The lady with a pet dog

A forty-year-old man named Dmitri Gurov is intrigued by a young woman walking along the sea front of Yalta with her small Pomeranian dog. Dmitri dislikes his shrewish and intelligent wife and, as a result, has numerous love affairs. Although the protagonist disparages women and calls them "the lower race," he secretly acknowledges that he is more at ease in their company than in men's. One day, "the lady with the dog" sits down next to Dmitri to eat in the public gardens. The man pets her dog in order to strike up a conversation. He learns that she is called Anna Sergeyevna, that she is married, and that she has come to Yalta on vacation. Over the next week, Anna and Dmitri see a lot of each other and grow close. The older man is intrigued by the exuberant naïveté of his young partner, yet he also recognizes a trace of sadness in her character. In contrast to the elder women with whom he used to have affairs and who would occasionally display a "rapacious expression" on their beautiful faces, Anna excites Dmitri's desire with her fresh and unaffected nature. In particular, he is drawn by her "diffidence, the angularity of inexperienced youth" that reminds him of his daughter. Every evening the couple observes the sunset from the vantage point over Yalta at Oreanda and are impressed anew by the "beautiful and majestic" scenery. The only things that mar Anna's happiness is the thought that her husband, Von Diderits, will send for her and her fear that she has lost Dmitri's respect by sleeping with him. In the end, Von Diderits sends Anna a letter urging her return, and she leaves Dmitri with something like relief. When parting with Dmitri, Anna states, "It's a good thing I am going away … It's fate itself!"

The action switches to describe Dmitri's daily routine in Moscow: visiting his clubs, reading newspapers, and working at his bank. Dmitri believes that his memories of Anna will soon wane and that he can continue his everyday routine in peace and satisfaction. However, this does not happen, and soon the protagonist grows to despise the "useless pursuits and conversations" with which he is surrounded. Consequently, Dmitri resovles to visit Anna in her unspecified hometown. The protagonist takes the train to "S—-" and arrives only to pace in front of the Von Diderits' residence, futilely hoping that Anna will emerge and speak with him. When this does not happen, Dmitri decides to go to the theater that evening to see a production of the operetta "The Geisha," hoping his lover will also attend. Sure enough, the protagonist sees Anna in the audience watching the show with her obsequious and insincere-looking husband. When Von Diderits leaves the theater to smoke during the interval, Dmitri approaches Anna and confesses his love for her. The young woman tells Dmitri that she has missed him but also berates him for coming to see her. The lovers decide that Anna will visit Dmitri in Moscow, on the excuse that she has to see a gynecologist.

The story concludes with a description of Anna's visits to Moscow and the unbearable strain she feels living this lie. Although Dmitri is perfectly happy with the way things have worked out, he does admit to feeling disconcerted about the implications of falling in love for the first time. He criticizes himself for being an aging, graying old man who seduced women by pretending to be someone he was not. Dmitri comforts Anna as best he can, but he knows that there will be a long way to go before they can be freed from their "intolerable bonds" and live together openly.

Analysis

The Lady with the Dog is perhaps Chekhov's best known and certainly one of his best-loved stories. It exemplifies the author's subtle yet powerful style, as Chekhov is economical with language and never says more than he needs. He conveys emotional complexity in just a few words, thus preserving the intensity of his characters' feelings. For example, on first seeing Anna at the theater in her hometown, Chekhov expresses Dmitri's romantic yearning with the passage: "she, this little woman, in no way remarkable, lost in a provincial crowd, with a vulgar lornette in her hand, filled his whole life now, was his sorrow and his joy … He thought and dreamed." The author writes as though he is painting a canvas, producing a work that is grand in scope yet intimate in feel. The author uses colors to convey both the changing spirits and feelings of the characters, as they veer from the grandly impressive to the muted and prosaic. For example, the aging Dmitri's hair is described as graying, and he often wears gray suits, whereas the sea at Yalta is suffused with color as "the water was of a soft warm lilac hue, and there was a golden streak from the moon upon it." Chekhov presents Yalta as a romantic oasis for Anna and Dmitri, a place of color, freedom, and intimacy that they cannot hope to recreate elsewhere. The lovers worry about what they mean to one another—Anna frets that Dmitri thinks of her only as a "common woman," while Dmitri thinks that Anna is beguiled by a false impression of him as a "kind, exceptional, lofty" man—because both recognize that their relationship is founded on past disappointments and future hopes, as well as on present desires. Chekhov thus plays with our implicit belief that characters do not exist beyond their narrative framework: clearly, Anna and Dmitri are people defined by the past and their dreams for the future, as much as they are by the short period of their lives conveyed here. As the editor Donald Rayfield

has noted, *The Lady with the Dog* talks more about beginnings than it does endings. There is no straightforward linear progression in Chekhov's narrative: readers are called to question what has happened outside of its bounds and to wonder at the lives its characters will continue to lead.

Indeed, in order to understand this tale, we have to guess at what has happened before the events described and what will happen after them. Dmitri may be interpreted as an aging seducer entering the twilight his womanizing years, who dupes Anna just as he realizes that he has deceived himself for many years. However, the protagonist could also be understood as a man searching for conviction, as someone who is enchanted and ultimately redeemed by the innocent romanticism of his young lover. The tale itself is riddled with ambiguity: we see that Anna rekindles Dmitri's desire for life but also that Dmitri's love for her complicates as well as tarnishes his view of home. Because Dmitri remembers the vistas of Yalta as being boundless in their magnificence and beauty, so Moscow seems to him endlessly dreary, as though he were cooped up in a "madhouse or in penal servitude." Chekhov suggests that, for Dmitri, the world of love and of women is not straightforward, and, indeed, Dmitri's devotion to the female sex or "lower race" is rewarded by confusion and a faint hope in future salvation. The story ends on a typical note of ambiguity, as Dmitri recognizes that he is living two lives: "one open, seen and known by all who cared to know" and another "running its course in secret." The only way the couple can resolve their fears is to acknowledge that they are poised at the beginning of a "new and splendid life," albeit one that they will not openly enjoy for a long time to come.

Literary Analysis: "How Much Land Does A Man Need?"

Since Adam and Eve ate the fruits from the Tree of the knowledge of Good and evil, humans desired to take possession of more than they need in benefit of themselves. Human desires have brought many of us away from our original natures that God gave in the beginning. We often waste our time that has been given pursuing materialistic things. The theme of the story "How much land does a man need?" by Leo Tolstoy clearly delivers its message that greed as no boundaries and will bring you to death.

Tolstoy tells that greed starts from coveting of other's possessions. He starts his story with two women, arguing about whose life was better; a life with or without possessions. As the two continued, the master of the house, Pahom, thought to himself, "If I had plenty of land, I shouldn't fear the Devil himself!" Pahom's thought that he would not do any sin if he had land started the whole process of greed and triggered the Devil to grant him his wishes for land. Therefore, Pahom ended up with lands to himself by the power of the Devil. When we covet other's possessions and let greed take over our mind, we often give in to the works of Devil over our lives. This showed how greed can make us fall into Devil's work.

As the story progresses, Tolstoy conveys his message that greed has no boundaries. When Pahom gained land, he became possessive of the land and caused disputes with his neighbors. Due to threats by the neighbors, Pahom moved to a larger land where he could possess and grow more crops for himself. Whenever there was an opportunity to gain more land, Pahom, full of greed, moved to the other land to satisfy him. However, everywhere he moved, he wasn't satisfied with what he had. He looked for more and better land even though what he had was enough for him. Pahom's actions reflect the characteristics of greed again. As what Tolstoy tried to tell, greed has no boundaries. What we have with us does not seem satisfactory, and it keeps us to look for more.

Tolstoy ends his story with an excellent example. On Pahom's last trip to find land, he gained an opportunity to gain land as much as he wanted. Pahom made a deal that he would gain the land that he made mark on if he came back to the starting point before sunset. Pahom, full with greed, walks beyond his limits. As a result, Pahom had to run to get back to the starting point. When he did, he died of exhaustion. The landowner, who saw this happen, buried Pahom. The only land he needed in the end was eight feet long, three feet wide land. The end of the story teaches us how much we actually need in life. After death, we do not carry or bring anything with us. Use the time given for better things than to satisfy your greed.

Many people in the world today believe that we need possessions and wealth to live a happy life. They often waste their time trying to gain more for themselves. As Tolstoy tries to tell us, we should not

have greed on materials that are meaningless, but we should do things that are worthy. As the story said, the only thing we need in the end, is a little piece of land.

Another one:

In “How Much Land Does a Man Need?” by Leo Tolstoy, this is a story about a peasant, Pakhom, who lives in a small rural village in Russia. Pakhom was known as a "peasant" because the town people and others had more then him land and money wise. Since Pakhom was a farmer he really had to work for everything that he needed. Times were especially hard when he didn't have enough land to grow more crops and make more profits then what he already had going. At first Tolstoy shows us how Pakhom was more of the conservative type of man who didn't dwell over having everything but that suddenly changed when things got harder. Pakhom seemed to be experiencing problems when his calves constantly go onto one lady's land and for each time it would happen she would basically sue him and he would have to pay a fine. He started getting furious because not only was money getting taken from him but also he felt that the lady didn't understand him what so ever. Soon enough Pakhom starts thinking and decides he wants to get more land and was lucky enough to buy the lady's land when she needed to sell it. Everything suddenly starts changing in the story at this point. Pakhom is no longer looked upon as a peasant and is starting to succeed farming wise and business wise. The only problem is now he is starting to become this greedy person who is looking for any opportunity to gain as much money as possible so later on he starts fining other peasants whose animals are on his land and destroying his crops. Little by little he starts buying all this unnecessary land that he could get a hold of. Then one day this peasant stops into his village and calls in and Pakhom allows him to stay the night. They start having a conversation and the guy was telling him about this one place, Volga, where he was able to have as much land as he wanted for basically no money. Pakhome gets interested sells everything he has from his village and heads out to Volga. He inquires all the information he needed so he could get as much land as he could and all he had to do was accomplish one goal. The Chief of Volga strictly states that if he had completed thirty-five miles from where he started and back to the start line by sunset then that would be all his land. In his mind he basically told himself he will go towards his goal no matter what happens because that is the best thing that has ever happened. All in all Pakhom decided to try and accomplish this goal but all for nothing. He took everything easy and when he noticed he was losing out on time and land he starts pushing himself to get to the finish line regretting he had ever accepted this challenge. He started getting weaker and weaker as he headed toward his goal until he drops to the floor with blood everywhere and no pulse. He had died of dehydration and exhaustion. Not only did he lose his life for trying to gain land but he lost his life for being greedy and this was his lesson to be learned

Literary and Cultural Analysis

In “How Much Land Does a Man Need?” Tolstoy is giving us a glimpse into the life of a peasant in Russia during the 1800s. Right away, the textbook gives us information that Tolstoy was a social reformer who used his writing to try to incite change in his country. We find out that Russia had serfs who were tied to the land and almost inslaved by the wealthy landowners who charge them such steep fines for the land. Tolstoy wanted to help better their situation, but at the same time, “the longer [he] worked among the poor, the more he believed that material solutions—money and land, for instance—were not the answer to society’s basic problems, which he considered to be moral rather than economic.” (958). This belief of his can be seen in the text when Pakhom believes that he only needs land to survive, but once he is given enough land, his issue become more of a moral one.

In the story itself, the conflict between the sisters in the exposition show that the poor and the wealthy are at odds with each other. The wealthy sister criticizes the life of a farmer, while the peasant sister says that the wealthy city people are easily tempted by the devil. Tolstoy is showing that the poor

and the wealthy in his country have a hard time understanding the life of the other. He further demonstrates this issue with the early change in Pakhom’s character. When Pakhom is fined by the wealthy landowner for the damage his cattle does to her land, he thinks that he is being treated unfairly. However, when he buys land and other peasants’ animals damage his land, he easily forgets what it was like to be on the other side of the situation. “After a time, Pakhom’s neighbors began to bear him a grudge for [fining them], and would now and then let their cattle on to his land on purpose.” Once Pakhom becomes wealthier, he forgets what life was like as a peasant and treats the peasants worse than he was treated by the landowner. Tolstoy is demonstrating the social situation in Russia in which the wealthy and the poor are at odds with each other, although later in the text, he shows that it is not because of money, but rather morals.

In Tolstoy's story he sets a sort of imagery in your head so you are able to visualize and interpret what he is really trying to point out. Everyone starts off with a little but then as soon as you are able to obtain more then what you have then you get thirsty in sense. You get thirsty by wanting more then what is really necessary for one to have. For example Pakhom states "No matter," he concluded, "I will go towards the rising sun"(968). The next thing you know you are willing to do what ever it takes as long as you get as far as you can."An hour to suffer, a life-time to live"(970). The only problem with this is the fact you can only go so far before something happens and then when you realize it wasn't worth doing what you did you regret everything."Oh dear," he thought, "if only I have not blundered trying for too much! What if I am too late. Though afraid of death, he could not stop" (970/971). In Pakhom's case not only did he not get any land but he risked his life and basically killed himself for being greedy. Tolstoy is pointing out to everyone that it's not worth losing anything for wanting everything.

Freedom

Now remember, ladies and gentlemen, I have no time to talk the usual old nonsense about freedom, tonight. Let us come to business. What is perfectly free person? Evidently a person who can do what he likes, when he likes and where he likes, or do nothing at all if he prefers it. Well there is no such person; and there never can be any such person. Whether we like it or not, we must all sleep for one-third of our lifetime; wash and dress and undress; we must spend a couple of hours eating and drinking; we must spend nearly as much in getting about from place to place. For half the day we are slaves to necessities which we cannot shirk, whether we are monarchs with a thousand servant or humble labourers with no servants but their wives. And the wives must undertake the additional heavy slavery of child-bearing if the world is still to be peopled.

These natural jobs cannot be shirked. But they involve other jobs which can. As we must eat we must first provide food; as we must sleep we must have beds and bedding in houses with fireplaces and coals; as we must walk through the streets we must have clothes to cover our nakedness. Now, food and houses and clothes can be produced by human labour. But when they are produced they can be stolen. It you like honey you can let the bees produce it by their labour, and then steel it from them. If you are too lazy to get about from place to place on your own legs you can make a slave of a horse. And what you do to a horse or a bee you can also do to a man or woman or a child if you can get the upper hand of them by force or fraud or trickery of any sort, or even by teaching them that it is their religious duty to sacrifice their freedom to yours.

So beware! If you allow any person, or class of persons, to get the upper hand of you, they will shift all that part of their slavery to Nature that can be shifted on to your shoulders; and you will find yourself working from eight to fourteen hours a day when, if you had only yourself and your family to provide for, you could do it quite comforably in half the time or less. The object of all honest Governments should be to prevent your being imposed on in this way. But the object of most actual Governments, I regret to say, is exactly the opposite. They enforce your slavery and call it freedom. But they also regulate your slavery, keeping the greed of your masters within certain bounds. When chattel slavery of the negro sort costs more than wage slavery, they abolish chattel slavery and make you free to choose between one employment, or one master, and another; and this they call a glorious triumph for freedom, though for you it is merely the key of the street. When you complain, they promise that in future you shall govern the country for yourself. They redeem this promise by giving you a vote, and having a general election every five years or so. At the election, two of their rich friends ask for your vote; and you are free to choose which of them you will vote for to spite the other—a choice which leaves you no freer than you were before, as it does not reduce your hours of labour by a single minute. But the newspapers assure you that your vote has decided the election, and that this constitutes you a free citizen in a democratic country. The amazing thing about it is that you are fool enough to believe them.

Now mark another big difference between the natural slavery of man to Nature and the unnatural slavery of man to man. Nature is kind to her slaves. If she forces you to eat and drink, she makes eating and drinking so pleasant that when we can afford it we eat and drink too much. We must sleep or go mad: but then sleep is so pleasant that we have great difficulty in getting up in the morning. And firesides and families seem so pleasant to the young that they get married and join building societies to realize their dreams. Thus, instead of resenting our natural wants as slavery, we take the greatest pleasure in their satisfaction. We write sentimental songs in praise of them. A tramp can earn his supper by singing "Home, Sweet Home."

The slavery of man to man is the very opposite of this. It is hateful to the body and to the spirit. Our poets do not praise it: they proclaim that no man is good enough to be another man's master. The latest of

the great Jewish prophets, a gentleman named Marx, spent his life in proving that there is no extremity of selfish cruelty at which the slavery of man to man will stop if it be not stopped by law. You can see for yourself that it produces a state of continual civil war—called the class war—between the slaves and their masters, organized as trade unions on one side and employers' federations on the other. Saint Thomas More, who has just been canonized, held that we shall never have a peaceful and stable society until this struggle is ended by the abolition of slavery altogether and the compulsion of every one to do his share of the world's work with his own hands and brains, and not to attempt to put it on any one else.

Naturally the master class, through its Parliaments, schools and newspapers, makes the most desperate efforts to prevent us from realizing our slavery. From our earliest years we are taught that our country is the land of the free, and that our freedom was won for us for ever by our forefathers when they made King John sign Magna Charta—when they defeated the Spanish Armada—when they cut off King Charles's head—when they made King William accept the Bill of Rights—when they issued and made good the American Declaration of Independence—when they won the battles of Waterloo and Trafalgar on the playing fields of Eton—and when, only the other day, they quite unintentionally changed the German, Austrian, Russian and Ottoman empires into republics. When we grumble, we are told that all our miseries are our own doing because we have the vote. When we say: "What good is the vote?" we are told that we have the Factory Acts, and the Wages Board, and free education, and the New Deal, and the dole; and what more could any reasonable man ask for? We are reminded that the rich are taxed a quarter, a third, or even a half and more, of their incomes; but the poor are never reminded that they have to pay that much of their wages as rent in addition to having to work twice as long every day as they would need if they were free.

Whenever famous writers protest against this imposture—say, Voltaire and Rousseau and Tom Paine in the eighteenth century, or Cobbett and Shelley, Karl Marx and Lasselle in the nineteenth, or atheists and libertines, murderers and scoundrels; and often it is made a criminal offence to buy or sell their books. If their disciples make a revolution, England immediately makes war on them and lends money to the other Powers to join her in forcing the revolutionists to restore the slave order. When this combination was successful at Waterloo, the victory was advertised as another triumph for British freedom; and the British wage slaves, instead of going into mourning like Lord Byron, believed it all and cheered enthusiastically. When the revolution wins, as it did in Russia in 1922, the fighting stops; but the abuse, the calumnies, the lies, continue until the revolutionized State grows into a first-rate military Power. Then our diplomatists, after having for years denounced the revolutionary leaders as the most abominable villains and tyrants, have to do a right turn and invite them to dinner.

Now though this prodigious mass of humbug is meant to delude the enslaved class only, it ends in deluding the master class much more completely. A gentleman whose mind has been formed at a preparatory school for the sons of gentlemen, followed by a public school and university course, is much more thoroughly taken in by the falsified history and dishonest political economy and snobbery taught in these places than any worker can possibly be, because the gentleman's education teaches him that he is a very fine fellow, superior to the common run of men whose duty it is to brush his clothes, carry his parcels, and earn his income for him; and as he thoroughly agrees with this view of himself, he honestly believes that the system which has placed him in such an agreeable situation and done such justice to his merits is the best of all possible systems and that he should shed his blood, and yours, to the last drop in its defence. But the great mass of our rack-rented, underpaid, treated-as-inferiors, cast-off-on-the-dole workers cannot feel so sure about it as the gentleman. The facts are too harshly against it. In hard times, such as we are now passing through, their disgust and despair sometimes lead them to kick over the traces, upset every thing, and have to be rescued from mere gangsterism by some Napoleonic genius who has a fancy for being an emperor, and who has the courage and brains and energy to jump at the chance. But the slaves who give three cheers for the emperor might just as well have made a cross on a British or American ballot paper as far as their freedom is concerned.

So far I have mentioned nothing but plain, natural and historical facts. I draw no conclusion, for that would lead me into controversy; and controversy would not be fair when you cannot answer me back. I am never controversial over the wireless. I do not even ask you to draw your own conclusions, for you might draw some very dangerous ones unless you have the right sort of head for it. Always remember that though nobody likes to be called a slave, it does not follow that slavery is a bad thing. Great men, like Aristotle, have held that law and order and government would be impossible unless the persons, the people have to obey are beautifully dressed and decorated, robed and uniformed, speaking with a special accent, travelling in first-class carriages or the most expensive cars or on the best-groomed and best-bred horses, and never cleaning their own boots or doing anything for some common person to do it. And this means, off course, that they must be made very rich without any other obligation that to produce an impression of almost godlike superiority on the minds of common people. In short, it is contended, you must make men ignorant idolaters before they will become obedient workers and law-abiding citizens.

To prove this, we are reminded that although nine out of ten voters are common workers, it is with the greatest difficulty that a few of them can be persuaded to vote for members of their own class. When women were enfranchised and given the right to sit in Parliament, the first use they made of their votes was to defeat all the women candidates who stood for the freedom of the workers and had given them years of devoted and distinguished service. They elected only one woman—a titled lady of great wealth and exceptionally fascinating personality.

Now this, it is said, is human nature; and you cannot change human nature. On the other hand, it is maintained that human nature is the easiest thing in the world to change if you catch it young enough, and that the idolatry of the slave class and the arrogance of the master class are themselves entirely artificial products of education and of a propaganda that plays upon our infants long before they have left their cradles. An opposite mentality could, it is argued, be produced by a contrary education and propaganda. You can turn the point over in your mind for yourself; do not let me prejudice you one way or the other. The practical question at the bottom of it all is how the income of the whole country can best be distributed from day to day. If the earth is cultivated agriculturally in vast farms with motor ploughs and chemical fertilizers, and industrially in huge electrified factories full of machinery that a girl can handle, the product may be so great that an equal distribution of it would provide enough to give the unskilled labourers as much as the managers and the men of the scientific staff. But do not forget that when you hear tales of modern machinery enabling one girl to produce as much as a thousand men could produce in the reign of good Queen Anne, that this marvellous increase includes things like needles and steel pens, and matches, which we can neither eat nor drink nor wear. Very young children will eat needles and matches eagerly—but the diet is not a nourishing one. And though we can now cultivate the sky as well as earth, by drawing nitrogen from it to increase and improve the quality of our grass—and, consequently, of our cattle and milk and butter and eggs—Nature may have tricks up her sleeve to check us if the chemists exploit her too greedily.

And now to sum up. Wipe out from your dreams of freedom the hope of being able to do as you please all the time. For at least twelve hours of your day Nature orders you to do certain things, and will kill you if you don't do them. This leaves twelve hours for working; and here again Nature will kill you unless you either earn your living or get somebody else to earn it for you. If you live in a civilized country your freedom is restricted by the laws of the land, enforced by the police, who oblige you to do this, and not to do that, and to pay rates and taxes. If you do not obey these laws the courts will imprison you and, if you go too far, kill you. If the laws are reasonable and are impartially administered you have no reason to complain, because they increase your freedom by protecting you against assault, highway robbery, and disorder generally.

But as society is constituted at present, there is another far more intimate compulsion on you: that of your landlord and that of your employers. Your landlord may refuse to let you live on his estate if you go

to chapel instead of to church, or if you vote for anybody but his nominee, or if you practise osteopathy, or if you open a shop. Your employer may dictate the cut, colour and condition of your clothes, as well as your hours of work. He can turn you into the street at any moment to join the melancholy band of lost spirits called the unemployed. In short, his power over you is far greater than that of any political dictator could possibly be. Your only remedy at present is the trade union weapon of the strike, which is only the old Oriental device of starving on your enemy's doorstep until he does you justice. Now, as the police in this country will not allow you to starve on your employer's doorstep, you must starve on your own—if you have one. The extreme form of the strike—the general strike of all workers at the same moment —is also the extreme form of human folly, as, if completely carried out, it would extinguish the human race in a week. And the workers would be the first to perish. The general strike is trade unionism gone mad. Sane trade unionism would never sanction more than one big strike at a time, with all the other trades working overtime to support it.

Now let us put the case in figures. If you have to work for twelve hours a day, you have no freedom at all. If you work eight hours a day you have four hours a day to do what you like with, subject to the laws of the land and your possession of money enough to buy an interesting book or pay for a seat at the pictures, or, on a half holiday, at a football match, or whatever your fancy may be. But even here Nature will interfere a good deal; for if your eight hours work has been of a hard physical kind, and when you get home you want to spend your four hours in reading my books to improve your mind, you will find yourself fast asleep in half a minute, and your mind will remain in its present benighted condition.

I take it, then, that nine out of ten of us desire more freedom, and that this is why we listen to wireless talks about it. As long as we go on as we are—content with a vote and a dole—the only advice we can give one another is that of Shakespeare's Iago: "Put money in thy purse." But as we get very little money into our purses on pay day, and all the rest of the week other people are taking money out of it, Iago's advice is not very practical. We must change our politics before we can get what we want; and meanwhile we must stop gassing about freedom, because the people of England in the lump don't know what freedom is —never having had any. Always call freedom by its old English name of leisure; and keep clamouring for more leisure and more money to enjoy it in return for an honest share of work. And let us stop singing "Rule, Britannia," until we make it true. Until we do, let us never vote for a parliamentary candidate who talks about our freedom and our love of liberty; for whatever political name he may give himself, he is sure to be at bottom an anarchist who wants to live on our labour without being taken up by the police for it as he deserves.

And now suppose we at last win a lot more leisure and a lot more money than we are accustomed to. What are we going to do with them? I was taught in my childhood that Satan will find mischief still for idle hands to do. I have seen men come into a fortune and lose their happiness, their health, and finally, their lives by it as certainly as if they had taken daily doses of rat poison instead of champagne and cigars. It is not at all easy to know what to do with leisure unless we have been brought up to it.

I will, therefore, leave you with a conundrum to think over. If you had your choice, would you work for eight hours a day and retire with a full pension at forty-five, or would you rather work four hours a day and keep on working until you are seventy? Now, don't send the answer to me, please: talk it over with your wife.

Of Studies.

Studies serve for delight, for ornament, and for ability.[Study as an activity, in whatever form, brings us joy and enhances our thinking, speaking and writing ability adding charm to our personality.]

Their chief use for delight is in privateness and retiring; for ornament, is in discourse; and for ability, is in the judgment and disposition of business. [Study is always a private activity which people engage in when they are alone or in the privacy of their homes. It helps them in relaxation after a strenuous routine, when the body and mind need to slow down. It sharpens our intellect helping us to judge things soundly. It helps us to go about our life's business in a more capable way.]
For expert men can execute, and perhaps judge of particulars, one by one; but the general counsels, and the plots and marshalling of affairs, come best from those that are learned. [It enables the learned men, who have studied extensively, to critically examine issues, and arrive at the right conclusion. They can garner data, facts and arguments or against a particular view rationally. Such intelligent analysis of facts improves the soundness and quality of their judgment.]

To spend too much time in studies is sloth; to use them too much for ornament, is affectation; to make judgment wholly by their rules, is the humor of a scholar.[However, over-indulgence in studies leads to undesirable consequences. Setting aside long hours in a day to study will make a man idle. Overuse of the wisdom to analyze ordinary commonplace issues may make the man appear pretentious and needlessly showy. Sticking too much to rules to asses situations and decide action may invite mocking from others.]
They perfect nature, and are perfected by experience: for natural abilities are like natural plants, that need pruning, by study; and studies themselves do give forth directions too much at large, except they be bounded in by experience.[Studying adds finesse and perfection to human nature. Experience in life supplements such honing of nature. A person's abilities inherited by birth are raw. Only when they are carefully worked upon and honed, the in-born abilities yield us the best benefits. Studying is the way to hone one's abilities. But inferences from study may lead to imprecise conclusions. In such situations, one's experience in life comes in handy to arrive at the right conclusion. So, experience is very valuable as it supplements studies.]

Crafty men condemn studies, simple men admire them, and wise men use them; for they teach not their own use; but that is a wisdom without them, and above them, won by observation. [People who are cunning and deceitful have no appreciation for studies as they accomplish their objectives through many crooked ways. Simple folks, however, greatly value the role of studies in human life. Wise people inherently draw upon the ideas obtained from their studies while solving life's myriad problems.]

Read not to contradict and confute; nor to believe and take for granted; nor to find talk and discourse; but to weigh and consider. The aim of reading and acquiring knowledge must not be to refute other's views or accept the writer's views as gospel truth. It should also not be to engage in pointless discussion and argumentation. Studying should enable us to weigh facts and analyze them rationally.

Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested; that is, some books are to be read only in parts; others to be read, but not curiously; and some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention.[Books of varying content and genre are to be made use of differently. Some may be given a cursory reading, some others can be quickly sifted through. Other important books are to be read slowly and minutely so that the meaning and sense are thoroughly understood.]
Some books also may be read by deputy, and extracts made of them by others; but that would be only in the less important arguments, and the meaner sort of books, else distilled books are like common distilled waters, flashy things.[One can ask an assistant to read a book and prepare a short summary of it. But

such practice should be followed for obtaining guidance on matters of lesser importance. There are some books which are, in fact, shortened already.]

Reading maketh a full man; conference a ready man; and writing an exact man. Reading adds perfection to a man's personality.[Discussing with others about the contents of a book imparts special practical skills to the reader. Writing removes all the residual weaknesses out of the person and enables him to remember the contents of a book.]
And therefore, if a man write little, he had need have a great memory; if he confer little, he had need have a present wit: and if he read little, he had need have much cunning, to seem to know that he doth not. [So, writing helps to memorize facts. If he is shy enough not to discuss his reading with others, he will not be able to improve his wit. If he does not read, he will remain a somewhat stupid person.]
Histories make men wise; poets witty; the mathematics subtle; natural philosophy deep; moral grave; logic and rhetoric able to contend. [Studying history makes a man wiser, studying poetry makes a man wittier, mathematics gives sound logical sense, and philosophy imparts valuable lessons on morality.]

Abeunt studia in mores [Studies pass into and influence manners]. Nay, there is no stond or impediment in the wit but may be wrought out by fit studies; like as diseases of the body may have appropriate exercises. [Wit is a god-given gift. It is present in everybody. However, it can be sharpened by selective studying. This is akin to the way certain weaknesses of the human body are cured by appropriate physical exercises.
Bowling is good for the stone and reins; shooting for the lungs and breast; gentle walking for the stomach; riding for the head; and the like. Some of the exercises and the diseases they cure are … Bowling for stone and reins; shooting for lung and breast ailments; walking for stomach problems; horse riding for head etc.]
So if a man's wit be wandering, let him study the mathematics; for in demonstrations, if his wit be called away never so little, he must begin again.[If a person is unable to concentrate, he will do well to study mathematics. In mathematics, a slight loss of concentration leads to error. This makes the man to start all over again to do it. So, mathematics restrains the mind from darting off elsewhere.]
If his wit be not apt to distinguish or find differences, let him study the Schoolmen; for they are cymini sectores [splitters of hairs]. [If a person does not have the ability to discern, he will be benefited by studying Schoolmen as it trains mental ability and develops the art of expression.]

If he be not apt to beat over matters, and to call up one thing to prove and illustrate another, let him study the lawyers' cases. So every defect of the mind may have a special receipt.[If a person is unable to garner facts and manipulate them to put across his views convincingly, studying law will help him. Thus, every deficiency of mind can be addressed by appropriate reading.]

In this essay, Russel defines wisdom, and enumerates various ways of achieving it. He laments that though vast knowledge has been acquired, there has bee of no corresponding increase in wisdom

Russel defines wisdom by telling us about things which contribute to wisdom. The first is a sense of proportion. It is the capacity to consider all important factors in a problem carefully. Specialization makes it difficult. For example scientists discover new medicines but they do not know what impact these medicines will have on the life of the people . The medicines may reduce the infant death rate .But it may lead to increased population. In poor counties it may lead to shortage of food. If there are more people , it may lower the standard of life. The knowledge of the composition of the atom could be misused by a lunatic to destroy the world. Knowledge without wisdom can be harmful. It should be combined with the total needs of mankind. Even complete knowledge is not enough . It should be related with a certain knowledge of the purpose of life. The study of history can illustrate it. For example hegel wrote with great knowledge about history , but he made the Gemans believe that they were a master race. It led to the war. It is necessary therefore to combine knowledge with feelings. Men who have knowledge but no feelings lack wisdom. We need wisdom both in public and private life. We need wisdom to decide the goal of our life. We need it to free ourselves from personal personal prejudices. We may pursue even a novel thing unwisely if it is too big to achieve. People have wasted their lives in search of the 'philosopher's Stone ', or the elixir of life . They were not pragmatic. They were looking for simple solutions to the complex problems of mankind. Man may attempt to achieve the impossible, he may do harm to himself in the process.

Similarly in personal life wisdom is needed to avoid dislike for one another. Two persons may remain enemies because of their prejudice. One may dislike the other for imaginary faults. It they can be told that we all have some flaws, they may become friends. Russel believes that thought reasonable persuasion. We can avoid hatred. Wisdom lies in freeing ourselves from the control of our sense of our sense organs. Our ego develops through our senses. We cannot be free from the sense of sight, sound and touch. We know the world primarily though our senses. As we grow we discover that there are other things also. We start recognizing them . Thus we give up thinking of ourselves alone. We start thinking of other people, we grow wise. We give up our egoism. It is difficult to completely get rid of selfishness, but we can think of things beyond our immediate surroundings. Wisdom comes when we start giving importance to things which do not concern immediately. Wisdom comes when we stars loving others.

Russel feels that wisdom can be taught as a goal of education. The message in the parable of the Good Samaritan is that we should love our neighbor, whether friend or foe. Many a time, we miss the message in this parable, because we cease to love those who cause harm to the society. The only way out is though understanding and not hatred. In brief Russel exhorts us not hate anybody. The author draws out examples from history, of Queen Elizabeth I, Henry the IV, and Abraham Lincoln, who were free from the errors committed by other eminent people in the past.

The dangers of hatred and narrow - mindedness can be pointed out in the course of giving knowledge .Russel feels knowledge and morals can be combined in scheme of education . People should be educated to see things in relation to other things of the world . They should be encouraged to think of themselves as world citizens.

In conclusion the author states five factors that contribute to wisdom. They are.

1) Comprehensiveness

2) A sense of proportion

3) Emancipation

4) Impartiality

5) Awareness of human needs and understating.