural inclinations. Fourierism was modified and popularized in the United States by Albert Brisbane (with the help of Horace Greeley and the *New York Tribune*) and became the ideological foundation for a number of American communes in the 1840's and 1850's. The popularity of Fourier's ideas was soon eclipsed by that of other social philosophies, and the phalanxes (whose participants were derisively called 'four-year-ites') disappeared by the mid-1850's. (Guarneri, 2-3)

⁵ Andrews is famous as well for his polemic (published in the *New York Tribune* in the 1850's) with Horace Greeley and Henry James Sr., both of whom were also Fourierists. Andrews' was the most liberal voice in the debate, calling for immediate abolition of marriage.

⁶ The chief exception being those males who had not yet mastered Noyes' technique of "male continence" (described below), who were allowed to have relations only with post-menopausal women.

coitus reservatus), wherein the male partner was to engage in sexual intercourse without ejaculating. Noyes firmly attested that this practice could be mastered to the satisfaction of both partners and did not demand "unfulfilling" relations. The legacy of Noyes' pamphlet, "Male Continence," was to outlast the Oneida community itself, as variations on his doctrine became a principle feature in numerous subsequent sexual reform programs.⁷

As suggested by its title, the onus of behavioral modification and self-control fell primarily upon the male partner, who was to avoid the danger, to both the woman and the community (which was initially in economic difficulties and could not support newborn members), of unwanted pregnancy. Noyes advocated *coitus reservatus*, as opposed to the *coitus interruptus* proposed by Robert Dale Owen⁸, because he saw benefit in the retention of the male ejaculate. Popular belief had held for some time that such retention was, on the contrary, injurious. Eliza Burnz would still feel compelled to address this issue some thirty years later in her "Private Letter". The subject of male ejaculation was, in fact, a locus of confusion and contention at the time, raising not only the question of the advisability of "unnecessary expulsion" (related to age-old anxieties over "spilling the seed"), but also that of the fate of unexpelled sperm. Some thought that this sperm was "absorbed," for better or for worse, back into the body. Speculation on this topic was to continue for years; Henry Parkhurst would later take issue with Noyes' practice because he believed that stimulation of "the generative function of the sexual batteries," even if not leading to ejaculation, wasted sperm (which was presumably absorbed internally) and "divert[ed] the sexual batteries from their affectional function..." (*Diana* 16)

Parkhurst's distinction between the generative and affectional functions became common to American utopian sex doctrines of the late 19th century. Noyes initiated the distinction to separate his mode of sexual intercourse from the licentious: "The separation of the amative from the propagative, places amative sexual intercourse on the same footing with other ordinary forms of social interchange." (Noyes, 15-16). A similar distinction had been made by Robert Dale Owen in his birth control manual *Moral Physiology* (1830). Adopting the terms of 19th century phrenologists (assigning certain behavioral propensities to certain portions of the brain), these writers dissociated sexuality from that procreative aspect which many of their contemporaries viewed as its only valid function. While non-propagative intercourse could be denigrated as sinful by their conservative opponents, the reformers believed that sexuality had a secondary, social significance, and saw in highly sublimated sexual relations the embryo of their utopian ideals.

Many, indeed, believed that sexuality was a means of attaining much more than mere physical satisfaction. James W. Towner, a Universalist minister who had become

⁷ "Male Continence" went through four editions between 1849 and 1872; Oneida, which was founded in 1848, abandoned its communal program in 1881.

⁸ Not to be confused with his father, Robert Owen (1771-1858), the wealthy Briton who funded numerous communal ventures, including New Harmony in Indiana, one of the more successful 19th c. communes. Robert Dale Owen (1801-1877) was also involved in the commune, and in 1830 became the first public advocate of birth control in the United States.

a free love advocate at Berlin Heights, Ohio, and later a Perfectionist at Oneida, claimed that "all Free Lovers, with rare exceptions, are Spiritualists." (Ellis (a.k. Towner), 423) Nineteenth century Spiritualism, known primarily for its sensational table-tapping seances which brought communication with the dead, carried implications for the living as well. Once it had been shown that the spirit world could be reached, it seemed that human interrelations could, and should, be wrought upon a higher, spiritual plane. Rather than seeking a mate for propagative purposes, spiritualists searched for "soul mates," and often moved from partner to partner seeking such "spiritual affinities." (Stoehr, 35) This same tendency can be discerned in the writings of the sex reformers, who described the sublimating effect of their programs that spiritualizes the most earthly of human rituals and liberates humanity from the bonds of sexual transgression.⁹ If sexuality could be separated from its purely physical, procreative function, as Noyes and Owen had suggested, then its exaltations could be related to more sublime, metaphysical ends.

There was also a more practical side to the desire to reform sexual relations, stemming from concern over very real social problems which were exacerbated under the conditions of American industrialized society. The subtitle of Parkhurst's tract, "A psycho-fyziological essay for married men and women," reflects the increasing encroachment of medical (and pseudo-medical) science upon the privacy of the individual. Contraceptive methods, aimed at preventing unwanted pregnancy and seen as a valuable tool in dealing with the newly-developing problem of overpopulation, also transformed the discourse surrounding sexual relations. Some early purveyors of contraceptives, such as T. Nichols and E.B. Foote, published books and popular journals as a means of proselytizing for their merchandise, and thus began to popularize a literature that had previously been the esoteric domain of medical professionals. Health enthusiasts such as Sylvester Graham toured the country presenting a series of popular lectures endorsing a daily regimen and dietary prescriptions which aimed, among other things, to eliminate childhood masturbation and improve marital relations.

The linking of these private matters to the general health of the individual, as well as to issues of public health, engendered a more holistic understanding of the significance of sexuality. Drs. Caroline Winslow and Alice Stockham, correspondents of Tolstoy's (see below) were clearly motivated by their experiences as physicians in their efforts to reform the sexual practices which brought so many of their patients to them. Likewise Henry Parkhurst's and Eliza Burnz's reformist zeal was stimulated by their professional experience documenting courtroom testimonies describing the unhappy consequences of sexual relations. Eugenicists (among whom Parkhurst can again be counted) also emerged as spokespersons for a greater selectivity in breeding, which likewise implied reform in the economy of sexual relations. Once under the exclusive rule of the Church and State, sexuality now came under the public scrutiny of a variety of sources which offered all manner of unconventional alternatives to the understanding and practice of sexual relations within and without marriage.

The proponents of these alternatives were not able to undermine the conservative

⁹ See, for instance, the quote from Alice Stockham's *Karezza* below.

reticence on sexual matters without a challenge. Anthony Comstock's censorial reign over the public display and distribution of "obscene" materials, attempted to restrict the liberalization of discourse on sexuality.¹⁰ Despite such efforts, by the time *Diana* was set in type at Burnz's New York publishing office new approaches to sexuality were in the process of being "absorbed" from these cultural margins into the mainstream; Parkhurst's tract was not a program for a Fourierist phalanstery, but was instead intended for "ordinary men and women." In fact, Parkhurst and Burnz were members of a circle of reformers who braved the penalties of the Comstock laws in order to make their various programs for sexual reform known to the general public. Besieged by "Comstockism," they worked tirelessly against his marginalizing pressure. It is not surprising that, in an effort to circulate their ideas more broadly, this group of reformers turned to Lev Tolstoy, who was not only sympathetic to their views, but who also commanded an immense audience.

TOLSTOY'S AMERICAN "COLLEAGUES"

In a letter dated October 23, 1890, some two weeks after Eliza Burnz provided Tolstoy with a copy of *Diana*, Dr. Caroline Winslow sent to Yasnaya Polyana the previous year's edition of *Alpha*, as well as a number of other publications produced by the Moral Education Society of Washington D.C. One of the first American woman doctors, Winslow was head of this Society and edited *Alpha*, which served as its mouthpiece. She reported to Tolstoy, that, as editor of the paper, she had "contended for the right of the unborn child to a proper endowment of health, peace and beauty, and for the recognition of the law of continence except for procreation in marriage." Recognizing a kindred spirit in the author of *The Kreutzer Sonata*, Winslow urged Tolstoy, whom she believed to hold "the largest audience of any living writer," to write another work showing the way out of the dismal situation he had portrayed in Pozdnyshv's story. Winslow herself was always quick to document cases of sexual excess and abuse, and championed the liberation of women from all of the untoward effects of unwanted sexual activity and pregnancy. Tolstoy responded approvingly to *Alpha*, and instructed his daughter Masha to write

¹⁰ Comstock (1844-1915) organized the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, and was the stimulus for state and national obscenity legislation. He often became personally involved in the Society's investigations and sting operations, ruthlessly pursuing his enemies in a vendetta-like fashion similar to that which was later to mark the career of J. Edgar Hoover. His pigeonholing of the work of early sexologists as obscenity sent many of them to jail (see below), and explains the reluctance of Henry Parkhurst to sign his name to *Diana*.

The American translation of *The Kreutzer Sonata* was itself banned from distribution through the mails under the "Comstock laws." Much to his embarrassment, the translator, Benjamin Tucker, had spoken out in 1890 against liberal opposition to Comstock's laws, only to find his own translation censored under a Post Office Department ban. (Sears, 250-1)

Winslow, asking her for references to other material of a similar vein.¹¹ (See Appendix for her reply.) It is not known if Tolstoy was aware that the "Alphism" which gave the journal its name was the same practice which Parkhurst was revising in *Diana* (seeking to make it more palatable by tending to the physical satisfaction of the abstaining partners). He did at least recognize the affinity of Winslow's views with Parkhurst's, however, for in sending *Diana* to A.M. Kalmykova in November of 1890, he included several of the Moral Education Society's publications, indicating that they were "of the same orientation" (того же направления). (PSS LXV, 183)

In the margins of her first letter to Tolstoy, Winslow wrote "I have neglected to say I am a friend of Dr. Alice Stockham of 40 years standing."¹² Alice Stockham was perhaps the first of the American sex reformers to come into contact with Tolstoy. She will no doubt be familiar to a number of readers as the author of *Tokology* (1883), the maternity handbook which was translated into Russian and published under Tolstoy's supervision (1892). One of the chapters in *Tokology* was in fact devoted to "Chastity in the Marriage Relations," as Stockham believed that sexual relations during pregnancy were injurious both to the mother and to the unborn child. It was this chapter in particular that captured Tolstoy's attention when he read the English text in November of 1888. As he wrote to Chertkov:

"О брачной жизни я много думал и думаю, и, как всегда бывало со мной, как я о чем начинаю думать серьезно, так извне меня подстрекают и мне помогают. Третьего дня я получил из Америки книгу одной женщины доктора (она писала мне) под заглавием: «Tokology, a book for every Woman», by Alice Stockham, M.d. (sic) Книгу вообще превосходную, но главное, трактующую в одной главе о том самом предмете, о котором мы с вами переписывались, и решающую вопрос, разумеется, в том же смысле, как и мы. Радостно видеть, что вопрос давно поднят, и научные авторитеты решают его в том же смысле."

("I have thought and am thinking a great deal about married life, and, as it has always been with me, as I begin to think seriously about something, people prompt me from outside and help me. Three days ago I received from America a book by a woman doctor (she wrote to me) under the title: *Tokology, a book for every Woman*," by Alice Stockham, M.d. (sic) A magnificent book in general, but most importantly, dealing in one chapter with that very same question about which we wrote each other, and deciding it, of course, in the same way that we did. It is pleasing to see that the question has long been raised, and that scientific authorities are deciding it in the same way.") (PSS LXXXVI, 188)

Tolstoy wrote to Stockham as well, advising her that sexual relations "without the wish and possibility of having children are worse than prostitution and onanism, and in fact are

¹¹ See his diary entry of Oct. 30, 1890. Tolstoy's approval of Winslow's views is further indicated by his recommendation and forwarding of her material to E.A. Pokrovsky and A.M. Kalmykova in November of that year. (See his letters of Nov. 5 & 17, 1890.)

¹² Winslow and Stockham attended the same medical school at the Eclectic College in Cincinnati, Ohio. Winslow is registered as the 5th woman to become a physician in the United States.

both." (*PSS LXIV*, 202) Tolstoy proclaimed that *Tokology* was "not only for women, but for mankind," which was in need of enlightenment "especially in the matter treated in your book in chapter XI." (202)

Although Stockham was to collaborate with Tolstoy on the Russian translation of her book, she herself did not entirely agree with Tolstoy's condemnation of non-propagative sexual relations. She instead supported the practice of *coitus reservatus*. *Karezza* (1896), a short book in the genre of *Diana*, is a demystification of an earlier passage in *Tokology* concerning "sedular absorption." In *Karezza*, Stockham endorses the principles of male continence as established by Noyes and his nephew George Noyes Miller,¹³ mixed with elements from the theories of Henry Parkhurst and Eliza Burnz.¹⁴ She in fact shares the anti-intercourse bias of the latter two authors (as opposed to Noyes and Miller), as she believes that, using the methods of *Karezza*, intercourse should occur but every few weeks or, even better, every three or four months. Stockham further advocated equal reserve for both partners, as the female was to stop short of orgasm just as was the male.

While thus delimiting the physical pleasures of sex, she on the other hand increased the promise of spiritual reward. The erotic sublimation of carnal love reaches new heights in Stockham's description of intercourse:

Approaching the event, expressions of endearment and affection, accompanying general bodily contact, is [sic] followed by the complete but quiet union of the male and female organs. During a lengthy period of perfect control, the whole being of each is submerged in the other, and an exquisite exaltation experienced. This may be followed by a quiet motion, entirely under full subordination of the will, so that at no time the thrill of passion for either party will go beyond a pleasurable exchange... In the course of an hour the physical tension subsides, the spiritual exaltation increases, and not uncommonly visions of a transcendent life are seen and consciousness of new powers experienced." (Stockham, *Karezza*, 23-24)¹⁵

Stockham was perhaps aware that her views would not be received well by Tolstoy;

¹³Miller followed his utopian novel *The Strike of a Sex* (1890), in which women give men the choice of continence or abstinence, with a second novel, *After the Sex Struck, or, Zugassent's Discovery* (1895). "Zugassent's Discovery" is none other than the practice of male continence. Alice Stockham distributed both of Miller's books before making her own contribution to the literature with *Karezza*.

¹⁴ Stockham quotes her predecessors liberally--a full two pages, for instance, are lifted verbatim from Burnz's "Private Letter" without proper citation.

¹⁵ This extraordinary passage suggests the possible influence of Ida Craddock, another phonographer/sex reformer, who is not considered here because she had no correspondence with Tolstoy. Craddock maintained a relationship with a heavenly bridegroom, who "can adapt himself to her most delicate fluctuations of sentiment at a moment's warning, and so never fails to be truly her companion." (*Heavenly Bridegrooms*, NY, 1918, p. 121). In the 1890's she quit phonography and dedicated herself wholly to sexual studies, in which she saw three levels of progression toward "Borderland wedlock": beginning with *Alpha*, then following with *Diana* as a transition to *Zugassent's Discovery*, then ending with "psychic wedlock," or union with the Divine. Orgasm without ejaculation brought contact with the "Ultimate Force as the third partner in a sex union." She was celibate, as she believed was required in order to be presentable to her heavenly bridegroom.

though she had maintained her correspondence with him after their partnership working on *Tokology*, and had sent him her 1893 book, *Koradine Letters*, with its supplement "Creative Life: a special letter to young girls" (of which Tolstoy again approved), there is no record of Tolstoy ever having encountered *Karezza*.¹⁶

Stockham was frequently censored under the Comstock laws, including an occasion when another of Tolstoy's correspondents, Moses Harman, attempted to publish passages from *Tokology* in his radical periodical *Lucifer, the Light Bearer*. This latter journal dealt with all manner of radical economic and political ideas, but proclaimed in its masthead that its specialty was "Sexology, or Sexologic Science, believing this to be the Most Important

¹⁶Despite the ultimate disjunction of their views, Stockham's influence on Tolstoy deserves further consideration; Tolstoy's acquaintance with her ideas is coincidental with his first labors on "The Kreutzer Sonata," which continued throughout the period of his assistance in the publication of the Russian translation of *Tokology*. This relationship is explored in the article by Robert Edwards, "Tolstoy and Alice B. Stockham: The Influence of 'Tokology' on The Kreutzer Sonata," in this issue of *Tolstoy Studies Journal*. When Stockham visited Yasnaya Polyana in late 1889, however, it was her spiritualism that fascinated Tolstoy. Of Quaker upbringing, Stockham piqued his curiosity about American sectarianism; Tolstoy made a list of important American sects in his diary, many of which are noted for unconventional sexual practices, and wrote to his daughter Tatiana that "М. Stockham очень мне была полезна, не в медиц[инском], а в религиозном, в сведениях о религиозном движении в Америке, к[оторым] она сама занята" ("М. Stockham was very useful to me, not in a medical, but in a religious [way], in providing information about the religious movement in America, with which she is herself occupied") (Tolstoy, PSS LXIV, 312). Interestingly enough, Tolstoy made the following comment in his diary: "Стокг[ам] очень мила--спиритуалистка совершенно того духа, кот[орого] W[orld] Adv[ance] Thought. Очень это интересно. Вера в связь с миром духов приводит их к истине." ("Stockham is very kind--a spiritualist of exactly the same spirit as World Advance Thought. This is very interesting. Belief in a connection to the world of spirits leads them toward the truth.") (Tolstoy, PSS L, 152-3). He was to praise this tendency again in his reading of *Koradine Letters*, as he wrote to Chertkov: На днях я получил книгу «Koradine Letters». Это мысли о назначении женщины и о духовном лечении, и к книге есть supplement, которое мне очень понравилось «Creative Life». Мысль этой брошюры, обращенной к женщинам и девушкам, --но она также относится и к мужчинам, --та, что в известный период в человек проявляется как бы сверх обыкновенная энергия. Она называет это «Creative power life» -- творческая сила, и человек стремится приложить ее. Половое приложение --низшее. Человек, почувствовав эту силу, должен знать, что ему нужно, и он может творить, и должен тотчас же прикладывать к делу эту творческую силу: строить дом, садить сад, лес, учить, писать, делать что-нибудь новое, чего не было. Я думаю, что это правда, даже отчасти испытал это. Трудность тут для нас только в том, чтобы сбить эту творческую силу с того пути, к которому она привыкла, и наладить на новый. ("Several days ago I received a book *Korradine Letters*. The idea of this brochure, on the calling of women and young girls--but it applies just as well to men--is that in a certain period there arises in a person some greater than usual energy. She calls this "Creative power life"--a creative power, which one strives to apply. The sexual application is lower. Feeling this energy, a person should know what he needs and that he can create, and should at once put this energy to use: build a home, plant a garden or forest, study, write, do something new, whatever it may be. I think this is true, and have even experienced it to some degree. The only difficulty for us is to turn that creative energy away from its usual avenues and to set it upon a new one.) (PSS LXXXVII, 227)

of all Sciences...."¹⁷ Harman was a longstanding and outspoken champion of free speech and radicalism whose publishing efforts spanned thirty years, evolving from early free love newspapers (*Valley Falls Liberal* and *Kansas Liberal*) into the more expansive *Lucifer* and *American Journal of Eugenics*. In 1908, Harman began sending copies of the latter journal to Yasnaya Polyana, and wrote to Tolstoy several months later inquiring as to whether he wished to continue receiving the subscription. It is not at this point known whether or not Tolstoy ever read Harman's journal, but if he did, he might have noticed his own *Kreutzer Sonata* offered for sale in "Lucifer's Book List," alongside *Diana* and *Karezza*.¹⁸

Lucifer had in fact been a sounding board for discussions of the various merits of revisionist sexologies. A frequent contributor was Elmina Slenker, a colleague of Henry Parkhurst and the leading spokesperson for "Dianism" in the years when Parkhurst was still maintaining his anonymity as author of the text. Slenker's praises of Dianism appeared regularly in Harman's journal, as did the comments of other readers, both pro and con.¹⁹ Tolstoy's own contribution to the discussion of Dianism was in fact printed in translation in *Lucifer* as "What Diana Teaches," an off-print of which was subsequently made available to readers through the "Book List."²⁰ Later in the 1890's, Henry Parkhurst contributed regularly to *Lucifer*, including a weekly column of "Sociologic Lessons" discussing the fundamentals of political economy.

¹⁷ Harman's daughter Lillian, 17, "married" Edwin Walker in a free love ceremony that was much publicized in *Lucifer*, after which they were arrested and imprisoned. Walker, who lived in New York and served as Advertising Director and Eastern Representative to the journal, wrote one of the "commendations" of *Diana* which appeared at the front of later editions of the pamphlet. (Similar prefatory comment was contributed by another contributor to *Lucifer*, the utopian novelist and anarchist J. William Lloyd, who later wrote, after Stockham's, another *Karezza*. Lloyd's *Karezza*, which is evidently still in print, is devoted fully to the goal of increased pleasure.)

¹⁸ Harman had from the mid-1880's offered a variety of radical political and literary works for sale, including Russian authors such as Bakunin, Chernyshevsky and Dostoevsky. (Sears, 48) An ardent humanist, Harman dated his publications according to the chronology adopted at the St. Louis Liberal convention of 1882, in which E.M. (Era of Man) became the designation for the period beginning in 1600, when Giordano Bruno was burned at the stake for claiming that other solar systems existed. (Sears, 49)

¹⁹ See for example No. 661 of June 2, 1897. Slenker is more emphatic in her praises than Parkhurst: "Male continence, religious chastity(!), priestly celibacy(!) nunneries, etc., etc.; but at last comes the real sovereign and queen, the Goddess Diana, who points a way out of all these innumerable ills [prostitution, etc.], and shows the flower-bordered path of purity, peace and love." Harman himself had reservations about Parkhurst's theories, and printed E.B. Foote's attacks on Alphism and Dianism.

²⁰ *The Kreutzer Sonata* was also subject to a lively discussion in *Lucifer* in the early 1890's. The commentary in *Lucifer* applauded Tolstoy's forthrightness in exposing the depravity of sexual relations; the editors' response to news of the American censorship of Tucker's translation is typical of the journal's free speech bent--"Bravo, Lyof Tolstoi! that a work of yours is considered worthy of inhibition." (VIII, 7, Aug. 8, 1890)

PARKURST AND BURNZ

Were it not for the fact that he was affiliated with Stephen Pearl Andrews, who himself mixed phonography and other practical pursuits with utopian idealism, Henry Parkhurst might seem a very unlikely author of a guide to "psycho-fyziological" relations for married couples. In a biographical sketch written by his son, Parkhurst is presented as an important figure in two fields--phonography and astronomy. He served from 1848 to 1854 as the first phonographic reporter for the United States Senate (during which period Andrews temporarily hired on with Parkhurst as an assistant) and later performed that same service for the Superior Court in New York City. A very energetic man, he was also Professor of Astronomy at the Brooklyn Academy of Arts and Sciences; he further produced a number of inventions of the most varied sort, wrote papers calling for "A New Currency," "Duodecimal Notation," and English language reform, and published two journals, "The Plowshare" and "The American Reporter." As mentioned above, he was involved in the radical circles of New England Fourierists as well, as a member of their Boston Association and a participant at Brook Farm.

Despite his interest and accomplishments in all these fields, Parkhurst wrote in "Why I Wrote Diana" that he regarded his most important work to be in the field of sexual research. His first writings on sexuality were produced as part of a practical exercise, comprising one of several books he wrote in an effort to learn to "think in phonography." The later project that grew into *Diana* was begun as a similar exercise, when, in 1878, Parkhurst decided to teach himself how to type. His desire to learn typing itself stemmed from a sexual issue, as he was attempting to find a way to deal with the reluctance of female amanuenses in his employ to transcribe blunt courtroom testimony on sexual matters:

...occasionally there would be divorce cases, requiring transcription day by day, and not infrequently containing language which refined women were not accustomed to. There are sometimes cases in which it is absolutely necessary...to use the plainest possible words, as well as to give details of criminal sexual acts." ("Why" 4)

The adoption of the typewriter for transcription allowed Parkhurst to type in those passages which his female employees refused to transcribe, without the noticeable change that would have occurred with handwriting. The circumstances under which Parkhurst wrote *Diana* pervade the text itself, as Parkhurst begins the tract by referring to "the records of our courts" as an indication "that the institution of marriage is losing its hold upon the consciences and lives of our people." (8) In his attempt to salvage that institution Parkhurst would display that same deference to women that he had shown in adopting the typewriter, as in *Diana* women were given the regulatory prerogative in the marital bed. The creation of *Diana* is also typical of Parkhurst's pragmatism--sitting down at the typewriter to deal with a practical problem, he tapped out an argument for the reform of those sexual relations which had caused his dilemma. In producing his reform program Parkhurst refers not only to personal experience, however, but also to the work of his American predecessors in sex reform--to Noyes' *Male Continence* and Winslow's *Alpha*

in particular, both of which he believed had proven inadequate to the cause.

As Eliza Burnz is noted in her biographies as one of the first women to work as a stenographer in New York City, and Henry Parkhurst claims to have been the first to employ women in this capacity, it is quite likely that Burnz's contact with Parkhurst initially stemmed from their common professional, rather than reformist, interests. Burnz was another enthusiast of typography and orthography, and worked diligently throughout her life for the advancement of phonography and spelling reform. She printed a number of pamphlets dedicated to these causes, many of which explicated her own method of phonic shorthand. Like Andrews, her interest in phonography emerged from a fascination with Pitman's shorthand method, which she saw as not only a practical device for reporters and secretaries, but also as a valuable educational aid in mastering the English language. More importantly (and again following the footsteps of Andrews), Burnz early on displayed a tendency to combine this practical sensibility with an eye for social reform.²¹ After the Civil War, for instance, she used her phonetic spelling method in a special literacy program for newly-freed slaves. She likewise used her access to printing resources to work for women's rights, serving as editor of *Woman's Advocate*. Burnz herself certainly had no lack of feminist pluck, and her experiences facing the prejudice of her day regarding the capacity of women to engage in public service no doubt heightened her sensitivity to social injustice. Her particular interest in sex reform might also have been fostered by her stenographic duties, where she likely encountered such cases of sexual transgression and infidelity as described by Parkhurst.

It was Burnz's New York publishing house, the vehicle for her phonographic publications as well as headquarters to the "Leag for Short Spelling," that published six editions of *Diana* in the 1880's and 1890's.²² It was Burnz who sent the pamphlet to Tolstoy in 1890 and whose name appeared at the end of the "Private Letter" in the booklet's closing pages. Parkhurst maintained his anonymity as author of *Diana* until shortly before the 6th edition appeared in 1896. His confessional "Why I Wrote Diana," which was appended to the text in this edition, represented his attempt to come to the aid of the aforementioned Elmina Slenker; she had been arrested under the Comstock laws

²¹ A text called "The Reformer" was included in each edition of Eliza Burnz's textbook, which included the following passage: "All history and all experience teach us that new ideas are unpopular with the masses of men, and that those who advance them must expect opposition and persecution... What then is the duty of the reformer? ...he is but an instrument through which the Great Unknown works out his designs and purposes in the world, and his progression as well as his neighbors' conservation is a necessary condition to the exact and orderly working of the universal and ever-persistent law of progress."

²²A tireless advocate of short spelling, Burnz's orthographical rules were printed in the back pages of *Diana*. Her even-handed devotion to both orthographic and sexual reform is further indicated by her second letter to Tolstoy, in which she attempted to interest him in her Step by Step Primer in Pronouncing Print, which would "enabl foreigners to get the correct pronounciation of English words in spite of our barbarous orthografy." (See Appendix.)

The copy of the brochure sent to Tolstoy must have been the 4th edition, published in 1890. Burnz's letter is signed "SAXON" in the third edition, so that Tolstoy could no have identified the author otherwise (referring to it as "письмо Бёрнс").

while gathering input for Parkhurst from readers of his tract.²³ It is for these reasons that *Diana* came to be associated with Burnz's name over the years, a confusion most significant in the case of a 1910 letter of Vladimir Chertkov to Tolstoy, which will be discussed below.

TOLSTOY READS *DIANA*

As stated above, Tolstoy had significant reservations about the theories presented in *Diana*.²⁴ He in fact introduces these reservations into the very text of his article on *Diana*, which he titled "*Ob otnoshenii mezhdu polami*" ("On the Relations between the Sexes"), by suggesting that Parkhurst's text emerged from a "не христианское, а скорее языческое, Платоновское мирозерцание" ("non-Christian, but rather a pagan, Platonic world-view"), a statement which he admitted, in a letter to Chertkov, was a way of shielding himself from blame.²⁵ (*PSS XXVII*, 287) Indeed the tract's very title elicited this distinction, Parkhurst would later point out that he had chosen it because "in the heathen mythology Diana was the goddess of chastity." ("Why" 8) The title is indeed quite appropriate to Parkhurst's pamphlet, as the Roman goddess Diana (identified with the Greek goddess Artemis) was not only a goddess of chastity, but also of fertility and of the forest.²⁶ True to its title, the text does offer a mix of chastity, eugenics and sensuality that in many ways contradicts the stark, uncompromising asceticism of Christian chastity. With Tolstoy's caveat in mind, then, we can consider what elements are particularly troublesome to him, and can further examine how he transforms the text--how it is "Christianized" by the excision of its "pagan" elements, and, more importantly for our concerns, how it is "Tolstoyanized."

As described by Tolstoy, the main point of *Diana* is that sexual relations should

²³Parkhurst's attack on Comstock and the methods used to entrap Elmina Slenker appears in No. 643 of *Lucifer* (Jan. 27, 1897).

²⁴In his correspondence about *Diana*, Tolstoy was always less equivocal about Burnz's "Private Letter" than about the main text. "Еще получил я статью «Диана» из Америки о поло [вых] сношениях и написал изложение ее. Перевести ее всю было бы хуже и перевел приложение к ней письмо." ("I also received an article "Diana" from America on sexual relations and wrote an exposition of it. To translate the whole thing would have been worse--and I translated the letter appended to it.") (*PSS LXXXVII*, 49) "В Диане есть многое нехорошее, а выбрал то, что по мне б[ыло] хорошо. Аисьмо Борнс прекрасно." ("There's a lot in Diana that isn't good, and I chose what, in my opinion, was good. Burnz's letter is wonderful.") (*PSS LXV*, 183)

²⁵Статью Дианы я тоже подправлял и в начале вставил место..., в к[отором] я выгораживаю себя и говорю, что хотя основы этой статьи не христианские, а языческие, она все таки может быть очень полезна. (I also touched up the Diana article and inserted a place... where I shield myself [fence myself off] and say that although the basis of the article is not Christian, but pagan, it might still be very useful.)

²⁶In Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Blithedale Romance*, the character Zenobia, representing the "new woman" in the novel's utopian setting, dresses up as the goddess Diana in a forest masquerade. The novel is based on Hawthorne's experiences at Brook Farm, where Henry Parkhurst was also a member.

be directed as much as possible toward spiritual, rather than physical satisfaction, as physical desire tends to supersede the capacity for its fulfillment. Sexual relations comprise "влечение различных полов друг к другу, могущее принимать форму самого духовного общения только мысли, самого животного общения, производящего деторождение, и всех самых различных ступеней между тем и другим." ("the attraction of opposites for one another, capable of assuming the form of the most spiritual union in thought only, or of the most animal union, causing the propagation of children and all those varied degrees of relationship between the one and the other.") (*PSS XXVII*, 287) The attraction between the two polar opposites represented by the sexes is thus marked by a range of modes of expression which is itself delineated by two poles-- the spiritual and physical (or animal). As Parkhurst argues, physical and spiritual relations are mutually effective, so that the satisfaction of desire in one mode reduces desire in the other. Each individual relationship establishes its own ratio of spiritual to physical interaction--however, Parkhurst finds in the range of these interactions not only a quantitative difference (in sexual versus spiritual intercourse), but a qualitative one as well, with the greater value to be found at the spiritual end of the scale:

...чем форма общения ближе к крайнему физическому пределу, тем больше разжигается желание, и тем меньше получается удовлетворения; тем ближе к противоположному крайнему, духовному пределу, тем меньше вызываются новые желания, тем полнее удовлетворение. Чем ближе к первому, тем разрушительнее для жизненной силы; чем ближе к второму, к духовному, тем спокойнее, радостнее и сильнее общее состояние.

...the nearer the form of intercourse approaches the extreme physical boundary, the more it kindles the desire, and the less satisfaction it receives; the nearer it approaches the opposite, spiritual boundary, the less new desires are excited and the greater the satisfaction. The nearer it comes to the first, the more destructive it is to life energy; the nearer it approaches the second, the spiritual, the more serene, the more enjoyable and forceful is the general condition. (*PSS XXVII*, 288)

We can feel Tolstoy's personal enmity toward the physical emerging in these lines, countered by his abiding faith in the power and vitality of ascetic, spiritualized relations. Tolstoy sees in Parkhurst's arguments a legitimation of such relations, as abstinence becomes a quite natural and clearly beneficial pattern of behavior: "...он не только не признает невозможности воздержания, но считает его естественным и необходимым условием разумной половой гигиены как в браке, так и вне его." ("...he not only does not recognize any impossibility in self-restraint, but considers it a natural and indispensable condition of a reasonable system of sexual hygiene in married life and outside of it.") (*PSS XXVII*, 288)

Parkhurst himself, however, does indeed recognize limits to self-restraint, and in fact stresses throughout the text the need to maintain a balance of physical satisfaction. Conspicuously absent from Tolstoy's *Diana* is the sensuality which Parkhurst advocates for marital relations, notwithstanding their ultimately chaste nature. In fact, the Dianic principle which gives the pamphlet its name refers precisely to the practice of sublimation of desire through controlled sexual contact:

In order to secure proper and durable relations between the sexes, it is essential to live in harmony with the law of Alfism.

Abstinence except for procreation

But if that principle is adopted alone, no means being taken to provide for the due exercise of the sexual faculties, it will be likely either to be abandoned or to lead to a life of asceticism. In order to make Alfism practicable for ordinary men and women, another law must be observed:

--Sexual satisfaction from sexual contact

understanding by the term contact, not merely actual physical nude, external contact, but using the term in its more general sense, to include sexual companionship, or even correspondence, bringing the minds into mental contact. The observance of this law will lead to complete and enduring satisfaction in abstinence. (*Diana*, 7)

Parkhurst in fact takes pride in offering his reader this satisfaction, having set forth a program through which chastity does not require deprivation, but instead suggests fulfillment. The tract's title and its epigraph, "*The twain shall be one flesh*" both stress the corporeal, while the author does not renounce the flesh, but admits its powerful beauty:

When the twain become one flesh, they should no longer cherish reserve from each other. People do not know what they lose by seeing the nude only in paintings and in statuary. A picture of a fall of snow, of a tree waving in the wind, or of a foaming cataract may be beautiful; but how much more beautiful is nature herself, where the falling snow, the waving branches, the dashing waters, are in actual motion, making a picture which no art can portray. And so much more beautiful is the nude in action than the lifeless forms of the painter or sculptor. (42)

In light of this value placed on reality over representation, physical contact becomes a necessary part of the rational hygiene of marriage.

When men and their wives can learn to be together, seeing each other, and embracing each other without the intervention of clothing, and to enjoy such caresses disassociated from passionate feelings, there will be little danger that there will ever be such sexual excess between them as to endanger the perpetuity of their mutual attraction." (43)

Such interaction produces a "galvanic satisfaction," whereby the sexual urge is met with a passion-dulling, yet pleasurable response, restoring "the sexual equilibrium in the normal way," and avoiding "amorous excess."²⁷

As Parkhurst describes it, "the principles laid down here consist of a duty and a

²⁷ Parkhurst is somewhat unclear in describing the limits to this contact. While taking issue with Noyes' practice of male continence (because it "stimulates into activity the generative function of the sexual batteries; and this not only causes a wasteful use of sperm, but diverts the sexual batteries from their affectional function, diminishing amative attraction"), he nevertheless offers an ambiguous conclusion: "Experience in each individual case can alone determine what form of external sexual contact will afford the highest satisfaction..." (18)

privilege; the duty of abstinence except for procreation, and the privilege of sexual satisfaction from sexual contact." (45) Attempts to fulfill the Alphic duty without resort to this privilege, however, are ill-fated--Parkhurst maintains that the ascetic impulse, when not balanced with the proper portion of satisfaction, is a danger to the health and longevity of a marriage and its individual partners. Sexual interaction, in all its various guises, is "an important element of our natural sensibility," and in fact fulfills and improves men and women. (22) When properly controlled, the sexual impulse provides a "helthful action," and the "sexual batteries" (testicles and ovaries) generate a vital power "which makes the perfect man, more noble than the eunuch." (22, 9) As Parkhurst was to say later in "Why I Wrote Diana," theories which relied only on repression met "with constant failures from the neglect to cultivate and to satisfy the physical sex nature." ("Why", 8) The idea of sexual continence "had been taught as a moral principle only, to be obeyed as a sacrifice; whereas, Diana teaches it also as a physical principle, the violation of which is a sacrifice." (7) The Dianic principle, in other words, was based in a pragmatic reconciliation with the physical laws with which ascetics had struggled for so long, and was believed by Parkhurst, in fact, to represent a means of optimizing physical satisfaction.

At first glance it would seem that this regimen of rational control of physical desire might indeed have prevented Pozdnyshv's fall. He had, after all, pointed to unbridled sensuality as the source of the enmity between himself and his wife: "Влюбленность истощилась удовлетворением чувственности, и остались мы друг против друга в нашем действительном отношении друг к другу, то есть два совершенно чуждые друг другу эгоиста, желающие получить себе как можно больше удовольствия один через другого." ("Love was exhausted by sensual satisfactions, and we were left facing each other in our true relation, that is as two egotists, completely alien to one another, desiring to achieve as much pleasure as we could from one another.") (PSS XXVII, 32) Parkhurst would maintain that this animosity could have been avoided through controlled, "galvanizing" sexual contact and spiritual intimacy. Tolstoy, however, took a more pessimistic view. While in *Diana* it is assumed that couples "can learn to be together, seeing each other, and embracing each other without the intervention of clothing, and to enjoy such caresses *disassociated from passionate feelings*," Tolstoy maintains no such Noyesian trust of the body. The "Postlude to the Kreutzer Sonata" offers no safe haven--even before sexual maturity--for excursions into sensuality, the dangers of which emerge in the everyday practices of bourgeois society:

Наряды, чтения, зрелища, музыка, танцы, сладкая пища, вся обстановка жизни, от картинок на коробках до романов и повестей и поэм, еще более разжигает чувственность, и вследствие этого самые ужасные половые пороки и болезни делаются обычными условиями выращивания детей обоего пола и часто остаются и в зрелом возрасте.

(Costumes, reading, entertainments, music, dances, sweets, the whole setting of life, from pictures on boxes to novels, stories and poems, inflames sensuality even more, as a result of which the most horrible sexual vices and diseases become the normal conditions for the maturation of children of both sexes, and often endure into maturity as well.) (PSS XXVII, 82)

This list of anathemas, extending far beyond the bedroom door, provides a striking contrast to the frolicking encouraged by Parkhurst. The mind is never to relax in its struggle to overcome the desires of the body, and the program of corrective labor which is to keep it properly occupied offers no place for Dianic diversions. Romantic love and all its "poetry" only distracts men and women from the true duties incumbent upon them in their most productive years, during which they should be occupied with their true life's work (labors to improve humanity). Non-propagative sexual relations and the mechanisms allowing such relations are rejected because they free people "от забот и трудов о детях, служащих искуплением плотской любви." ("from cares and labors over children, which serve as the expiation of carnal love.") (XXVII, 81)

Parkhurst's justification for sexual contact is based in assumptions which Tolstoy did not accept; that, though in need of reform, marriage is a worthy and redeemable institution, and that sexual behavior should be codified in accordance with observable and unimpeachable physical laws. For Tolstoy, the only inviolable laws are spiritual, and are derived from the teachings of Christ. The moral imperative of chastity was presented in Matthew 19:12, when Christ answered a question about marriage by referring to "eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven," adding, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." Tolstoy was very literal in interpreting this passage, and was uncompromising in arguing for its fulfillment, even if this were to mean the end of generations of humankind. As he had argued in the "The Kreutzer Sonata" and its "Postlude," the birth of new generations was merely a "safety valve," a cycle of second chances in which the ultimate goal was always the victory over the body and its sensual temptations.²⁸ Thus marriage was viewed only as the "next best" alternative to a life of chastity and uncompromised spirituality. The veracity of this stark ideal is proved by its very incommensurability with human nature and the physical world: "Идеал только тогда идеал, когда осуществление его возможно только в идее, в мысли, когда он представляется достижимым только в бесконечности и когда поэтому возможность приближения к нему --бесконечна." ("An ideal is only an ideal, then, when its realization is possible only as an idea, in thought--when it seems achievable only in eternity and when, for this reason, the possibility of approaching it is eternal.") (PSS XXVII, 84) Reconciliation with the body was therefore antithetical to Tolstoy's approach to the dilemma represented in sexuality; admitting the power of the body, he was nonetheless unwilling to assign it authority over the spirit.

Thus the basic premises of Tolstoy's chastity program are radically different from Parkhurst's, emerging from an acceptance of human imperfectability that contravenes Parkhurst's rationalist reformism. Tolstoy's impulse toward chastity is ascetic in that it

²⁸ Pozdnyshv argues: Из срастей самая сильная, и злая, и упорная -- половая, плотская любовь, и потому если уничтожатся страсти и последняя, самая сильная из них, плотская любовь, то пророчество исполнится, люди соединятся воедино, цель человечества будет достигнута, и ему незачем будет жить. ("Sexual, carnal love is the strongest, and most wicked and stubborn of the passions, and for this reason if the passions are done away with, down to the last and strongest one, carnal love, then the prophecy will be fulfilled; people will unite as one, the aim of humanity will have been achieved, and there will be no reason to live.") (PSS XXVII, 29)

rejects the body and the sensual gratification it calls for; like that of the Desert Fathers, it is intrinsically connected to a Christian vision of Utopia, wherein humanity will overcome its corporeal limitations and live in a perfect community of spirits. Parkhurst's view, also utopian in its own way, seeks to refine the body through a rational balancing of its needs and limitations.²⁹ The Dianic program is not unlike a phonography of the body, stripping its excesses and imbuing it with a satisfying functionality. It is a utilitarian and indeed a "Platonic" utopianism, as Tolstoy suggests, in that it harkens back to the *Republic* in its view of sexual virtue as the harmonization of individual needs with those of society. Parkhurst believes as well in the perfecting quality of idealized sexual relations, which are both physically and morally exalting. His reveries on the rarified intimacies he proposes provide a sharp contrast to the opinions of Pozdnyshov, who asserts: "предполагается в теории, что любовь есть нечто идеальное, возвышенное, а на практике любовь ведь есть нечто мерзкое, свиное..." ("It is suggested in theory that love is something ideal and exalted, but in practice it is really something foul and swinish.") (*PSS XXVII*, 34) Sensual satisfaction, much like the aesthetic enjoyments renounced in *What is Art?*, is displaced by the moral imperatives of Christianity.

It is no surprise, then, that the snowdrifts and prancing nude forms of the Dianic landscape are omitted in Tolstoy's article, which instead privileges the "Alphic" asceticism Parkhurst had sought to mitigate.³⁰ Tolstoy worked diligently on his exposition of the text, working through at least five drafts of the text within a period of several days immediately following his receipt of the pamphlet.³¹ In spite of these labors, however,

²⁹ Parkhurst even allowed that "an occasional violation of [chastity] in practice wud be of littl more consequence than the violation of the fyziological principls, that food should be taken at regular hours, and sleep during the hours of the niht." (41)

³⁰ Comparison of the passage quoted above (about nude forms, etc.) with the following passage from the "Kreutzer Sonata": Возьмите всю поэзию, всю живопись, скульптуру, начиная с любовных стихов и голых Венер и фрин, вы видите, что женщина есть оружие наслаждения. ("Take all of poetry, painting, and sculpture, beginning with love poems and the nude Venuses and Phrynes, and you'll see that woman is an instrument of pleasure.") (*PSS XXVII*, 37) This austerity is also reflected in Tolstoy's language in describing Diana, which avoids the discursive excesses of the original. Parkhurst tends to illustrate his arguments with far-flung analogies, creating the sort of bells and whistles which often euphemistically describe the sexual act itself: the sexual attraction in its different forms behaves like a magnetic, galvanic, or electric force, with accompanying explosions and repulsions; the male sexual drive is compared to the lactation of cows, which require milking only when regularly milked.

³¹ The editors of the *Sobranie sochinenii* include in their annotations to the text some comments on a draft which they consider to be subsequent to the manuscript from which the text was printed in *Nedelia*. Two changes are noteworthy. The first is the deletion of two sentences:

Брак поэтому, по мнению автора, составляющий естественное и желательное условие для всех людей, достигших зрелого возраста, не есть необходимо физическое соединение, но может быть и духовным. Смотри по условиям и темпераменту, а главное по тому, что соединяющиеся считают должным, хорошим и желательным, для одних брак будет более приближаться к духовному общению, для других -- к

Tolstoy began to worry that he had not sufficiently obscured the sensuality of *Diana*, and, writing to Nikolai Strakhov two weeks later, he confessed:

Изложение брошюры «Дианы», после того, как я послал вам, мне разонравилось. Я много выпустил и смягчил, а то там есть нехорошее -- удовлетворение чувственности в разных видах; и я боюсь, что она может подать повод к соблазну, особенно место о малороссийском обычае жениханья. Да и лучше не печатать ее вовсе.

(I took a disliking to the account of the pamphlet *Diana* after I sent it to you. I left out and softened a lot, but there's still something bad--satisfaction of sensuality in various forms--and I'm afraid that it might lead to temptation, especially the part about Ukrainian engagement customs. Yes, it would be better not to print it at all.) (PSS LXV, 177)

To his dismay, however, "*Ob otnošenii mezhdru polami*" appeared as written in the last October issue of *Nedelia*, just two weeks after Tolstoy had received the pamphlet from Eliza Burnz.

Tolstoy's initial enthusiasm for Eliza Burnz's "Private Letter" was to undergo a similar reversal, though for different reasons. The "Letter" discredits the belief that the male body required elimination of excess sperm, arguing instead that such a notion derives

физическому; но чем больше общение будет приближаться к духовному, тем полнее будет удовлетворение.

(For this reason marriage, in the author's opinion, comprising the natural and desirable condition for everyone who has reached maturity, is not necessarily a physical union, but may also be a spiritual one. Depending on the conditions and the temperament, but primarily on that which the partners consider proper, good and desirable, for some marriage will approach the spiritual union, while for others, the physical; but the closer it comes to the spiritual union, the more complete will be the satisfaction.)

This cut may merely be stylistic, in that the passage is somewhat redundant in relation to the rest of the article; it is, on the other hand, possible that Tolstoy was uncomfortable with the freedom of choice the passage offers married couples, and likewise with the suggestion that marriage is a "desirable condition."

The second change alters the penultimate paragraph of the article, reworking the completion of this phrase: "...приведение разума в согласие с изложенными здесь принципами и постепенное образование привычек, согласных с ними...." ("...the gradual leading of the reason into agreement with the principals here outlined, and the gradual education of the habits in accordance with them..."). In the printed version it continues "...избавит людей от многих страданий и даст им удовлетворение их половых стремлений." (... will preserve people from much suffering and give them satisfaction of their sexual desires."), while in the later draft it reads "...все более и более будет избавлять человечество от тех бедствии, которым оно подвергает себя науршением закона, которому подлежит человек в отношении полового стремления." (...will more and more preserve humanity from those calamities to which it subjects itself by the violation of the law under which a person is bound in relation to sexual desire.") Again Tolstoy has removed "sexual satisfaction" from the picture.

from "sexual immorality" and is "destroying the vitality and happiness of our race." (Burnz, 52)³² Basing her argument entirely on "comparativ fyziology," Burnz uses rhetorical devices similar to Parkhurst's, unhesitatingly indulging in the method of analogy. Correcting those who would mistakenly class the "Spermatic Secretion" with those bodily fluids which require expulsion, such as bile, pancreatic juice, or saliva ("some men will spit a pint a day..."), Burnz suggests that the secretion of semen is rather akin to that of "lachrymal fluid" or, in other words, tears, which "ar ever redy, waiting to spring forth when there is adequate cauz, but they do not acumulate and distress the man becauz they are not shed daily, weekly, or monthly." (54, 52) A number of factors further legitimize the analogy:

Neither flow of tears or semen is esential to life or helth. Both ar greatly under the control of the imagination, the emotions, and the wil; and the flow of either is liable to be arested in a moment of sudden mental action. Also, when a man sheds tears, there is a subsequent depression arizing from nervous exhaustion consequent upon the violent emotions which caused the tears, and a similar effect follows sexual emission. (53)

Making for an even happier analogy, the stigma attached to crying among men can now be extended to undesirable sexual activity, as Burnz points out that "it is unmanly for them to shed tears frequently or on trivial ocazions, and that moreover uncalld for emission is a destructiv waste of life material." (53)

Tolstoy was no doubt especially appreciative of these insights, echoing as they did the argument of Pozdnyshev in the *The Kreutzer Sonata*: Мужчине необходимо [удовлетворять свою похоть] ... Опять милые жрецы науки уверили всех... Внушите человек, что ему необходима водка, табак, опиум, и все это будет нербходимо." (For men it is necessary [to satisfy their lust]... Again the dear wizards of science assure everyone... Convince a person that he needs vodka, tobacco, or opium, and all that will be necessary.") (PSS XXVII, 35) Moreover, Burnz had not only focused her arguments on male sexuality, but had fashioned them so as to imply that true masculinity lay in the proper control of the passions. In suggesting that submission to the sexual impulse could in some sense be "unmanly," she challenged the traditional privileging of sexual virility as a sign of manhood, and affirmed instead a more Stoic masculinity. Thus her text resonates with Pozdnyshev's (and Tolstoy's) lamentations over youth misspent in the pursuit of carnal pleasures, and with the argument in the "Postlude" that avoidance of such sensual self-indulgence would preserve the strength and productivity of a proper manhood. To this end Tolstoy suggests at the end of his article on *Diana* that the "Private Letter" should be disseminated "между взрослыми мужчинами, губящими так напрасно свои лучшие силы и свое благо, и, главное, между

³² The "Letter" appears at the end of *Diana* as an appendix of the sort which was common to the genre, the record of another voice lending further authority to the central text. In the same manner, Tolstoy's extract/review was later to be appended to the end of *Diana*, with an introductory comment from Parkhurst. We can consider Tolstoy's utilization of these texts to support his arguments in "The Kreutzer Sonata" as yet another deployment of this device.

бедными, гибнущими только от незнания, мальчиками в семьях, училищах, гимназиях и в особенности корпусах и закрытых заведениях..." (among grown men, so uselessly wasting their best strengths and their well-being, and, most importantly, among the poor boys perishing only out of ignorance in families, schools, gymnasia and especially in the army and boarding schools...). (PSS XXVII, 289)

The text was not destined to enjoy such wide distribution, however, as Tolstoy's enthusiasm was again checked by reservations. While the first drafts of "*Ob otnoshenii...*" indicate that Tolstoy originally intended to include his translation of the "Private Letter" at the end of his account of *Diana*, he wrote Strakhov that the letter was probably too candid for the readers of *Nedelia*. Seeking a forum with a more limited audience, Tolstoy turned to E.A. Pokrovsky, editor of *Vestnik vospitaniia*, whose brochure "*Ob ukhode za malymi det'mi*" Tolstoy had helped edit and prepare for publication. Unfortunately, this attempt to direct the work to a more "suitable" audience placed it under greater critical scrutiny than it could withstand, as Pokrovsky answered that he could not vouch for the veracity of the letter's content and thus declined to publish it. This concern evidently impressed Tolstoy, for when the text was finally published--by *Posrednik*, four years later, in the collection *Tainyi porok: Trezvyie mysli o polovykh otnosheniakh*--he wrote on the envelope containing the manuscript, "Верно ли физиологически?" ("Is it accurate physiologically?") There is little record of the events surrounding the publication of the "Private Letter" at this later date, so we do not know how, or even if, this question was decided by Tolstoy. A continued uncertainty is perhaps reflected in the fact that neither his translation nor his praise for the letter in "*Ob otnoshenii mezhdu polami*," which was quoted to preface the text, are attributed to Tolstoy by the editors.³³

POSTLUDE

Tolstoy's reversal in his reading of *Diana* is perhaps best illustrated in one final episode in our story, occurring some twenty years after Eliza Burnz first sent the pamphlet to Yasnaya Polyana. In February, 1910, Vladimir Chertkov had learned of "another" pamphlet, written, as he believed, by Eliza Burnz, which was being passed from hand to hand in manuscript copy in England. Chertkov was concerned about this pamphlet, as it was "also" called "Diana," and was being confused with the previous "Diana," of which Tolstoy had spoken approvingly in his article «О половых отношениях»:

Вы когда-то написали статью о половом вопросе, в которой цитировали целиком прекрасную статью Елизы Борнз Е. Burnz, американской писательницы. Оказывается, как мне говорил навестивший вас не так давно друг мой Даниель, что эта же самая Е.

³³ In translating the "Private Letter", Tolstoy was assisted by A.M. Bogomolets, a doctor who was visiting Yasnaya Polyana at the time. Their translation is by and large faithful to the original text; there is one notable deletion, Burnz's "Also, when a man sheds tears there is a subsequent depression arising from nervous exhaustion, consequent upon the violent emotions which caused the tears, and a similar effect follows sexual emission."

Burns написала, кроме того, брошюру о супружеских отношениях, с которой мы с вами ни как не можем согласиться, под названием: "Diana." А в Англии многие, в том числе был и Даниель, думают, что вы с этим согласны т.к. в той давнейшей вашей статье хвалили и цитировали другую хорошую статью Е. Burns, также связанную со словом Diana.

You at one time wrote an article on the sexual question, in which you cited, in entirety, a wonderful article by Eliza Burnz, an American writer. It seems, as I was told by my friend Daniel, who visited you recently, that this same Eliza Burnz wrote another article on marital relations, with which we can by no means be in agreement, under the title "Diana." And in England, many people, including Daniel, think that you are in agreement with this, inasmuch as in that old article you praised and cited the other, good article by E. Burnz, also connected to the word Diana.³⁴

Though he reports that he is sending a copy of the text to Tolstoy, Chertkov suggests that since its language is somewhat obscure, he might do well to describe the author's ideas. In his synopsis of the pamphlet, which is of course none other than the original text by Parkhurst, Chertkov focuses on that "pagan" sensuality of *Diana* which Tolstoy had referred to, and then obscured, in his earlier resume. Accurately summarizing Parkhurst's views, Chertkov emphasizes their sensual aspect, describing a program of flirting, frolicking, and even, albeit incomplete, sexual intercourse, with which he is certain Tolstoy can by no means be in agreement. Though he asked Tolstoy to read the material himself and to be forthcoming with his opinion, Chertkov was so certain of Tolstoy's disapproval that he could not resist some rather predisposing comments: "Если не можете или считаете не стоит на это отвечать подробно, то напишите мне по этому поводу хоть несколько слов, чтобы воспользовавшись ими, я мог опровергнуть ваше сочувствие такому безобразию." ("If you can't, or consider it unnecessary to, answer in detail, then write me at least a few words on the matter, so that, using them, I might refute your sympathy with such disgracefulness.")

Tolstoy's answer indeed confirmed Chertkov's opinion on the matter:

О последнем вопросе, о Диане, к[отор]ую я пробежал, отвечаю, что мои взгляды о полов[ых] отнош[ениях] много раз были высказаны и что они, как не могут сходиться с взглядами этой Г[оспо]жи, так я считаю полное целомудрие высшим совершенством, к к[оторо]му должен стремиться человек, самым же низшим и безнравственным отношением к половому стремлению --признание этого стремления источником допустимых наслаждений.

On the last question, about Diana, which I looked over, I will answer that my views on sexual relations have been expressed many times, and that they are not in agreement with the views of this woman, inasmuch as I consider complete chastity, toward which a person should strive, as the greatest perfection, and the recognition of that striving as a source of acceptable pleasures as the most base and immoral relation to the sexual desire. (PSS LXXXIX, 172)

³⁴ The full text of this letter may be found in the appendix below.

The irony of this final episode, though perhaps lost to its chief protagonist, was not, however, unforeseen by him. In confirming Chertkov's supposition in his responding letter, Tolstoy unwittingly justified the apprehension he had experienced in his first encounter with the text some twenty years earlier. Parkhurst's attempt to make abstinence practicable through controlled sexual contact was ultimately too compromising for Tolstoy, whose own writings on sexuality reveal a complete disdain for sensuality in all its forms. Writing to ask Chertkov his opinion about *Diana* in 1890, Tolstoy had indicated the selectivity of his approval of the text-- "...написал изложение ее. Перевести ее всю было бы хуже" ("I wrote an extract of it. To translate the whole thing would have been worse"), and in this incomplete recreation of the text he had done much to rewrite it according to his own beliefs. (*PSS LXXXVII*, 49)

APPENDIX

I. Eliza Burnz's Letters to Tolstoy³⁵

1. OCTOBER 7, 1890:

New York, Oct 7, 1890

Count L.N. Tolstoi,

Honord Sir;

We hav the pleasure of transmitting you, by mail, a copy of a small book, entitled, "Diana, a psycho-fyziological essay on sexual relations, for married men and women," which we hope wil reach you in safety.

Since the circulation, in America, of your work, "The Kreutzer Sonata," very many persons hav said, "Diana carries out, and explains, and makes practicabl, Count Tolstoi's theories. So we take the liberty of sending you a copy, that you may judge for yourself. Praying for the fulfilment of your heart's dearest wish,

We ar, dear sir

Truly yours

Burnz & Co.

P.S. We shall be glad if you honor us with a notice that the work reaches you safely.

2. FEBRUARY 12, 1893:

New York, Feb 12th 1893

Count Lev N. Tolstoi

Honored Sir;

About two years ago, I sent you a copy of "Diana" which you thought so well of as to write a review of it in a Russian paper.

I now take the liberty of sending you two copies of my recently publisht Step by Step Primer in Pronouncing Print. This will enabl foreigners to get the correct pronunciation of English words in spite of our barbarous orthograpy. Soon, I hope to hav portions of the Scriptures--first the Sermon on the Mount--set in this Pronouncing Print; then other popular English works. A young Russian Mr. Wm. Robert Ebell, who has been in America 12 years, proposes to get my permission to publish this Primer with the introduction and explanations, and parts of the body of the book in Russian, for the benefit of Russians who ar in America, or Russia.

The two copies of the Primer ar sent by mail. I enclose in this specimen of Pronouncing Print.

Respectfully your humbl co-worker for humanity's good.

Eliza B. Burnz

³⁵ FMT, Tc 208 85/1, Tc 208 85/2

II. Caroline Winslow's Letters to Tolstoy³⁶

1. OCTOBER 23, 1890:

Dr. Caroline B. Winslow
1 Grant Place

Washington, D.C. Oct 23, 1890

Count Tolstoi
Dear Sir

Pardon this intrusion on your valuable time--But I must not omit [?] expressions of gratitude to the author of "Kreutzer Sonata." It delights me to hear the truth from a man's standpoint. So few men of our nation have any conscience on the subject of sexual holiness. And that solid falsehood, the "Physical Necessity" is so deeply engraved on the hearts of most men, and the few that have convictions on this subject are not often outspoken. Makes your book a sure treat.

I have taken the liberty to mail to your address a copy of the last years publication of The Alpha a paper edited by me for Thirteen years, in which I have contended for the right of the unborn child to a proper endowment of health, peace, and beauty, and for the recognition of the law of continence except for procreation in Marriage.

I have likewise sent you a package of pamphlets and leaflets published by the "Moral Education Society" --If you will do me the honor to look over these publications you will not be surprised that I am moved to address you, and they will introduce me, better than my note can.

Will you not write another book, and show forth the remedy, the antidote for that misery and the jealousies and hatred that separates so many married couples, and the disappointment, and heartaches, in the failure of their children, who become a sorrow and shame to their parents, instead of a pride and joy. Kreutzer Sonata does not cheer the heart of the reader with the hope and promise of a wiser and better fruition, when the "Laws of Sexual Life" are better understood and obeyed. There must be some way out of this domestic and public misery. Do you realize that at this day you probably [sic] house the largest audience of any living writer--Your opportunity of doing good by another book is boundless.

If this is offensive to you, forgive, and believe me truly your grateful friend.

Caroline B. Winslow

[In the margin:] I have neglected to say I am a friend of Dr. Alice Stockham of 40 years standing.

2. JULY 26, 1891:

Grant Place
Washington
July 26, 1891Count Tolstoi
Dr friend

A mutual bond must exist between those whose aims & objects in life run in parallel lines--It makes us friends.

I am just now for the first time reading your Anna Karenina. It gives me the first glimpse

³⁶ GMT, Tc 246 67/1, Tc 246 67/2

of Russian society life--not very different from the wicked waste of time and ability in all civilized society--everywhere men and women are serving the devil rather than God in the pursuit of pleasure instead of striving for higher and more enduring happiness which follows good uses of time and means.

Last February I received a note from your daughter asking me to name to you any new books or articles that tended to forward & propagate our reformatory views--Have you read "The Strike of a Sex" by Goerge N. Miller--"Is this Your Son, My Lord?" by Helen H. Gardner--[fr "Nova"] "The Dolls House" by Ibsen. If not I would like to send you copies of a cheap edition.

I would likewise call your attention to "True Manhood" by Elizabeth R. Shepherd & "For Girls" by the same lady.

They are special physiologies, taking up the subject where school physiologies leave off and carefully teaching young people their duties in Sexual Matters--duties to themselves and others. "Manhood" price \$2.00 For Girls \$1.00

Your daughter promised a remittance for the literature I sent to your order--This remittance was to come in a few days. I will mention it has not yet been received. If it was sent I fear it was lost.

I have many more of our publications if you can use more.

I shall be happy to hear from you again & believe me most sincerely your grateful friend.

Caroline B. Winslow

III. Moses Harman's Letter to Tolstoy³⁷

fr. American Journal of Eugenics

Los Angeles
Dec. 30, 1908

We have been sending you our magazine as a complimentary for several monthes and not hearing anything from you, we are in doubt as to whether it reaches you. We write you this line to ask whether you get our magazine, and if so, whether you would care to have it continued as a complimentary to your address.

Kindly drop us a line on an International postal card, and oblige,

Yours very sincerely & fraternally,

Moses Harman

IV. Vladimir Chertkov's Letter to Tolstoy of February 16, 1910³⁸

Милый друг Л.Н., ваше чувство, что мы духовно так близки, что вам трудно мне писать, я вполне понимаю и сам иногда испытываю нечто в том же роде к вам. Оно меня не только трогает, но служит, еще здесь на земле, наглядным проявлением того, насколько теснее связывает духовное единение, чем какая бы то не была другая связь--личной

³⁷ Б.А.Н.

³⁸ Б.А.Н.

любви, дружбы, --в области пространства и времени. Но вместе с тем, в том положении, в каком я нахожусь вынужденной разлуки с вами без малейшего представления о том, когда мы опять свидимся и с полной возможностью, что не свидимся никогда, мне не может не нехватать письменного общения с вами. И с этой стороны мне было бы очень грустно, если бы вы перестали мне от времени до времени писать те хорошие откровенные письма, которые всегда составляли одну из самых больших радостей моей жизни. Но за невозможностью этого, пишите мне хоть несколько строк, не откладывая, тотчас по получении каждого моего письма --Жду вашего ответа на мое последнее письмо с телеграммой, посланной вдогонку о моем письме в газеты по поводу сфальсифицированной вашей статьи под заглавием «Последний этап.» Я хочу лучше написать это письмо в газеты, но жду, во-первых вашего разрешения опубликовать его, и, во-вторых, быть может, ваших поправок. --Мы все здесь опечалены болезнью Алекс. Львовны. Телеграфировал сегодня узнать, как ей? Я так рад, что вы пользуетесь Булгаковым, и что он, по видимому, действительно вам помогает. А уж он то как рад! --Вы вероятно уже увидели в февр. Выпуск "Жизни для всех" мою статью "Две цензуры Льва Толстого." Как странно вышло, что стединение, помещенное там всех мест, выпущенных "Русск. ведомостями" из вашей статьи "О науке" составляют как мне уже заметили некоторое читатели, само по себе, очень последовательное и сильное изложение. Мое душевное состояние вялое. Я несколько дней проболел сильной простудой. Теперь почти поправился. Недоволен собой. Все не могу овладеть своей низшей, плотской природой. Завидую в этом отношении вашему возрасту. --Кстати, по поводу полового вопроса: Вы когда-то написали статью о половом вопросе, в которой цитировали целиком прекрасную статью Елизы Борнз Е. Burns, американской писательницы. Оказывается, как мне говорил навестивший вас не так давно друг мой даниель, что эта же самая Е. Burns написала, кроме того, брошюру о супружеских отношениях, с которой мы с вами не как не можем согласиться, под названием: "Diana". А в Фнглии многие, в том числе был и Даниель, думают, что вы с этим согласны т.к. в той давнейшей вашей статье хвалили и цитировали другую хорошую статью Е. Burns, также связанную со словом Diana. Т.к. недоразумление это очень нежелательное, то я попросил Даниель выслать мне эту с нашей точки зрения предосудительную брошюру Е. Burns, которая в Фнглии циркулируется в рукописном виде, будучий недозволена к печати. Посылаю вам ее заказной бандеролью, и очень жотелось, чтобы вы в письме ко мне сообщили ваше мнение о ней, высказываясь так, как высказались бы человеку, не знающему еще, как к этому отнестись, т.е. забывая, что я вперед с вами согласен. Т.к. статья это вероятно намеренно, в избежание цензурности формы, написана довольно вычурным языком, то вы можете многое пожалуй и не понять. А аотому только главное своими словами, соответственно местам отмечанным мною на полях карандашом. (Вообще, если вам некогда читать всей статьи, то вы можете ограничиться местами, отмечанными мною в полях каарандашом: в них все главное сказано.)

Правильные супружские отношения требуют полного воздержания от сношуние кроме как для деторождения. Это называется "Alphism." Но т.к. это трудно исполнить и может вести к аскетизму, то для обыкнове нных людей рекомендуется другой прием. А именно взаимное соприкосновение без полового акта, по крайней мере без довершения полового акта. Это называется "Dianism." Соприкосновение это понимается в самом разнообразном смысле, начинчя с душевного, словесного, общения, даже путем переписки, затем рукопожатия, поцелуи, хождение голыми друг перед другом, спанье в одной кровати, взаимные ласки в кровати, даже совокупление, но без окончательного акта.

Основание для этого такое: называя общим термином "amatory" вообще половые влечения, автор различает между "amative" и "amorous" desires. "Amative" feelings это взаимное влечение между мужчиной и женщиной, вытекающее из любовного, нежного отношения друг к другу. "Amorous" desires, это те, которые ведут к деторождению. Для того, чтобы быть в силах избегать "amorous" отношений, (ведущих к деторождению), обыкновенным людям советуется вступать и поддерживать между собой "amative" отношения, т. е. видаться, влюбляться и т.д., а супругам--соприкосаться в одной кровати голыми телами. Это будто бы дает удовлетворение и помогает воздерживаться от полного совокупления.

В этом сущность учения, изложенного в брошюре "Diana," с которым многие в Англии предполагают, что вы согласны, вследствие совпадения термина "Diana," который вы привели в одном вашем сочувственном отзыве и перевод статьи о половом воздержании того же автора E. Burns.

Если не можете или считаете что не стоит на это отвечать подробно, то напишите мне по этому поводу хоть несколько слов, чтобы воспользовавшись ими, я мог опровергнуть ваше сочувствие такому безобразию.

Вот пока все. Ожидаю вашего ответа относительно моего письма в газеты о «последней стадии».

WORKS CITED

- Burnz, Eliza. "A Private Letter to Parents, Fyzicians, and Men- Principals of Schools."
In *Diana*. 4th ed. New York: Burnz Publishing House, 1890.
- Ellis, James (James Towner). *Free Love and its Votaries*. New York: 1870.
- Guarneri, Carl J. *The Utopian Alternative: Fourierism in Nineteenth Century America*.
Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Maude, Alymer. *The Life of Tolstoy*. London, 1908-1910.
- Nichols, Thomas. *Forty Years of American Life*. London: J. Maxwell, 1864.
- Noyes, John Humphrey. *Male Continnence*. Oneida, 1872.
- Parkhurst, Henry Martyn. *Diana: A psycho-fyziological essay for married men and
women*. 4th edition. New York: Burnz & Co., 1890.
- . "Why I Wrote Diana." In *Diana: A psycho-fyziological essay for married men and
women*. 6th ed. New York: Burnz & Co., 1896.
- Sears, Hal D. *The Sex Radicals: Free Love in High Victorian America*. Lawrence, Ka.:
Regents Press of Kansas, 1977.
- Stern, Madeleine B. *The Pantarch. A biography of Stephen Pearl Andrews*. Austin:
University of Texas Press, 1968.
- Stockham, Alice. *Tokology: A book for every woman*. Chicago, 1883.
- . *Karezza*. Chicago: Alice B. Stockham & Co., 1896.
- Stoehr, Taylor. *Free Love in America: A Documentary History*. New York: AMS Press,
1979.
- Tolstoy, Ilia. *Moi vospominaniia*. Moscow: 1914.
- Tolstoy, L.N. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Moscow: 1928-1958.
- Wunderlich, Roger. *Low Living and High Thinking at Modern Times, New York*.
Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1992.

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL