VAASAN YLIOPISTO

GALINA DUBOVA

Under Other Eyes

Constructions of Russianness in Three Socio-Political English Novels

ACTA WASAENSIA NO 226

LITERARY AND CULTURAL STUDIES 4
ENGLISH

UNIVERSITAS WASAENSIS 2010

Reviewers

Professor Joel Kuortti
Department of English
20014 University of Turku
Finland

Professor Anthony Johnson
Department of English
P.O. Box 1000
90014 University of Oulu
Finland

Julkaisija	**Julkaisuajankohta**	
Vaasan yliopisto	Lokakuu 2010	
Tekijä(t) Galina Dubova	**Julkaisun tyyppi** Monografia	
	Julkaisusarjan nimi, osan numero Acta Wasaensia, 226	
Yhteystiedot Vaasan yliopisto Filosofinen tiedekunta Englannin kieli PL 700 65101 VAASA	**ISBN** 978–952–476–310–3	
	ISSN 0355–2667, 1795–7494	
	Sivumäärä 211	**Kieli** Englanti

Julkaisun nimike
Toisen silmin: Venäläisyys kolmessa englantilaisessa yhteiskunnallis-poliittisessa romaanissa

Tiivistelmä

Merkittäväksi osaksi 1900-luvun englantilaisessa kirjallisuudessa on noussut se tapa, miten kansakuntaan ja kansalliseen identiteettiin liittyvä problematiikka esitetään.
Tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan kuinka mielikuva Venäjän kansakunnasta ja sen identiteetistä on rakennettu ja esitetty kolmessa englanninkielisessä romaanissa. Tarkasteltavat teokset ovat Joseph Conradin *Under Western Eyes* (1911), Rebecca Westin *The Birds Fall Down* (1966) ja Penelope Fitzgeraldin *The Beginning of Spring* (1988).
Teokset on valittu niiden kuvaaman ajan perusteella sekä niiden yhteiskunnallis-poliittisen taustan vuoksi. Ne sijoittuvat Venäjän vallankumousta edeltävään aikaan ja rakentavat kuvaa kansallisesta toiseudesta, alempiarvoisuudesta ja epämääräisyydestä, joka leimaa henkilöhahmojen elämää ympäristön epäjärjestyksen ja epävarmuuden lisäksi.
Tutkimushypoteesina on, että teksti luo representaation, joka rakentuu stereotypioiden ja mielikuvien varaan. Tämän todentamiseksi käytetään varhaisempia englantilaisia tekstejä, jotka joko viittaavat Venäjään liittyviin kysymyksiin tai kuvaavat Venäjää.
Teoreettisesti tutkimus liittyy Hallin (1997), Bhabhan (1990, 1994, 1998) ja Kiberdin (1995) käsityksiin representaatiosta sekä kansakunnan kertomuksista ja yhteisön identiteettiin liittyvistä ongelmista. Tutkimuksessa analysoidaan erilaisia tulkintoja binarismista ja vastakkainasetteluista, jotka saattavat muodostaa perustan monikerroksiselle Venäjä-kuvalle.
Tutkimuksen mukaan Venäjän esittäminen englantilaisessa kirjallisuudessa tapahtuu erilaisten kerronnan symbolisten ristiriitaisuuksien ja kulttuuristen konfliktien avulla. Niiden merkitys itsessään on ambivalentti ja ajoittain paradoksaalinen.
Tarkastelluissa teoksissa kansakunta näyttäytyy kaoottisena ”toisena”. Sille annetaan joko kollektiivinen identiteetti Pyhän Äiti-Venäjän muodossa, tai se esitetään orjuuteen sidottuna yhteisönä. Nämä piirteet tuovat esiin identiteetin epämääräisyyden ja sovinnaisuuden. Koska Venäjä sijaitsee idän ja lännen välillä, siitä tulee alati liikkeellä oleva hybridinen yhteisö ja epämääräinen suhteessaan sekä itään että länteen. Teosten rakentama identiteetti vahvistaa historiallista käsitystä englantilaisista hallitsijoina.

Asiasanat
Venäjä, representaatio, stereotyyppi, kansallisen identiteetin rakentaminen

Publisher
Vaasan yliopisto

Date of publication
October 2010

Author(s)
Galina Dubova

Type of publication
Monograph

Name and number of series
Acta Wasaensia, 226

Contact information
University of Vaasa
Faculty of Philosophy
Department of English
P.O. Box 700
FI–65101 VAASA, FINLAND

ISBN
978–952–476–310–3

ISSN
0355–2667, 1795–7494

Number of pages
211

Language
English

Title of publication
Under Other Eyes: Constructions of Russianness in Three Socio-Political English Novels

Abstract
Questions of nation and national identity have become significant in terms of their representation in twentieth-century literature in English. This work seeks to demonstrate how the image of the nation, and in particular that of Russia, has been constructed and represented in three English novels: Joseph Conrad's *Under Western Eyes* (1911), Rebecca West's *The Birds Fall Down* (1966), and Penelope Fitzgerald's *The Beginning of Spring* (1988).

The novels were selected with regard to their time placement. Set in pre-Revolutionary Russia, they construct the otherness, inferiority and ambiguity of the nation through a disorder and uncertainty in the characters' lives and setting. This work argues that such a representation becomes a textual reproduction, constructed on the basis of stereotypes and ideas. In order to examine this, some earlier English texts, which either invoke Russian matters, or represent Russia, are discussed.

Theoretically, this study continues the work of Hall (1997), Homi Bhabha (1990, 1994, 1998), and Kiberd (1995) on problems of representation, narrating the nation and the imaginary construction of a community. The study attempts to explore different readings of binarisms and contrasts which may lie behind the multifaceted image of Russia. It suggests that the representations of Russianness in English texts are articulated through various metaphorical forms of narrative expressing national difference, and thereby producing symbolic contradictions and cultural conflicts whose meaning is itself ambivalent and at times paradoxical.

The results indicate that in these literary works, the nation is seen as a chaotic Other: it is either endowed with a collective identity, embraced by Holy Mother Russia, or represented as a slave-bound community features which demonstrate the ambiguous and conventional nature of the "troubled" Russian identity. Being in a liminal state between East and West, the Russia of the novels is displaced, constituting a nomadic and hybrid community, and provoking ambiguity in relation to both cultures, eastern and western. Such a construction reinforces the historical perception of the English as the master, and acknowledges the Other, with its own culture, economy and zeitgeist, as the invention of Russia in the English literary text.

Keywords
Russia, representation, stereotyping, construction of national identity

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The importance of identity construction and its representation in literature in our world has been recognized through a series of recent works written on the topic by the reading of which the latter have become encouraged by writing more and more on this subject attempting to clarify the concepts, related to this phenomenon. Yet this work has been stimulated not only by reading the works of Benedict Anderson, Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, Decland Kiberd, Gerald Porter and Stuart Hall, but also by a great contribution of colleagues and friends involved directly or indirectly into this project as well as by the personal attachment of the writer.

After making Finland my new home, I started rethinking my identity belonging which proved to be non-absolute, unfixed, opted for modification, or in other words, constructed. My original division of the world between "here" (non-West) and "there" (West) has turned out to be imagined, and has become possible to exist for me in reverse as well: "here" (West) and "there" (non-West). In this sense, the process of differentiating between self and Other has appeared to be in flux, placing the notions of "home" and "abroad" in the positions of hierarchical dualities. The realization that these two can be read, perceived and interpreted in different ways generated the seeds for this study.

However, despite all this, my first and foremost inspiration has been my supervisor, Professor Gerald Porter, whose graduate student I had an opportunity to be during my studies at the University of Vaasa, and whose compelling ideas and thought-provoking lectures on the issues of identity and belonging raised my curiosity and interest in the subject. His critical insights, offered support and encouragement resulted in my postgraduate studies and start of this project in 2004. During these years he has shared with me his enthusiasm and a tremendous degree of attention, and has been an invaluable source of information and assistance. His guidance, commitment and intelligence have led me through this hard but fascinating work. I will never be able to fully express my gratitude and indebtedness for his immense input into this study.

During our regular research seminars at Vaasa University, I also benefited from the valuable comments made by Professor Sirkku Aaltonen, Dr. Jukka Tiusanen, and Dr. Tiina Mäntymäki of the English Department as well as from my friends and postgraduate students Marinella Rodi-Risberg, Maj-Britt Höglund and Wang Lei who have provided me with kind support and stimulation. I would like to express my particular appeciation to the preliminary examiners, Professor Joel Kuortti, Professor Anthony W. Johnson, and Professor Maria Olaussen, who read and commented on the entire work. I also thank the people at Tampere, Helsinki and Vaasa University Libraries, especially Tuula Hakomäki who has helped me find a great selection of published books and journals on the subject.

My participation in a number of international conferences, where I met colleagues from different countries who shared with me their ideas and thoughts on the is-

sues of identity in general and representation of Russian identity in particular, encouraged my practical interest and stimulated my writing. I am especially indebted to Dr. Graham Dawson from Brighton University, England, who advised me on some aspects of representation, recommended some additional literature and commented on my paper presented at the I International Conference on Nation and Identity in 19th-20th Century Literature in English, held in Murcia (Spain) in 2006. At the same time I benefited from the erudition and knowledge of the representation of identities, expressed by Dr. Ali Gunes from Kafkas University, Turkey who is currently working for the International University of Sarajevo, and got new ideas from the discussions with Tintti Klapuri from Turku University who shared with me her views about Chekhov's work.

During my participation in the Third Biennial Rebecca West Conference held in New York in 2007, I found inspiration in my conversations with Carl Rollyson, a Professor of English at Baruch College, who has studied Rebecca West's life in detail, and produced an interesting range of books about her life and work. At the same period, I collected and extended my material about Rebecca West's art through the encouraging discussions with Dr. Bernard Schweizer from Long Island University and Dr. Ann Norton, a Professor and Chair of the English Department from Saint Anselm College in Manchester, USA, and through systematic research at the New York Public Library. For original material and practical help I should particularly like to thank the people serving at the Berg Collection of English and American literature of the New York Public Library; the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library of Yale University; and the McFarlin library of Tulsa University who provided me with Rebecca West collection of her personal letters and papers.

My particular thanks to Dr. Georgiy Chernyavskiy, a Professor of History at Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, who has advised me on historical aspects of the Russian past and has taken an interest in reading and providing his comments on the entire work.

I also thank my mother Larysa for her encouragement and continuous emotional and literary support as she often inspired me with the new ideas on the subject and provided me with some additional material she found on New York Public Library shelves.

Finally, this work would have never been completed without the generous love, devotion and patience of my husband Alexandr and two daughters Ilana and Sanna, who in every respect shared with me this long and arduous path and from whom I continuously acquired my inspiration and stimuli.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

> The stereotype, then, as the primary point of subjectivization for both colonizer and colonized, is the scene of a similar fantasy and defence – the desire for an originality which is again threatened by the differences of race, colour and culture … The stereotype is not a simplification because it is a false representation of a given reality.
>
> Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture,* 1994.

Any study of the representation of Russia in English literary writing generates a complex perception of the nation. Many writers in English from the sixteenth century to the present, whose works this study will briefly mention or discuss in detail, have imagined Russia as a fixed stereotypical Other that has remained relatively the same across the centuries. The binary opposition between a civilized English realm and a barbaric Russia has facilitated a representation in which the former has been seen as superior while the latter has been destined to submit. Under this construction, a fixed set of representational images has begun to coalesce caused by the common practice of the writers to rely on earlier literary works, as well as by the indeterminacy of Russian national identity. The formation of such a cache of stereotypes has enabled some writers in English to explore the limits in the representation of the Russian nation.

Although considerable research has been devoted to the idea of representation as a construction of different meanings, rather less attention has been paid to how Russia is constructed in 20th -century literary writing in English. Further investigation is needed in order to analyze why Russia has served as a stereotypical Other, a literary construct – born out of "blood and soil" (Greenfeld 2003: 261) and of uncommon individuals – that has gradually become the enigmatic identity of twentieth-century man. Like all doubles, the image of Russia has been constructed with regard to both the "best" and the "worst" of selves (Cheyette 1993: 12). It has been defined as savage and uncivilized on the one hand, and Holy and enlightened on the other. This contradictory vision has situated the Russian nation in opposition to the idealized English, who were, in Liah Greenfeld's words, "symbolically elevated to the position of an elite" (2003: 66). The hegemonic status of an imagined superior state has generated a conventional literary representation in which Russia has been perceived as a nation with a collective identity and alien to England.

Moreover, the vision of Russia as bizarre and exotic, a blend of familiarity and foreignness, has stemmed from its ambiguous geographical and cultural place-

ment: defined as both East and West, it has been different from both. With its sense of uniqueness and isolation, Russia through English eyes came to constitute a nomadic nation whose borders were fluid and indefinite, and whose identity was open to translation. As a result, the representation of a barbaric nation with a collective nomadic spirit, or a simple holy people, has been refined and redefined through the centuries, but never essentially modified.

This study therefore aims at analyzing representations of Russianness in three English socio-political novels set in pre-Revolutionary Russia: *Under Western Eyes* (1911) by Joseph Conrad, *The Birds Fall Down* (1966) by Rebecca West and *The Beginning of Spring* (1988) by Penelope Fitzgerald as part of an intertextual dialogue with earlier texts in English.[1] This analysis finds its focus in what is seen as central to the novels, that is, a binaristic and ambivalent perception of Russian national characteristics which have come to constitute a more complex and multifaceted image of Russianness. It is in relation to this binarism that the present study will employ the idea of the imageme, characterized by its polarities and a highly contingent nature. It will be treated through the interplay between the auto-and hetero-images of Russia as well as through antagonistic tropes attributed to it in English discourse.

My analysis will seek to investigate how and why such a representation has become a repetitive textual practice, constructed on the basis of fabricated stereotypes, how this conventional construction has produced the image of the Other in English culture, and whether the three Anglophone writers under scrutiny are working within a tradition of English literary representations of Russia. To examine these problems, the study will focus on the key issues in a representation of national identity. The issues are the imaginary construction of a literary production and its symbolic connotation, as well as an intertextual aspect of representation, which will allow this study to see twentieth-century representations of the nation in relation to previous practices of literary discourse.

Methodologically, intertextual reading as well as a combination of constructionist and intentional approaches will be applied throughout the thesis. The purpose and the function of this combination is to demonstrate the subjective and predetermined nature of many representations, resulting in the creation of stereotypical images and beliefs. Studying the three novels in relation to each other and against a whole tradition of texts dealing with Russianness, the thesis will attempt to

---

[1] The abbreviations used in this work for the novels' titles will be the following: *Under Western Eyes (UWE)*, *The Birds Fall Down (Birds)* and *The Beginning of Spring (Spring)*.

demonstrate how national imagery functions through recognizability, which facilitates the comprehension of a text. National stereotypes gain their meaning by invoking, or referring to, familiar imagery from earlier texts, resulting in their becoming commonplaces (Leerssen 2000: 280). Therefore the creation of national characteristics is an intentional manipulation, and is subjectively constructed by the course of representation.

These ideas will be demonstrated through a discussion of some earlier English writers' works, such as those of John Fletcher, Daniel Defoe, John Milton, Robert Browning, Virginia Woolf, and others. Their definition of the Russian character follows and extends a conventional placement of the nation between barbarism and civilization. This unstable position generates a perception of the nation in-between, represented through Russian enslavement to religious experience. In other words, this study considers constructions and reconstructions of that identity through a process of writing and representation. It proposes that in the three novels, the image of Russia is projected as an enigmatic, different and polarity-bound phenomenon, and that this is an underlying feature as a whole within twentieth century Anglophone literature. Although some of the attributes the writers in English attach to Russia have also been the elements in the auto-image of Russian national writers, the three Anglophone novelists' representations examined in this study are distinguished by their creation of Russia as an imagined community and fabricated nature of the image of Russianness.

My choice of novels with a similar setting and time is not random. At the basis of my argument is the theoretical stance – asserted by Stuart Hall (1997), Roland Barthes (1957, 1967, 1973), Mikhail Bakhtin (1975), and others – that representation is a construction of meanings through the symbolic practices and processes that language operates with (Hall 2003: 25). Therefore, the language of representation works in the three novels to produce a coherent meaning of the image of the nation. Through the lives of the characters, who function as signifiers to symbolically embody the riotous image of Russia, the nation is represented as unstable, hybrid and chaotic. Although we are mostly dealing with the private situations of individuals, history intrudes on them with pervasive seriousness. Russia is imagined as a frontier civilization located between barbarism and civilization, slavery and enlightenment, and therefore constitutes a place where these oppositions are at their most extreme. The pre-Revolutionary setting is represented as a chaotic and troubled land in which the protagonists' unfulfilled ambitions and destroyed hopes become overwhelming.

However, this is not only because of the instability of the pre-Revolutionary time, but also because of the ambivalence and complexity of the image of Russia. In becoming part of a tradition such an image has been articulated through a number of controversial perceptions even of those writers who attempted to represent the nation outside the pre-Revolutionary setting. The novels by Anthony Burgess, Helen Dunmore, James Meek, and others to which this study refers to demonstrate the ambiguous and unstable image of the nation. It is possible to read the three novels under scrutiny through an appeal to these writers because, as mentioned earlier, the representation of national imagery gains meaning when it is read in context against or in connection with other representations. Thus set outside the pre-Revolutionary setting, the Russia of the novels is performed through its conventional placement: it is a European Other and the antithesis of the West.

The study of representation has been a favourite topic for analysis since Auerbach (1953). Stuart Hall (1997) investigated the subject as the production of meaning through language, arguing that there is no direct relation between the world and the text; instead there is a reference to the world using imaginary things and abstract ideas (2003: 28). His study draws on the work of Roland Barthes (1957, 1973), Mikhail Bakhtin (1975) and Julia Kristeva (1974, 1980, 1986), who, using a semiotic approach, explored the ideas of textual production in terms of its dialogical principles, intertextual relations and meaning. These theoretical studies found their practical application in the works of Benedict Anderson (1983), Declan Kiberd (1995), and Gerald Porter (2001) and who studied the imaginary construction of a community, and Ireland, Wales and Scotland in particular (see Kiberd, Porter) as subjects of the British Empire. The authors claim that the relations between England and her subjects have been created as an imperialistic mechanism initiated by the English against their polarities. As a result, the "outlandishness" (Porter's term 2001: 101) of the Scottish, Irish and Welsh was established to define the superiority and domination of the English. Liah Greenfeld (1993), Martin Malia (1999), John Michael Archer (2001), Richard Pipes (1974), Vera Tolz (2001) and others also raised in their works questions of power with regard to the relations between the West and Russia: noting the great weight of subjectivity that governed Russia when it was represented by the West. According to the authors, Russia was stereotypically and at times contradictorily defined in relation to the West, producing an ambivalent imagery.

This assumption will be developed with support from the ideas broached by Edward Said in his critical work *Orientalism* (1978), where he defines western identity as superior and, as "Occidental", dominating its other, Oriental cultures. He draws a distinction between the two continents, criticizing a persistent attempt to

represent Europe as powerful and comprehensible, and Asia as defeated and distant:

> It is Europe that articulates the Orient; this articulation is the prerogative, not of a puppet master, but of a genuine creator, whose life-giving power represents, animates, constitutes the otherwise silent and dangerous space beyond familiar boundaries (1978: 57).

In other words, the knowledge of the Orient, in Said's view, was produced in the West with the emphasis on the former being subordinate to and dependent upon the latter. Said's discourse is based on the representation, classification and interpretation of the relationships between the two worlds by means of imaginary narrative constructs. Russia, with its ambiguous placement and unsophisticated qualities, has been represented as a striking example of Oriental backwardness (Pipes 1995: 204-205; Wolff 1994: 10-15, 30-35, 64), and therefore, is located in this study within the context of orientalism.

In contrast to Said's model, David Cannadine (2001) and Robert Irwin (2006) propose that the idea of the "West" is itself a stereotype based on a combination of different nations and national conventions. Russia, too, has been a major imperial power. All this suggests that the positions of strong and weak, superior and subordinate are themselves unfixed. They are subjectively defined by the process of representation, in which, according to Joep Leerssen's study (2000), certain established character attributes related to a given nationality take the form of decisive clichés. Therefore it can be argued that stereotypes are characterized by their very contingent and relational nature.

Problems of narrating the nation with regard to positions of power are explicitly demonstrated in Homi Bhabha's studies "DissemiNation: time, narrative, and the margins of the modern nation" (1990), *The Location of Culture* (1994), and "Culture in between" (1998), which significantly paved the way for this work. By considering space, time and margins, the author suggests that the writer's attempt to construct the nation results in its irresolution as a story technique (1994: 140):

> It is the mark of the ambivalence of the nation as a narrative strategy – and an apparatus of power – that it produces a continual slippage into analogues, even metonymic, categories, like people, minorities, or "cultural difference" that continually overlap in the act of writing the nation (1990: 291).

Bhabha explores the cultural representation of this ambivalence, drawing particular attention to the meanings and symbols associated with national life. His ideas of social belonging, political affiliation, metaphoric displacement and hybridity as prerequisites for generating new meanings and producing in-between spaces will

be extensively used throughout this study to demonstrate their attachment to the issues of representation of the nation in English literary writing.

Russia can be regarded as a very fertile ground for an author of fiction, yet the construction of Russian identity remains a relatively unexplored area. In his *Russia Imagined: Art, Culture and National Identity 1840-1995*, Robert C. Williams (1997) examined Russia's relations with the West, both imagined and real. He argues that, in being developed as a subject to the West, Russia has tried to compensate for her sense of national estrangement by inventing or borrowing anti-Western ideas and ideologies. The nation has defined itself as "an organic culture rather than a mechanical civilization" (1997: xiii). In doing so, Williams asserts, the so-called "Asiatic backwardness" of the Russian character has become an asset. As a variety of Russian nationalism, initiated by the people rather than by the state, the idea of the Russian soul has emerged. It has appeared from an idealized vision of the Russian peasant, a character type which the West has definitely lacked. In other words, the Russian nation has become a distinctive cultural construct resulting in the creation of its own national narrative opposed to the Western one – a phenomenon that each of the writers, Fitzgerald, West and Conrad, has examined at length.

Stereotyping the Russian nation as a people with a distinctive character was indeed questioned by some English travellers and writers, who identified similar practices between the English and the Russian people. Richard Chancellor in 1553 recognised a great deal of detail from his home country reflected in Muscovy:[2] the churches, the monarch and signs of civility (Hakluyt 1910: 254). A distant civilization blossoming with wild roses was the land encountered by the seventeenth-century English voyager John Tradescant, who travelled to Russia to improve his collection of exotic plants.[3] In Palmer's words, "He was interested in grafting, and it is this endeavour that ought to encourage us to rethink what we know of England's relationship to Muscovy" (2004: 235). Anthony Jenkinson, an English merchant and royal diplomat, and John Merrick, an English ambassador to Russia at the beginning of the 17th century, also acknowledged the admirable reception they received from Muscovites (see Palmer 2004: 51-53). These ideas

---

2 The term "Muscovy" (or "Rus") is a Western term which existed from 1480, when Moscow established independence, until Peter the Great's inauguration of the "Russian Empire" in 1721 (Milner-Gulland 1997: 3). What we call nowadays "Russian" was in fact referred to as "Muscovite" in 16th to 17th –century documents and Renaissance travellers' accounts (Poe 2000: 8). Thus, when talking about 15th to 17th –century Russia or the representations of Russians, I will refer to them as Muscovy and Muscovites because semantically they are similar.

3 Tradescant was a professional gardener as dependant on travel as the merchant (Palmer 2004: 233-234).

will be traced in early English texts by Shakespeare, John Fletcher and others. Unlike the travellers, the writers represent Russia as different, simultaneously veiling the ideas of her proximity to England.

Fletcher's and Shakespeare's comparisons of the two worlds will be related to the three novels of this study, in each of which the theme of difference and sameness can be identified. *The Loyal Subject* (1618) by Fletcher and *Love's Labour's Lost* (1595-1596) by Shakespeare offer a new insight into the representation of Russia by the English. A similarity of practices between the Muscovite and English courts is concealed in the main plots. Through a number of literary modes of expression, comic disguises and decisive intimations, the writers represent two cultures as each other's Other, simultaneously showing their proximity. This is in a way an attempt to explore the otherness in reverse and to articulate the idea that each nation probably accumulates qualities of both universality and exteriority, and therefore can be perceived as both comparable and different at the same time.

In two of the three novels under scrutiny, this proposal is present. Some of the English characters, such as Frank Reid (in *The Beginning of Spring*) or Edward Rowan (in *The Birds Fall Down*) find themselves alien to the country of their residence but still in a place quite similar to their own. It is an upside-down world, akin to that which Anthony Burgess, referring to *Animal Farm*, calls "Orwell's fantasy world" (1973: 101) and a place in which one may be aware of "everything necessarily containing its opposite" (1973: 128). In other words, the construction of Russia in English narrative has created an ambiguous image of the nation which seems to have involved the representation of both the nation as a radically exterior other and as an organic universal civilization somehow aligned racially to other cultures, and to the English in particular. Like Kiberd's idea that "the Englishman [sic] needs the Irish to help him determine his own identity" (1995: 53), the English may need the Russians to sharpen the definition of themselves.

Revisiting and repetition in the form of inversion is related to the concept of culture as an organic natural whole. Zainab Bahrani, who has studied the representation of Babylon and Assyria through visual images in her work *The Graven Image* (2003), argues (2003: 54) that the organic model portrays human cultures metaphorically and visually as a tree, with the roots or lowest shoots being the countries of the Orient. Russia, rooted in Byzantium, is one of those. In contrast, the progress of civilization is represented through the Western nations as mature phases at the top of the tree. Hence, the passing of time is expressed through this organic structure and its evolution. Moreover, in Bahrani's opinion, the past is seen as a necessary part of present Western identity, and by definition must ex-

clude the oriental Other, or at least separate it from the present Western historical narrative. However, in the case of Mesopotamia this does not take place. Instead, the past is grafted onto the tree of the progress of civilization, establishing intelligibility through a comparison of Western identity to the Other. Thus the idea of the Other has developed from the notion of the West, although the world has never been as neatly divided into two parts, West and non-West, as Said's theory suggests (see Thompson 2000, Cannadine 2001, Malik 2001, Irwin 2006).

The idea of the national superiority of the English nation which runs through the three novels raises questions of power. The writers are dealing with the exposition of power through which the English characters maintain their dominance over their Russian counterparts, demonstrating that "knowledge and the power of naming, representing and theorizing have been produced and controlled in the West" (Blunt and McEwan 2002: 9). The English characters are largely represented as rational, progressive and manly. They constitute symbolic elements of a social realm which creates a basis for the concepts and ideas in the minds of the characters, who interpret this social phenomenon with an emphasis on its cultural, subjective meaning. The Russian characters in turn are often imagined as irrational, backward and feminised, which inevitably places the nation in an alien position and generates a dependence of the subordinate upon its master. The present study will demonstrate that this standard cultural stereotype, generated by travellers and developed by poets and writers later, has reinforced the imaginative perception of Russia as a subordinate cultural Other, and has prepared the ground for the nation to be represented as such in twentieth century writers' works.

Moreover, this work sees the superiority of English identity over the Russian national character constructed in English writing as coming from its religious standing as well. In the sixteenth century, at the time when Russia was "discovered" by Richard Chancellor, England constituted "a new social structure unlike any other, and a novel, at that time unique, identity" (Greenfeld 2003: 66). According to Greenfeld (2003: 61), "the English people was chosen, separated from others and distinguished by God; the strength and glory of England was the interest of His Church; and the triumph of Protestantism was a national triumph". Although this kind of argument also accompanied the definition of the Russian character later (see Williams 1997: 286; Greenfeld 2003: 258), resulting in the construction of the concept of the Russian soul in 1840-1880, at a time when Russian "civilization" was being defined by the English, the image of the opposite, backward and savage people started to take shape much earlier. The emphasis on the distinctiveness and uniqueness of the English nation, and the greatness of Elizabeth (Greenfeld 2003: 65), symbolically separated England from Russia, ascribing their relations to those of master and slave. As this study will show, the invention

of Russia in English literary texts has been associated with profound instability and alienation, drawing on a variety of literary constructions in which the nation has been symbolically "blackened" (Archer 2001: 122), slave-bounded, or simply depicted as a barbaric society. The idea of blackening of the Russian nation is used in this study to demonstrate the savagery and the reductionism of the Russian characters in the novels in relation to the English.

Some earlier English texts, such as Shakespeare's *Love's Labour's Lost* (1595-1596), John Fletcher's *The Loyal Subject* (1618), John Milton's *A Brief History of Muscovia* (1682), and Daniel Defoe's second part of *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) show these ideas in practice. They are small independent pieces of writing through which a coherent web of intertextual representations can be identified, and in which the image of Russia as the Other can be traced. Such a vision of the nation has been preserved in the English literary tradition across the centuries, and this study suggests that it constitutes that cultural past which dramatically influences any modern writer in English, and Fitzgerald, Conrad and West in particular. Apart from these three writers' novels, this study will also refer to such nineteenth-twentieth-century and later works as Robert Browning's "Ivan Ivanovitch" (1878), Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* (1901), Norman Douglas' *South Wind* (1917), Virginia Woolf's *The Voyage Out* (1915) and *Orlando* (1928), George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945), Anthony Burgess's *Honey for the Bears* (1963), Helen Dunmore's *The Siege* (2001) and *The House of Orphans* (2006), and others. They too can be regarded as a revisiting and repetition of the previous literary practices relating to the representation of Russia.

All communities are imaginary, or, in Dunmore's protagonist's words, "everyone came from somewhere else at some time" (2006: 13). The nation is constructed through imagination and "subjectivization" (Hall 2003: 315), and the imaginary is presented as "real". In this representation the positions between strong and weak vary: questions of power are never absolute, and Russia, represented as subordinate, can also be imagined as a master. For example, in Dunmore's *The House of Orphans* (2006) we are faced with the representation of a Russia that rules Finland, and although people live "like slaves tied to the land" (2006: 28), they are represented as superior to the Finnish nation. Russia is a despotic, demonized community from which, "like all extremes", comes "restless, rebellious anger against the order of things" (2006: 58). Dunmore uses power in a highly symbolic way to emphasize the exclusion of the nation and to construct imaginary relations between superior and subordinate.

Russia is represented as an oppressor in Dermot Bolger's novel *The Family on Paradise Pier* (2005). Although it is set during the later, Soviet period, with the horror of Bolshevism that this entailed, many of the earlier Russian stereotypes can still be identified. To escape from his "troubled" Irish identity, the main character Art tries to embrace the substitute ideology created by the Soviet system. Thinking that his alienation can be overcome by a would-be ideal society, such as Russia represents ("there is no crime nor punishment" (2005: 174)), he migrates to Russia and marries a Russian woman. However, at the end of the novel, both the system and his family life fail him, which demonstrates that Soviet Russia too, with its autocracy and exclusive ideology, cannot become a shelter for reconciliation. Conversely, it is represented as a threat and a repressive discourse to emphasize the destructive nature of the Russian nation.

The representation of Russia has thus been formed within a range of narratives which, as Homi Bhabha points out, "may themselves be part of a process of ambivalent identification" (1994: 145). The construction of Russian identity by the West has been endowed with a "double" and "split" time of national representation (1994: 144) in which the relations between a master and a slave have been imagined as diametrically opposed world views. While the former has striven to create liminality in time and space, the latter has laboured to extend them. Russia has been a timeless world of chaos in which even an Apocalyptic event such as the Russian Revolution has been regarded as merely part of a cycle. W. B. Yeats's poem "The Second Coming" (1920), in which history and the Revolution were represented as a series of cycles, expresses the idea. Yeats himself believed in an eternal Apocalypse, exploring the idea of resurrection in his work:

> Turning and turning in the widening gyre
> The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
> Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold; …
> Surely some revelation is at hand;
> Surely the Second Coming is at hand. (1967: 210, 211)

The writer's attempt to convert death into eternity and to represent immortality can be also applied to Russia, which strives to expand its borderlines in space and time. We can identify similar ideas in Thomas Mann's novel *The Magic Mountain* (1924). When an Italian Herr Settembrini observes some Russian patients at the sanatorium where the novel is set, he comments on their Oriental characteristics, calling them 'Mongolian Muscovites'. Then he continues: "Have you never noticed that when a Russian says 'four hours', it means no more to him than 'one hour' does to us? The idea comes easily to mind that the nonchalance with which these people treat time has something to do with the savage expanse of their land. Too much room - too much time. It has been said that they are a nation with

time on their hands - they can afford to wait" (2005: 289). Bhabha's idea of the split time of the imagined nation, the time which turns into an ambivalent sign, constructing the narrative as if from two different temporalities of meaning which endows the imagined nation with its ambiguity and difference, is relevant here.

Mann's words also raise the question of the non-sequential nature of time and, in Bhabha's words (1994: 141), "the ambivalent and chiasmatic intersections of time and place" associated with the imagined communities, and Russia in particular. It is as if Russians treat time differently from other nations because they are regarded as being broad in terms of their land, their soul and their "eternal" lifetime. Their time is, in Jay Griffiths's words, an "elastic, ambiguous time of myth which seems female" (2000: 56). The ideas of the revival and continuity of the Russian nation can be also traced in Fitzgerald's and West's novels. We will see later how the writers try to avoid an unhappy dénouement and to view the future of Russia optimistically by returning their protagonists to a new cycle of events. As the books were written after the Revolution, this is in a way to represent chaos as leading to social change.

The three writers under study here all shared this point of view. Cicily Fairfield (1892-1983), Rebecca West's original name, started her writing career at a very early age, with the first appearance of her publications in 1911 (Rollyson 1998b: 2). Rebecca was stimulated by the successful journalistic activity of her father, Charles Fairfield, not to mention her writing "a remarkable characteristic of seeing life in terms of dynastic disputes" (1998b: 2). A portrayal of her father presiding over his family as in a court is reflected in her novels, and in *The Birds Fall Down* in particular, where Nikolai, as the grandfather, the oldest and the most experienced male character, is represented as a king with authority. The writer's vision of the world as a court, a family falling apart and a father's (king's) inability to save the situation is the Russian novel's subplot, alluding to Rebecca West's favourite work of literature, *King Lear* (Rollyson 1998b: 2-3). Her father figures, like her own father,[4] are all unstable, and incapable of fulfilling their function as leaders of the family and guardians.

On the other hand, she clearly expresses her female characters' longing and desire for male dominance, a position which questions West's status as a feminist writer and suggests what Ann V. Norton calls her "paradoxical feminism". In her book of that name (2000), Norton maintains that, while West expresses tremendous

---

[4] Charles Fairfield left home and abandoned his family when Rebecca West was eight years old (Rollyson 1998b: 3). He belonged not to the family but to the outside world, making the Fairfields into 'displaced' persons (Glendinning 1987: 11, 18).

anger toward men and many aspects of patriarchal structures, she simultaneously creates an elaborate, if at times cynical, rationalization of women's "appropriate" subordination to masculine frameworks and culture (2000: xvii). This idea, as the present study will demonstrate, is expressed not only through the dominant role of male authority over West's heroines, but also through the power and oppression of masculinist culture such as the English imperial one over the symbolically feminine Russian identity constructed in *The Birds Fall Down.* In this representation, there is an evident attempt by the writer to exercise her paradoxical feminist philosophy together with her nationalistic ambition, and to invoke the idea that any masculine ideology, whether Orthodox Christianity, tsarist Russia, the behaviour of English 'gentlemen', Marxist revolutionaries, or Hegelian philosophy, is unable to protect the female (Norton 2000: 83).

West dreamt of writing a novel that would express her Shakespearean sense of the treacherous nexus between family, politics, and art, abandoning her first draft, known as "Cockcrow", in 1943, and beginning another, which was completed as *The Birds Fall Down,* in 1966 (Rollyson 1998b: 191). Although she never visited Russia, West met Russians in exile in France during the 1920s, and when drafting the novel, she consulted Moura Budberg, H.G. Wells's Russian mistress and most probably a double agent herself, about the names of her characters.[5] West's influences may well have come from H. G. Wells's, who had profound knowledge of Russian literature, appreciated the works of Tolstoy, Turgenev and Gorky and visited Russia three times.[6]

West's interest in Russia as well as her early influences can be also traced on the basis of her private collection of books, currently owned by the University of Tulsa, which comprised of over thirty items either about Russia or by Russian writers. Rebecca West was familiar with the work of Dostoyevsky, Gorky, Chekhov, Tolstoy, Turgenev, Pushkin and Herzen, and might well have relied on her library sources with respect to the Revolution.[7] While Chekhov could be consid-

---

5 In 1912, after impressing H. G. Wells with her negative review of his novel *Marriage*, Rebecca West was invited to lunch with him and his wife Amy. When the two fell in love, West "found herself in unexpected and undesired positions of mistress and unwed mother" (Norton 2000: 4). Their ten-year affair and Rebecca's struggle to raise alone her illegitimate son Anthony profoundly affected her writing and her psychological status. She suffered emotionally from being the mistress of a married man, conveying in her novels the contradictory aspects of her life (Norton 2000: 6-7).

6 See Kozyreva & Shamina (2005: 48).

7 Rebecca West's private library collection demonstrates that among a thousand books available at her hand to please the writer's interests, several sources about the Russian Revolution and the pre-Revolutionary time were also included: among them, Boris Nicolaievsky's *Aseff: The*

ered to be one of West's early mentors, Tolstoy was too boring for her.[8] In her private letter of October 10th, 1917 to Sylvia Lynd (1888-1952), an English poet and prose writer, she commented on *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina* as "nothing but stuffed Tolstoys" whose writing she "cannot speak, but only yawn", simultaneously praising Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*, *The Possessed* and *The Raw Youth* (Scott 2000: 29).

In addition, West was also familiar with Emma Goldman, the anarchist and feminist, who was brought up in Russia, emigrated to the United States and was deported to Russia in 1917. Rebecca West had met Goldman in London and provided her with support and the necessary backing. Goldman insisted on the inevitable, inherent, monolithic totalitarianism of Soviet Russia and blamed Bolshevik ideology when campaigning against the Communists. West observed that Goldman spoke Russian as her native language and declared her ideas with great authority, which probably convinced West of Goldman's profound knowledge of the Russian problem.[9] Goldman's anti-Soviet views and disillusionment with Russia, which she expressed in her book of that name (1925) with Rebecca West's Introduction to it, was evidently another influence on West's disbelief in the Revolution and her exploration of the idea in *The Birds Fall Down*.

West's anti-Bolshevik, anti-Communist standpoints also stemmed from her life. According to Carl Rollyson, the writer absorbed the atmosphere of the Revolution even as a child. Her conservative father often invited revolutionaries to their home for debates. As a girl, West observed these discussions and drew conclusions about Bolshevism. With her antipathy towards Communists, she wrote a series of articles on the tyrannical policies of Communist regimes, attacking Soviet Russia for having destroyed the class system and the hope it had given (Rollyson 1998a: 2-5; Glendinning 1987: 89-90).[10] Her choice of setting the novel before the Revolution undeniably demonstrates her desire to deal with the roots of the Russian Revolution "without having to battle critics who would undoubtedly accuse her of a conservative attack on the revolution itself" (Rollyson 1998a: 16).

Russian Judas (1934), Roy Medvedev's *The October Revolution* (1925), Arthur Koestler's *Why I changed My Mind About Communism* (1905) (McFarlin Library, University of Tulsa).

8 See Laing (2002: xxxv).

9 On Goldman's influence on Rebecca West see Glendinning 1987: 105-107; Wexler 1992: 44, 45; Rollyson 2005: 57.

10 In "The Inconviencies of Power" (1929), the artticle written for the *Time and Tide* magazine, West expresses her unsympathetic feelings towards the Russian system, blaming the Tsardom for being "veiled before the eyes of the public", and confirming the ideas hostility of England towards a country (that is Russia) "where it is easy to land in prison for other reasons than crime" (1929: 744).

Therefore, her Russian novel expresses the writer's attitude and contempt for the Soviet regime and probably Russia in general.

In his recent study *Rebecca West and the God That Failed: Essays* (2005), Rollyson argues that West's writing during 1917-1918 shows that she did not believe the Revolution would respect human rights, and was aware that the revolutionaries would destroy the world because of their fearful ideology (2005: 43). He continues that the only novelists in the Anglo-American world who preceded West in this awareness were Henry James and Joseph Conrad (2005: 44). This was one of the reasons why Conrad became an early influence on West (see our discussion later) and, for the Russian reader, one of the most controversial writers (see Voitkovska 2005).

A Polish expatriate born in the Russian Empire, in the territory of Ukraine, writing in the British tradition, and notorious for his Russophobia, Joseph Conrad's reputation remained marginal in Russia during the 20th century compared with that of Shakespeare, Dickens, Graham Greene, H.G. Wells, and Somerset Maugham (Voitkovska 2005: 147, 152). Because it was banned, or inadequately translated during Soviet times, Conrad's work has never gained familiarity with the average Russian reader (2005: 148). Moreover, the selection of his work introduced in Russia, and especially the absence of the more concertedly political novels, such as *Under Western Eyes*, did not significantly change the official assessment of Conrad in Russia (2005: 152). Although in his Author's Notes to the novel, written in 1920, Conrad stated that *Under Western Eyes* was universally recognised and published there in many editions (2003: vi), in Ludmilla Voitkovska's opinion, it is hard to say what the basis was of Conrad's satisfaction with the reception of the novel, which in fact had been published only once by that time, not in "many editions", and with no hard evidence of "universal recognition" (2005: 159). She continues that, while embracing Lawrence, Joyce, and Eliot, Russian readers either avoided Conrad because he was just too Slavic to exert any foreign charisma, or read it in precisely the way in which Conrad would not have wanted it to be read (2005: 160-161).

The ethnocentric qualities of Conrad's art were insistently promoted by his friend, Edward Garnett, who, in his influential reviews of Conrad's work, called him a "Slavic" writer.[11] Even as early as 1898, when he wrote the first general appraisal of Conrad, Garnett was drawing comparisons with Russians. His obsession with

[11] When linking Conrad with the great Slav writers, Garnett argued that his work possessed "those secrets of Slav thought and feeling which seem so strange and inaccessible" (qtd. in Carabine 1996: 7).

the Slavic element and insistence on the Slavic qualities of Conrad's art were particularly exasperating for the Polish Conrad, to whom all things Russian were anathema.[12] Conrad never wanted to be labeled as a Slavic writer, and this may partially explain his claim to have no knowledge of the Russian language in his spring 1917 letter to Garnett.[13] Some critics such as Frederick Karl and Helen Smith dispute this claim, suggesting that Conrad's residence in the Russian empire and his father's apparent knowledge of Russian were sufficient grounds to postulate Conrad's possible knowledge of at least some Russian.[14] In the same letter, Conrad insists on presenting himself as an unqualified judge of Russian literature, stating that he first encountered Turgenev through French and Polish translations. However, being aware of the appreciation of the Slavic temperament by the English reader, he later admits to Garnett that he does not mind being qualified as an expert on things Russian (Kaye 1999: 123-124).[15] This indisputably shows his contradictory feelings towards Russia: while distancing himself from all things Russian, he simultaneously tries to be indebted to Russian sources or to the Slavic temperament.

In this relation, Conrad's voice as narrator, with his hybrid English-Slavic identity, is complex and ambiguous. To Edward Garnett's private letter of 1911, in which he accused Conrad of his hatred of Russia in the novel (Smith 2007: 83), Conrad replies on October 20 of the same year:

> There's just about as much or as little hatred in this book as in the *Outcast of the Islands* for instance … If You seriously think that I have done that then my dear fellow let me tell you that you don't know what the accent of hate is. Is it possible that You haven't seen that in this book I am concerned with nothing but ideas, to the exclusion of everything else … And anyhow if hatred there were it would be too big a thing to be put into a 6/-novel. (Karl 1983: 488-489)

Yet, while disapproving of Garnett's accusations, Conrad, looking at England as a naval power from his reading of the British adventurers and a literary language from his reading of Shakespeare, at the same time snobbishly emphasized the supremacy of the English nation. His choice of English as a literary language appeared naturally from his early childhood associations with England as a noble

---

12 See Turton (1992: 168) and Smith (2007: 82-83).

13 See also McCullough (1946: 336-337).

14 His Father, Apollo Korzeniowski, had a pronounced influence on his son's linguistic development from which it can be supposed that he not only provided the boy with strong models of literary Polish, but also supplied him with some Russian (Pousada 1994: 336).

15 When leaving his home country for France in 1874 to join the merchant marine in Marseilles, Conrad was known on ship in the South Seas as the "Russian Count" (Pousada 1994: 337).

nation (Pousada 1994: 341-342). Thus Conrad's attempts at impartiality resulted in the articulation of a narrative about the Other (that is, Russia) which is complex and ambiguous not only because of the nation it represents but also because of the writer by whom it is represented. In other words, Conrad's mixed identity and probably perplexed feelings towards Russia have profoundly contributed to the complexity of the narrative.

As the child of a failed revolutionary, Conrad experienced the opposed ideologies of how to live as a Pole within a repressive Russian empire from a very early age, a situation which eventually resulted in his strongly rejecting the idea that the revolution as a tool could bring a radical improvement (see Rieselbach 1985 and Carabine 1996). Conrad's loathing of Russia, his multilingual background, his career in the British Merchant Service (1878-1893), during which he encountered a great variety of competing cultures, languages and imperialisms, laid the seeds for his fiction's main themes of racial difference, clashes, instability and disorientation (Said 2003: 554; Carabine 1996: xxv). Antagonisms, isolation, ambivalence, betrayal and heroism are central to Conrad's work, and, as in *Under Western Eyes*, remain unresolved. The relationships between parents, lovers, and friends fail, or are sacrificed in favour of ideology of one sort or another. In other words, Conrad's perplexed identity and incompatible experiences, on account of which Said called him "the wanderer . . . who can never shake off his sense of alienation" (2003: 554), left an irrevocable imprint on his writing.

Under Western Eyes (1911), was started by the writer with a complete story line firmly in mind (Higdon 1987: 187). Conrad's visit to Geneva in 1895 and a casual conversation with a stranger provided the idea for the novel, and suggested the contrast of Geneva and St. Petersburg upon which both the plot of the novel and the clash between West and East emerged (Carabine 1996: 7). The same contrast was typical of the attitude of Conrad's father, Apollo Korzeniowski. In a series of essays entitled "Poland and Muscovy", which appeared anonymously in 1864 in *Ojczyzna*, or *The Fatherland*, an émigré newspaper published in Leipzig, Apollo characterized Muscovy as an autocratic, morally corrupt and uncivilized state in contrast to dynamic and civilized Poland. He argues that the conflict between Poland and Russia is not merely a national affair, but rather the first stage of a far more momentous struggle: "the struggle between the West and the East, between civilization and barbarism" (1966: 128).

In addition, because, for Conrad, Russia was the antithesis of the West and of all things English, a land of political reaction and despair (Neilson 1995: 94), in *Under Western Eyes* the tsarist state is represented as an autocratic society with immoral individuals moving towards collapse. The novel appeals to Russian politics,

history, psychology and the relationship of the Russian with the Western, demonstrating strong Russian influence on Conrad's work. Yet this novel is not about either Russia or England but rather about the irreconcilability of past and present experiences. It is about psychological contention and ambivalence as well as probably about Conrad's personal search in public and private dilemmas, conscious and unconscious relations and the overall comprehension of life. In this text, as well as seemingly in Conrad's writing in general, these questions cannot be either avoided or resolved which suggests the ambiguities and binary oppositions explored by the writer.

As *Under Western Eyes* and *The Birds Fall Down* are intertextually linked, this study will discuss them in parallel. Both novels are unmistakably concerned with Russia and its relation to the West in general, and to the English in particular. However, the transmutation from a more universal theme of relations between the Russian and the Western to more specific aspects of it, such as subordination and power, ferocity and refinement, sentimentalism and reasoning, is a still more important aspect of this study. These aspects constitute a substantial part of the representation of the nation in which the "real" is converted into the symbolic. The characters are those symbols through which the main marks of "true" Russianness can be identified. We will see how the enigmatic Russian soul, which is regarded as evidence of the idea of the Russian nation, with its simplistic characteristics, is incorporated into the images of the protagonists. The Russian soul is juxtaposed against the European ethos, or in this case the English national spirit, and differs from it in its unsophisticated nature and collective quality. As Greenfeld expresses it, "the qualities of the Russian soul were arrived at through the mental exercise of posing antitheses to the existing Western virtues with regard to which Russia was particularly deficient" (2003: 256). In other words, the Russian soul – the spiritual sign of Russian national identity – has operated as the anti-model of Western rationality and materialism, which determine the criteria of either belonging to or exclusion from the nation.

By providing the novel with the original title *Razumov* (Higdon 1987: 187), the writer focused on the protagonist, whose surname derives from the Russian word *razum* or "reason". Yet, as in Rebecca West's writing, reason in Conrad's novel is not a property of the Russian character, to whom the protagonist relates himself by his heritage, and therefore its affinity with Razumov must be excluded. The impulses behind the protagonist's betrayal and confessions, his hatred of the revolutionaries at the beginning of the novel and his mingling with them at the end, can hardly be recognized as the workings of reason, which probably suggests why Conrad changed the title of his novel and put his story under the skeptical western eyes of an English narrator.

Peter Wolfe finds affinities between West's and Conrad's writing in the way they feature bizarre happenings, an impressionistic technique, and far-reaching political implications (1971: 116). In both writers' works, there is a consistent link between their philosophical concerns, literary technique and sociopolitical views (see Peters 2001). Both writers' novels represent the collapse and incoherence of a society, with elements of espionage, political intrigue and revolutionary practice. In addition, both novels appeal to the themes of loneliness, isolation and lost opportunity. While kept together, the characters of the novels are kept apart by forces working in opposition and destroying the community of mankind. The world as seen by Conrad and West is a place of perpetual conflicts which generate disenchantment and imbue hope. The events are developed and seen through a mood of strangeness, apprehension and suspicion (McCullough 1946: 338-340). As a result, Conrad, who met West in 1915, and wrote his novel fifty years earlier, is considered to be one of her major influences (Rollyson 1998b: 211) the basis of the English writer's own version of the Russian pre-Revolutionary world and human relations.

The practice of making the mental physical, according to Peter Wolfe, is a Conradian strain which helps show how far Rebecca West advanced as an artist (1971: 129). In the following descriptions the writers' artistic imaginations clearly parallel each other; in many pieces of their whole work similar instances can be identified: "When the light came back she [Laura] found that Kamensky was breathing deeply too, and in the same rhythm as herself. They were in horrid physical agreement." (*Birds* 1978: 354); while "Razumov received an almost physical impression of endless space and of countless millions" (*UWE* 2003: 20). Laura mentally matures from an innocent young girl to a conscious murderer who becomes physically immersed in lies and treachery. Razumov, too, develops from a student type character to a betrayer and an assassin. His mind is gradually shaped to commit a betrayal and to become involved in political espionage. He is influenced by the immense Russian space and the abundance of its population, and feels his association with both. The picture of mental and physical unity here endows both writers' works with the spiritual, and illustrates their concept of alternative power of the universe of darkness that may appear out of light.

The pre-Revolutionary setting was also the subject of some other pieces of writing from the time of the Revolution, to which Conrad's and West's novels are intertextually related. Hugh Walpole, who had worked with the Red Cross at the Russian Front during the First World War and was in St. Petersburg at the time of the Revolution in 1917, wrote two novels *The Dark Forest* (1916) and *The Secret City* (1919). As in Conrad's and West's novels, these works are linked through their English narrator-mouthpiece, John Durward, who witnesses the story of the

tragic love affair between an Englishman and a Russian nurse, and observes Russian psychology through English eyes (Cross 1985: 59). The narrator expresses his awareness of the squalid sides of the city of St. Petersburg, and develops his fantasy, suggesting an excursion into other worlds. Another relevant text to consider here is Maurice Baring's play *The Double Game* (1912), set in Moscow in 1907.[16] This is a play about revolutionary groups and betrayal, in which Marie, a member of "the Moscow branch of Social Revolutionaries" throws a bomb at the hated chief of Police, and after that commits suicide rather than be arrested (1985: 64). In other words, for Conrad, the former Russian citizen, Walpole, the Red Cross worker, and Baring, the writer and visitor to Russia – three "very dissimilar novelists with vastly different experiences of Russia" (Cross 1985: 62) – their vision of the nation is connected to the subject of the present thesis: it is a land of chaos, assassinations, revolutionaries and anarchy.

A similar vision of the country is constructed in Virginia Woolf's early novel *The Voyage Out* (1915), which, while not having the Russian setting, still has a significant number of references to it. Woolf's interest in Russia was not accidental. Her early reading of Russian literature and of the first travellers' accounts of Russia very much predetermined the performance of the nation in her writing. There will be a broad discussion of the development of the Russian element in Woolf's work with respect to *Orlando* in chapter IV of this study. What are significant here are the traditional references to the Russian politics of the time in her pre-Revolutionary novel, in which, like many other English writers dealing with Russia before the Revolution (Cross 1985: 53), Woolf mentions the revolution together with anarchism, exile and conspiracy. This is expressed by Evelyn, the heroine of the story:

> My friend knows a girl of fifteen who's been sent to Siberia for life merely because they caught her addressing a letter to an anarchist. And the letter wasn't from her, either. I'd give all I have in the world to help on a revolution against the Russian government, and it's bound to come (Woolf 2001: 374).

The references to the pre-Revolutionary Russian world bring the vision of a chaotic and anarchist society where lawlessness and anti-human relations rule. Being familiar with the reversed image of Russia in relation to England and probably

---

[16] Maurice Baring began visiting Russia in 1900, and from 1906 he produced a steady stream of books on all aspects of Russian life and conditions, beginning with *With the Russians in Manchuria* (1905), through *Landmarks in Russian Literature* (1910), *The Russian People* (1911) to *The Mainsprings of Russia* (1914) (Cross 1985: 62-63).

with Conrad's novel as well, Woolf also refers to Russia as eastern, making the opposition to England as western civilization clear: "a disease had broken out in the East, there was cholera in Russia" (2001: 37). Because of West's admiration of Woolf's work and especially of *Orlando*, with its barbaric representations of Russianness, the evocation of the East along with Russia later became an ironic quotation in *The Birds Fall Down*.[17] Such a representation performs the nation as underdeveloped and barbaric, approximating the writer's perception of Russia to Conrad's, West's and Fitzgerald's.

Although Penelope Knox Fitzgerald's (1916-2000) novel *The Beginning of Spring* (1988) is closely related to the subject of this discussion, it is my intention to discuss it separately from West's and Conrad's works. The first reason for this is that it is the most recent of the three novels under discussion, written in the period closest to the present. Secondly, it can be regarded as being more intensely imagined, because Fitzgerald, unlike Conrad, for instance, never went to Russia. Unlike West she never even visited a Slavic country,[18] but instead used her own knowledge and fantasy to construct the atmosphere and the characters. However, apart from her imagination, the writer uses a great deal of personal experience. Many of her male protagonists possess an irrevocable likeness to her husband Desmond, on the image of whom she drew the failure, misfits and loss embedded in her characters (Wolfe 2004: 3). Although Fitzgerald has never been called an autobiographical novelist, Lewis Tess maintains that her personal experience also gave way to the exploration of distant places and periods, which Fitzgerald examines in novels like *The Beginning of Spring*.[19] What makes the novel under scrutiny distinct from her other pieces of work is the probing of two worlds in opposition, Great Britain and Russia, through which the writer examines a compromise between a hegemonic and a non-powerful nation (as pre-Revolutionary Russia was seen by English eyes), and questions the apocalyptic hopes that imperialist Russia is preoccupied with.

In this sense, Fitzgerald's work stands apart from Conrad's and West's. Publishing her first book at the age of sixty, she somehow benefited from starting her

---

[17] Rebecca West praised Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* in the *New York Herald Tribune* (Glendinning 1987: 155).

[18] Rebecca West made three trips to Yugoslavia, which resulted in the travel book *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon*, published in 1941 (Glendinning 1987: 163-164).

[19] Fitzgerald's later novels are set in distant places and periods: *Innocence* (1986) is set in Florence in the 1950s, both *The Beginning of Spring* (1988) and *The Gate of Angels* (1990) take place on the eve of the First World War, with the first set in Moscow and the second in Cambridge, England, while *The Blue Flower* (1998) spans seven years in provincial Saxony in the 1790s (Tess 2000: 29-30).

career as a writer late because the effect of time upon her reputation was dazzling.[20] Although she never made her way into politics, but had profound knowledge of cultural history and art, her Russian novel touches socio-political issues at an exact historical moment. Her skillful references to Russian customs and manners, style of dressing, eating habits and the descriptions of pre-Revolutionary Moscow recreate the atmosphere of that time and place. By placing her English character Frank Reid in such a place, Fitzgerald demonstrates her interest in a different culture and alternative style of life as well as examines a duality of meaning and shifting relationships between a person and society. All these tensions and ambivalences permeate her Russian novel, creating an imaginative account of a foreign land from a purely foreign perspective.

Penelope Fitzgerald was also interested in the relationship between the rational and the emotional, which, according to Peter Wolfe, underlies her interest in alternative cultures (2004: 3). Russia, often stereotyped as spiritually Holy, female and unreasonable, was the perfect basis for exploring these issues. This is seen in Tess's reference to the existence in *The Beginning of Spring* of discussions of God and the soul throughout "the Russian novel" (2000: 34) in juxtaposition to the pragmatism of the novel's English protagonist. The dialogue between emotion and reason also raises the antagonism of forces between female and male characters in Fitzgerald's novel, and in this sense, approximates her writing to West's.

As with Rebecca West, who "constantly probes in her novels the problems that plague the intimate relationships of men and women, especially in the context of marriage" (Norton 2000: 110), Fitzgerald looks at the skewed power relations between the two genders and at "the steps by which political turmoil swamps ordinary lives" (Wolfe 2004: 299). In other words, in both writers' artistic tradition, the public is intertwined with the private, and politics intervenes with the lives of ordinary people. Although the latter (politics) is not central to both novels, it becomes a destructive force, signaling the intrusion of history (pre-Revolutionary time) and the maleness of the time (as politics is men's business, especially in West's novel). In both novels, politics affects the relationships between the male and female protagonists, which result in an unhappy marriage and betrayal, converting each other's lives into a miserable existence. The writers show a battle between individuals, reinforced by the riotousness of the time and by the chaotic

---

[20] From the start of her writing career, reviewers had been friendly and encouraging. She received many prizes, honours and claims for her greatness and felt confident about her status during her lifetime (Wolfe 2004: 4).

image of Russia, which symbolically demonstrates a revolt of masculine rationality against feminine unreason.

In such a situation, the contradictions in the characters' lives advance with increasing rigor, constructing the tightened atmosphere of pre-Revolutionary Russia. In most cases, one character's fate and family is depicted with a pervasive seriousness, while the nation serves as a background for their lives. Russia is stereotyped as "the magnificent and ramshackle country . . . where nature represented not freedom, but law" (*Spring* 1998: 177). Although the events leading up to the Russian Revolution are swirling around them, they do not seem to be as important as the existence of the central character Frank Reid. As a foreigner to Russia even though he has spent many years living in Moscow, he seems to be unprepared for the momentous changes under way. His image evokes John Reed, who was also a foreigner with an unqualified preoccupation with Russia's political turmoil.[21] The echo of Reid with Reed is striking in this regard, and demonstrates Fitzgerald's talent as a researcher as well as her interest in earlier texts about Russia.

In addition, Fitzgerald's novel relates intertextually to some earlier Russian writers such as Gogol, Leskov and Chekhov, who tend to represent the Russian character as simple and unsophisticated, and Russia as provincial and non-European. Thus the construction of Russian identity has been based not only on the stereotypical conclusions drawn from the earlier written works in English, but has also sustained some 19th century Russian writers' representations of the image of Russia. Therefore, *The Beginning of Spring* will be discussed in parallel with Chekhov's play *The Cherry Orchard* (1904), also set in pre-Revolutionary Russia. It will be argued that Russia in the English novel and in the Russian play is represented as a provincial realm opposed to sophisticated and metropolitan European culture. The writers emphasize the provincial habits of the Russian characters, the feminine image of Russia as a Mother figure and a peripheral location of the nation – all characteristics embraced by the concept of provincialism. This, as will be defined, is to associate the nation with subordination, backwardness and ignorance.

A few words about the structure of the present work are necessary here. Following this introduction, the second chapter considers the background for the study of representation. This gives an overview of the critical reassessment of the concept

---

[21] John Reed was an American left-wing reporter who represented the Russian Revolution in his *Ten Days That Shook the World* (1919) (Clayton 2002: 126).

of cultural representation. Different approaches to representation, such as the reflective, the constructionist and the intentional show how a literary text can be related to the world in terms of its representation. The image of Russia in the three novels is constructed with regard to "reality", or geopolitical Russia. Yet this construction is symbolic: it is based on previous practices of representation, and the writers' personal knowledge and imagination that they use to represent the nation. Therefore, the interplay between "reality" and representation is central to questions of the relation between past and present practices of representation of Russia in the English novel.

The third chapter raises problems of national identity. It clarifies the terms "invention", "fabrication" and "construction", and describes their applications in the process of image-building. It looks deeper into the process of visualization of the image as a phenomenon which results in the ambivalence in perception of the nation. As a result, the nation is seen as different, simultaneously preserving its universal features. In addition, based on studies by Said, Porter, Kiberd, Anderson, Cheyette and other scholars, this chapter investigates the process of construction through a fabrication of images, which results in a symbolic representation, endowed with a substantial proportion of both imagination and power. This constructs the positions between strong and weak, or the superior (Western, English) and the subordinate (Russia).

The fourth chapter of the present study examines the invention of Russia in early English writing and the influence of some English pioneer writers mentioned earlier on 20th century writers in English. It extends the idea of imagination being involved in representation of the nation since the English "discovery" of Russia in 1553, and indicates some persistent themes about and attitudes towards Russia, shaped in early English literature. The chapter also demonstrates how and in what ways the English awareness and first impressions of Russia have been developed into the clichés and stereotypical images that have survived until the present day. The importance of early records made by English writers and travellers that the chapter discusses lies in the fact of their intertextual connection with the three English novels under scrutiny, an idea which holds all the three narratives together, and allows their reading against, or in relation to, earlier texts under examination.

The fifth chapter considers the representation of Russia before the Revolution in the three 20th century English novels central to this study. It argues that a stereotypical perception of the nation, conventionally linked to Russia through English narrative, is typical of the three novels. Conrad, West and Fitzgerald use a symbolic manner of representation to reproduce the atmosphere of pre-Revolutionary

Russia and to depict the nation as chaotic and unstable. What underpins this construction is the images of the characters who stand as signifiers of the image of Russia. The chapter examines how the protagonists either suffer from, or become involved, in destruction, betrayal, disorder, political espionage, revolutionary activity and murder, which constructs the nation as a cataclysmic people at an apocalyptic time.

The sixth chapter discusses the emergence and development of the concept of the Russian soul, associated with spirituality, femininity and simplicity – "true" manifestations of the "authentic" Russian character. The discussion relates to a symbolic representation of the Russian soul in the three novels. It ponders the concept of the Russian soul as a stereotypically constructed redemptive quality of all Russian people, which the English writing about Russia attaches to it as a subordinate nation. In addition, this chapter also outlines the idea of provincialism embedded in all the three writers' works, and represented in Fitzgerald's novel in particular. The discussion of the representation of Russia as a peripheral realm with a provincial relation to Europe in *The Beginning of Spring* and in Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* (1904) will open more space for developing the idea of the construction of Russia in English writing not only in relation to the English literary tradition, but also in connection with Russian writers' conventions.

The seventh chapter suggests that, although Russia is constructed in the three English novels under scrutiny as an imagined community, the real is involved in the representation of the nation. Russia is placed in a time-and-place specific context which allows the past to transcend and to be approached via imaginary narrative. In other words, this chapter develops the dialogue between history and fiction, and examines how the imaginary coexists with the 'real', yet creating a sense of a historical past through the symbolic construction of its representation. The work of Hayden White, Roland Barthes, and Linda Hutcheon theoretically support the case that, although the historical narrative is muted, it works as a signified to endow the imaginary discourse with the "*realism effect*" (Barthes 1997: 122 original italics). This places Russia in a new context, providing the nation with a new historical meaning integrated into the paradigm of fiction in the three English novels. It will be demonstrated how, through different symbolic techniques of representation, the writers construct the pre-Revolutionary time and treat Russia as an ambiguous land.

The closing chapter deals with issues of displacement, the "unhomely", hybridity, and dislocation, which have become symbolically attached to Russian identity by writers in English. Situated on the borderline between two identities, with its ambiguous placement and rather unsophisticated qualities, the Russia of the novels is

constructed as a displaced and colonized nation. The latter characteristic, as the chapter will demonstrate, serves as an ideological symbol to signify the unhomely, depriving the characters of their home and making them perpetually search for belonging. This embodies the representational space of Russia as metaphorically confused, deprived of its stability and location, and conditioned into eternal movement. In this state of relocation, Bhabha's Third Space emerges, which this study will identify as a level at which the characters' identities become hybrid, simultaneously creating a frontier civilization.

To sum up, the present thesis will postulate that the representation of Russia in the English novel is an intertextual dialogue between present and past writings. Twentieth-century writers quote from earlier writers, who in turn repeat the generic accounts of travellers. Although their representation changes over time, this study will demonstrate that the ideological construction of the nature of Russian civilization remains repetitive. Present literary production is rooted in the historical narrative, which is, in Hayden White's words, a "verbal artifact", and the nature of representation is "essentially provisional" (1978: 42). In other words, we have no chance to deal with an "authentic" past, a survival text, or a preservation of the "truth"; instead, we are faced with a construction upon which the writers ground their own texts. As Linda Hutcheon expresses it (1989: 10), "both real and imagined worlds come to us through their accounts of them, that is, through their traces, their texts". This explains an intertextual sameness which all the three novels possess, and which this study will examine. The forms of representation in all three texts vary from reproduction of the previous practices to the recontextualization of the entire zeitgeist of pre-Revolutionary Russia. Consequently, the representation of Russia by Conrad, Fitzgerald and West is a permutation of the past fused with fiction. Their texts can be regarded as an attempt to rewrite Russian identity which challenges our knowledge of the nation.

2 REPRESENTATION

> The enunciation of cultural difference problematizes the binary division of past and present, tradition and modernity, at the level of cultural representation and its authoritative address. It is the problem of how, in signifying the present, something comes to be repeated, relocated and translated in the name of tradition, in the guise of a pastness that is not necessarily a faithful sign of historical memory but a strategy of representing authority in terms of the artifice of the archaic.
>
> Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 1994.

This study defines the concept of representation as the textual articulation of "reality" through a symbolic construction of images by means of language. It foregrounds notions of production, meaning and interpretation in literary texts. The idea of representation is, therefore, closely linked with narrative in which the interplay between the text and "reality" leads to a production of meaning, which may generate multiple interpretations. The terms "meaning" and "interpretation" will be of great importance, as they are what we, the addressees, extract from the product of representation in general, and from the texts taken for our discussion in particular. The idea that representation, meaning and interpretation are inseparable is the starting point for a critical investigation of the texts selected for the present study.

The concept of representation has been extensively studied in recent years (Anderson 1983, Cheyette 1993, Kiberd 1995, Hall 1997, Cheesman 2001, Porter 2001, etc.). In these works, it has been treated through intertextuality, stereotyping and constructedness, and is tightly woven with issues of identity. This chapter will show how these ideas are intertwined, and how they work independently to represent and to lead readers to new textual relations. They serve as ideological tropes to construct national identity and to reproduce the conventional subjective view of a particular culture. My emphasis is placed on the imaginary and the constructive form of a representation, which strives to give the impression of reality in order to reinforce the effects of power, domination, subordination and exclusion.

As mentioned above, the images constructed with the help of language are made to occupy the place of signifiers which do not reflect the world as it is, but rather construct it to produce meaning. Although manifested through the individual characters' lives and actions, these images possess common characteristics ascribed to the whole nation. The latter is represented through a constant attachment of certain ideas and clichés which generalize and demonstrate "typical"

characteristics, thereby predetermining our perception and identification of a particular people, in this case, the Russians. Yet these characteristics, as well as the images themselves, do not work effectively without a close connection and common affinity with the earlier produced textual records, since intertexual relations are an inevitable issue of representation.

The term "intertextuality", launched by M.M. Bakhtin, Ferdinand de Saussure and later developed by Julia Kristeva, will be explored in terms of the meaning of a given representation in relation to the previous practices of representation (Bakhtin 1975, Allen 2000). This study will analyse how the textual articulation of information, presented as an independent piece of writing, is, in fact, the writers' quotation of recognizable images from the past reproduced in their own literary accounts. Later chapters of this study will discuss how the texts mentioned above become relational in terms of their practices of representation, and how they can be linked to other texts which represent Russia. Consequently, in order to comprehend the complexity of intertextuality, and its use in the representation of Russia, this concept will be discussed in terms of its origins and its applications in modern literary theory.

Stereotyping and constructedness, the techniques of representation that this study is intended to broach, are very much related to each other. I will explore how stereotypes are constructed in literary writing, and why they have become so typical of Russia. The term "constructedness" serves a double function. Firstly, this study holds that stereotypes are constructed: they do not exist until people classify or differentiate particular species (i.e. plants, animals, human beings). The 'Otherness' of Russia is a good example of a stereotype constructed and developed in literary texts. Secondly, constructedness works as an aspect of representation in this study because "we construct meaning using representational system – concepts and signs" (Hall 2003: 25). The analysis in this work is to be based on a combination of the intentional and the constructionist approaches, with the purpose of demonstrating how the subjective nature of the representation constructs a stereotype.

2.1 Semiotics of Representation

Stuart Hall draws a distinction between three main approaches to representation: the reflective, the intentional and the constructionist (2003: 15). According to him, the reflective approach holds that meaning is given to an object: it is there, in the idea, person, or event, and language serves like a mirror to imitate that meaning. In other words, language imitates the "true" story fixed in the real world.

This study concentrates on the idea of representation as a construction of different meanings, rather than this mimetic theory.

The term *mimesis*, the connotations of which vary according to the context, indicates a relation between something which is and something which is made to imitate it (Murray 1996: 3). The theory of the text being a mirror-like reflection of the world was used in literary writing even before Plato's time. Plato's use of this term was mostly for representing a relationship between the language of poetry and reality. Mimesis or imitation played a crucial role in literary theory and art from antiquity to the end of the eighteenth century (1996: 29). The most typical image for describing the text as a reflection of the world or nature was the mirror: the sophist Alcidamas described the *Odyssey* as "a beautiful mirror of human life" (qtd. in Murray 1996: 30), and Vladimir Nabokov wrote in one of his poems (1981: 111): "I saw mirrored, besides my own self and the world, something else, something else, something else …".

Erich Auerbach argues in *Mimesis* (1953) that Homer's *Odyssey* might be a good example of a text "clearly outlined, brightly and uniformly illuminated, men and things stand out in a realm where everything is visible" (1953: 3). According to Auerbach, every episode is full of idyllic pictures, starting with Odysseus's boyhood, describing the years of his puberty, his adventures and return to Ithaca. He detects many "retarding elements" that "go back and forth" in the text, which, in his opinion, serve as retardations to avoid the narrative tension, and to operate things "in accordance with their nature" (1953: 5). He points out that, although the intellectual and linguistic culture of the text is highly developed, yet the picture of the characters involved in their relation to real life is very simple. As Auerbach puts it:

> Delight in physical existence is everything to them, and their highest aim is to make that delight perceptible to us. Between battles and passions, adventures and perils, they show us hunts, banquets, palaces and shepherd's cots, athletic contests and washing days – in order that we may see the heroes in their ordinary life, and seeing them so, may take pleasure in their manner of enjoying their savory present, a present which sends strong roots down into social usages, landscape, and daily life (1953: 13).

Auerbach maintains that this "real" world includes nothing but itself, or is transparent; as there is no secret meaning, there is no room for interpretation or reading the text. Thus, because of its orientation towards a reflective approach in representing reality, the Homeric poem "can be analyzed but cannot be interpreted" (1953: 13). I suggest that the *Odyssey* lacks that freedom which the modern text, and the novels selected for the present survey in particular, give to a reader.

This chapter will cover some aspects of interpretation later in more detail. However, Auerbach's view of Homer's work compared, for example, with Petronius' *Satyricon,* an example of Menippean satire, a genre which contains a humorous discussion of philosophy in alternating prose and verse, serious and comic elements, is significant here. Auerbach examines the well-known passage at the banquet involving Encolpius, the narrator of the *Satyricon*, who portrays the host and the guests at the Banquet. Auerbach (1953: 28) holds that if Homer evokes the impression of an unchangeable, basically stable social order, Petronius' episode of the banquet, taken for analysis, represents the world in motion: wealth and social position are unstable. Even happiness and fate are unstable, and Auerbach (1953: 29) establishes a certain link between this idea and the mimetic literary art of antiquity as another variation of representing the "real" world as it is. This instability can be also identified in the narratives of characters "who speak their jargon without recourse to any form of stylization". In other words, Petronius reaches his literary ambition "to imitate a random, everyday, contemporary milieu with its sociological background" (1953: 30). This approach to representation was later developed variously by other scholars.

In the thirties, George Lukács and Bertolt Brecht debated the forms taken by realism. Lukács appreciated the works of Balzac and Thomas Mann as a correct reflection of the full process of life (Brooker 1992: 39). He was convinced that the realist novel corresponded to the "extensive totality" (Lukács 1963: 24) of society. However, he suggested that literature creates its unique world, different from "real" life. Aiming at truthful construction of reality, it must also demonstrate both the concrete and abstract potentialities of human beings in life situations (1963: 26). In answer to Lukács's "formalist" model of realism, Brecht proposed a flexible popular realism (Brooker 1992: 39). His basic argument was concerned with the alternations of reality through the means of representation (Brecht 1964: 110). He rejected the concept of literary writing working to imitate the world. Instead, he suggested the "alienation effect", which could be reached by the protagonists creating the illusion of reality, and not attracting the audience's sympathy (Abrams 1971: 150). Though these two theorists take a different perspective towards literary texts from constructionist theory (to be discussed later), the area of realistic literary writing does not offer much room for different literary forms of expression. Neither does it represent outward reality in a more flexible way.

Auerbach's discussion of Russian realism and the representation of the world in the literary text by Russian writers in terms of the impression this production had on the western reader is important here. This study may suggest that western writing on Russia, might have been influenced by what Auerbach calls this "unlimited and passionate intensity of experience in the characters portrayed" (1953: 523).

This was particularly striking in the novels of Dostoyevsky (such as *The Idiot* or *The Brothers Karamazov*) and Tolstoy (such as *Anna Karenina*), and is also found in all three novels selected for the present survey and discussed later. By acknowledging the Russian characters' depths, Auerbach probably means that alteration which some readers discovered in them. He refers to it as "something truly monstrous", meaning those great modifications that the characters undergo from love to hatred, "from humble devotion to animal brutality, … from pious simplicity to the most cruel cynicism …" (1953: 523). These are the chaotic feelings which may not have been completely new to a western reader, but at least were accepted with a certain detachment.

The mixture of realism and tragedy in the works of the great Russian writers represented the spirit of the age, and constructed Russian life with a great deal of plausibility. Such subjects as the inner life of the city, crime and innocence, and the sufferings of the poor were used to produce a "real" picture of Russian society of that time. They deprived readers of any additional meaning that they could possibly extract from those texts by offering a single, ostensibly "unmediated", representation of Russia. Perhaps only Dostoyevsky fully succeeded in breaking this convention. Thus, as in the case of the *Odyssey,* Russian realistic writing also provoked the idea of the definitive text in relation to interpretation. There is little room left for imagination; everything should be taken seriously on the level of the realities of everyday life described in the novels. According to Auerbach, "the realistically portrayed individual is always in the wrong conflict with the social whole, which is represented as a given fact, an institution unalterably established in the background of the action and requiring no explanation in regard either to its origin or to its effects" (1953: 31-32). Auerbach concludes that in modern literature, the technique of imitation might involve serious problematic aspects of any character, regardless of type and social status. He suggests (1953: 31) that there can be no serious literary treatment of everyday scenes, places, occupations and social classes. We may read them at best idyllically, statically and ahistorically (1953: 33). In other words, the margins of realism are very narrow, and the limitations that it establishes within the text for terms of interpretation deprive it of the possibility of being characterized as resourceful and open to interpretation. What the mimetic approach discussed here lacks with respect to the three fictional texts examined in my analysis is an awareness that they are produced through the imaginary construction of the nation, which generates new meanings.

The representation of the world as a mirror-like reflection in the text has been questioned by poststructuralists, who see the relation of art and the "real" as more representational or symbolic. They imply that a literary text has been separated from the world, and as a result of this it could never reflect the world as it is. An-

drew Bennett and Nicholas Royle argue that there is no point in separating these two notions (text and world) because "there is no world without text", as well as "there is no text without, outside, of, the world" (1995: 31). Even though there is a cross-influence between text and world, which are not separated (1995: 32), texts produce our "reality" in different ways but never reflect it as it is. In other words, meaning is created, or constructed to represent something; it is neither fixed by someone, nor does it reflect "real" life. This study will explore the idea of how the realist strategies of the representation of Russia in the novels are challenged by the imagined characters, their lives and setting, how fiction intervenes in fact.

Stuart Hall highlights other approaches to representation in his work: the intentional and the constructionist. While he separates these two theories, it is my intention to hold them together. According to Hall, the intentional approach assumes that the author imposes his or her meaning on the world through language (2003: 25). However, both language and its connotations precede the writing. When describing the concept of constructionist representation, Hall makes a clear distinction between the "real" world of things and people and their symbolic way of representation. He argues that "the meaning depends, not on the material quality of the sign, but on its symbolic function". In other words, the concept of representation embraces images, each of which "symbolizes or stands for a concept to convey meaning" (2003: 26). In this process, the authors' intention, based on his/her background and the previous knowledge of the subject, is articulated by means of symbolic representation.

This idea echoes the theory of Roland Barthes developed in his *Mythologies* (1957). Although Barthes' starting point is "real" life, his attempt to construct meaning formed on his observations is clear. In doing so, he interprets the term "myth" as a language which represents certain images to convey a meaning. His essay "The World of Wrestling" (1972: 15-18) discusses wrestling as a spectacle and not as a sport. He implies that this spectacle constitutes signs, which are full of images. For example, in America, wrestling represents a fight between Good and Evil, while in France the public is expecting to see a "highly moral image: that of the perfect 'bastard'" (1972: 23). Thus he treats these images as signs which represent certain things to communicate meaning.

This meaning thus varies culturally. It is created by people in relation to their cultural and historical past. According to Hall, who follows Saussure, meaning is constructed by culture and its language: giving them a code, or a name. In addition, the codes fix the meaning, not the symbol itself (2003: 27). Thus, in the case of wrestling, Good and Evil work as a code for Americans, and "the perfect bas-

tard" would be a code for the French. The idea is represented through the image of the train in West's novel, which serves as a symbol to embody Russia. Like wrestling, the train and the characters' communication within it represent a series of images which are signs constructing Russia. As these signs, or symbols are completed by people, they are, according to Saussure's theory, subjective and irrational, in other words arbitrary. This arbitrariness of the sign results in the imaginary construction of the nation, which is no longer treated as an objective condition. Similar examples can also be given on the ground of linguistic differences. In other words, meaning is constructed through symbols and signs, and becomes culturally determined and historically dependent upon previously set representations of a particular society.

Because it is language which conveys meaning, a substantial portion of constructionist theory is devoted to language. Saussure's theory of language is useful here. Saussure also saw language as a system of signs that express ideas, and analyzed a sign as a twofold notion which possesses both form and concept (Saussure 2004: 60). He called the former *the signifier*, and the latter *the signified.* The former work in relation to the latter, producing the meaning of representation, which is not fixed. It can vary culturally, and is arbitrary. If meaning alters and cannot be finally fixed, then, as Stuart Hall states, "there is no single, unchanging, universal 'true meaning'"(2003: 32). Consequently, the meaning and the form of a signifier present imaginary and arbitrary notions, or, in Barthes' words, "the meaning is always there to present the form; the form is always there to outdistance the meaning" (1981: 123). In other words, representation as a rational construction operates through language to produce the irrational meaning and form which endow literary narrative with the imaginary.

This assumption is significant for the present thesis because it leaves room for the construction of national images in the text and the ways of textual interpretation. By interpretation, or reading the text, I mean the decoding or transcription of a given representation in a variety of ways to formulate meaning (though meaning is also produced by the reader). Such process is never fixed either, partly because it correlates in some way with the mental representation based on the associations of an individual, as well as on his/her previous experience. According to Hall, it is this mental representation which classifies the world into categories (2003: 34). In other words, the representation of images is delivered and received through a sequence of mental processes, each of which involves imagination and subjectivity, and is therefore distinguished by its irresolute nature.

These representational manipulations affect one way of interpreting things as well. Texts which were written a thousand years ago represent an image which we

can identify with those of the present time even though we spot their differences. As time passes, things change, and the meaning we extract from the text differs from that which people received when interpreting the same text at the time of its origin. Consequently, we can assume that the boundaries of any interpretation are blurred because the meaning we extract from a text in the end is not exactly the same as it was originally given by the author. Hilary Putman calls this type of understanding "charity in interpretation" (1988: 13), and Hall refers to a similar idea as "a sliding of meaning in all interpretation" (2003: 33). In other words, not only the language that representation operates with is arbitrary: the ways in which its meaning can be communicated and translated are also in constant flux.

What makes this theory comprehensible now is that national characteristics are contingent on interpretation, and vary according to context and historical time. We can observe how the images of various nations undergo changes. This happens not because they are misrepresented or distorted, but because old images seem to have become overused and do not gain a new development. As a result, some stereotypes are found to be inappropriate, and they are not so much ignored as generating their very opposite (Leerssen 2000: 278). The latter are activated according to the needs of the given situation. The old stereotypes, giving way to their new counterparts, result in an ambivalent discourse and a strongly contradictory imagery. In other words, the currency of interpretation is dependent on the communication of national characteristics over time.

When drawing a comparison between the two theories discussed above, the mimetic and the constructionist, a certain difference can be identified in both, in the ways of representing the world in literary writing, as well as in interpreting it. While the former limits the boundaries of interpretation, the latter strives to broaden them. Although there is room for reading the text in different ways when we are dealing with representation as a construction of meanings, there are certainly margins for interpretation (Eco 1992: 40). It is difficult to imagine that a text, once separated from "its utterer floats in the vacuum of a potentially infinite range of possible interpretations" (1992: 41). Even if we try a variety of meanings, we can never arrive at a conclusion that those signs or symbols which stand for certain things in the text mean everything. This is because whatever the varieties of a textual reading are, they are set in the "cultural framework of the original message" (1992: 42). In other words, the boundaries for interpretation of the text are limited by culture and dependent on cultural narrative, which is traditionally and historically rooted in national codes, symbols and identifications.

Claude Lévi-Strauss, who also studied myths as language, refers to these representations as "constituent units" (2004: 336). However, in his theory, myths func-

tion on a higher level, producing a more complex order of different meanings, which are relational. As Lévi-Strauss states, these units are not isolated relations; instead they can produce meaning only when operating as "bundles" of relations (2004: 336). From this, we can suppose that if these complex relations may initiate meaning, then there should be something that holds them together. As discussed earlier in the present study, representations are socially and culturally determined, and so we can suggest that there is an ideological force of discourse which functions as a binding tie between these constituent units, and which undermines or emphasizes their cultural likeness.

The underlying argument here is that there is an ideology behind every representation which becomes an essential issue in understanding the meaning of the representation. By "ideology" this study does not mean a traditional way of interpreting this term (the system of values, ideas and beliefs typical of the same social group of people). Instead, it defines the concept as a dynamic manipulation of constituent units. In other words, it is the formation, re-formation and exchange of these cultural products to create a meaningful world. The "bundle" of these units or products is not simply a set of ideas; it is, rather, the diversity of the social and cultural practices and relationships which impose an ideology on the representation. Louis Montrose emphasizes that "representations of the world in written discourse are engaged in constructing the world, in shaping the modalities of social reality, and in accommodating their writers, performers, readers, and audiences to multiple and shifting subject positions within the world they both constitute and inhabit" (2004: 585). In other words, ideology is a constituent characteristic of any representation, which unites all elements of this production. Though it is not seen, it is always present.

Since not all representational patterns are simply taken from the "real" world and brought to the text as an imitation of it, they are instead constructed to create a meaning which will also be socially determined and culturally shaped, and which will differ from those of the original. This is because, as Barthes puts it:

> Myth is speech stolen and restored. Only, speech which is restored is no longer quite that which was stolen: when it was brought back, it was not put exactly in its place. It is this brief act of larceny, this moment taken for a surreptitious faking, which gives mythical speech its benumbed look. (1972: 125)

Lastly, we arrive at a conclusion about strong binding ties between the notions of representation and interpretation, each of which is socially dependent. Thus the meaning given and taken in the practice of representation is determined by culture

and the time in which it is set. In other words, representations are "cultural constructs" set in the historical conditions of a specific era (Abrams 1971: 184). They formulate a part of our culture, and though they are encoded in symbols and signs, ruled by cultural and linguistic codes, they create meanings.

Thus all myths (to use Barthes' term to refer to objects, words, images and literary writing, or a text, in particular) function as signifiers to communicate a meaning. They carry a message, converted into a sign, which is read as language later on. This reading is always relational because it depends a great deal on culture. Readers tend to interpret a text so as to make it comply with what their own culture is preoccupied with. Abrams (1971) refers to this phenomenon as "appropriation" of the text (1971: 186) because readers always strive to make the text natural for their understanding.

Moreover, all representations are relational, and as Joep Leerssen argues, any nation can be contradictorily constructed as "northern" or "southern", strong or weak, and central or peripheral, bringing sets of clashing characteristics. The latter are very much dependent on the context, and can, therefore, be regarded as highly variable units. Because of this, stereotypes change over time, giving rise to their opposites and resulting in an ambivalent imagery. Leerssen calls this phenomenon the "imageme", emphasizing its polarities and contrasts, and defining its contradictory nature (2000: 276-279). Imagemes can be revealed through the interplay between an auto-image and a hetero-image, and through the inconstant character of national characteristics. In this study, the term will be used to articulate a duality, and to stress the ambivalence of the representation of Russia in the novels under scrutiny.

Overall, neither the author represents our reality as it is in the text, nor does the reader interpret it in the only way possible in relation to this representation. The complexity of the author-text-reader relation results in literary texts constituting a "diversity of dissonant voices" which represent not only "the orthodox, but also the subordinated and subversive forces of the era in which the text was produced" (Abrams 1971: 184). From this, it can be concluded that a literary text, and the novels selected for the present survey in particular, are a constructionist representation of the passage between the past and the present, which is not coherent. Rather, it is characterized by a variety of breaks and discontinuities which might also be regarded as practices of a representation to distance the earlier text and to detect the differences. As Barthes puts it, "myth is always a language-robbery" (1981: 131), because firstly it conveys meaning through form, and secondly it repeats what has been said before with some distortion. In other words, a text is not an autonomous piece of literary writing but a web of the previous texts as

contributions to construct a significant meaning through a representation. This leads to the idea of intertextuality, which this study will treat as a technique of representation. The argument behind this is that the relations between the cultural products, or, in Levi-Strauss's term, constituent units, cast their net over previously written texts, which in turn initiate possibilities for contemporary writing in that culture.

2.2 Nation as Text

"Appropriation" of the text is thus possible not only for the readers' convenience (to make it more readable, or natural for his/her understanding), but also to suggest that an author, to some extent also deals with this "appropriation" of the text written in the past. What lies behind this argument is a quotation of meanings from earlier texts, appropriated by writers in accordance with the norms and beliefs of the present time of a certain culture. Intertextuality underpins any constructive type of representation, and is central for the present study in particular. Therefore this section suggests that to construct the nation the writers under scrutiny deal with a textual reproduction of previous practices of representation which, although they possess a certain originality, still can be read in relation to other texts.

The Soviet literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin, who published his works in the 1920s and 1930s but remained unknown to the West until the 1980s, was one of the first to replace the static monologic model of texts with one where literary structure represents a dialogic interaction of multiple voices. To Bakhtin a literary work is a social phenomenon, composed of languages from diverse social contexts. In *The Dialogic Imagination* (1975), he argues that the language of a novel is a system of its "languages" (2002: 399), consisting of different units, subordinated yet still autonomous, which in combination create the whole unity of a text. He defines a novel as a diversity of social speech types (diversity of languages) and a diversity of individual voices.

Bakhtin's understanding of the concept of representation in the novel brings us to the crucial idea of an essential coherence between the theory of representation and its intertextual technique. This study assumes that signs and objects of representation are related to all the previous counterparts of earlier practices. The concept of intertextuality seems to penetrate into the heart of a representation, establishing certain resemblances or affinities between the past and present cultural constructs which the representation embraces. In Barthes' words (1981: 35), "any text is an intertext; other texts are present in it, at varying levels, in more or less recogniz-

able forms: the texts of the previous and surrounding culture". Thus my concern is not to deny the uniqueness of a piece of literary writing, but to suggest that intertextuality leads us to regard original texts as contributions to a code which brings a variety of significations into the text. It participates in cultural practices by making the relations between the text and the various languages or signifying practices of a culture possible. Intertextuality is involved in representation, which situates a text within the contemporary or earlier cultural context.

The previous section has already mentioned the idea of the text functioning in relation to the other texts, and not being an autonomous piece of writing. In addition to this, texts gain meaning when they are read in context, against or in connection with one another (Hall 2003: 232). Each image bears its own connotation, but, as Hall suggests, on a broader level; some similar representational practices can be identified, with some variations from one text to another. In this sense, the concepts of "difference" and "otherness" are the most striking examples of the argument, and will be discussed later in this study. Similarly, Hall defines intertextuality as the "accumulation of meanings across different texts, where one image refers to another, or has its meaning altered by being "read" in the context of their images" (2003: 232). In this regard, it can be suggested that the status of the original meaning that has produced all the others is not important any more. It is this search for the disconnections and alterations which matter. Thus fiction operates as both an intertext – in which there is always the possibility of finding and establishing a relationship with some other texts – and as a structure characterized by a distinction that can be drawn between one thing and another (Phillips 1991: 93). Such difference and sameness make any text both an independent and a relational piece of writing.

This is one of the reasons why Linda Hutcheon, in her essay "The Politics of Postmodern Parody" (1985), refers to intertextuality as "parody", an ironic quotation or appropriation (1985: 225). She questions the artistic originality and uniqueness of a parody, arguing that, as in any form of reproduction, in parody the original is rare, single and valuable (1985: 225). However, parody works to foreground the politics of representation, and so gives a different significant meaning to the text. By this, she means that parody "rereads" the past to deal with the present, using difference to demonstrate the inevitable separation between the contexts of the past and present representations (1985: 226). What is important here is that this "rereading" never produces a single meaning, or even a direct type of discourse, but rather what Bakhtin calls an "intentional dialogized hybrid" in which past and present representations "actively and mutually illuminate one another" (2002: 76). Thus parody, or intertextuality, is an intentional construction

in which the original images, metaphors and styles are intertwined with the post-created parodic narrative.

Julia Kristeva introduced Bakhtin's theory of language and literature to the French-speaking world in the late 1960s (Allen 2000: 3). The influence of Bakhtin on Kristeva is clearly demonstrated in her work (e.g. *Revolution in Poetic Language* 1974, *Desire in Language* 1980). Like Bakhtin's ideas on the dialogism and hybridity of the text, she is concerned with the manner in which a text is constructed out of already existing discourse (Allen 2000: 35). According to Kristeva, a text is a "permutation of texts, an intertextuality in the space of a given text", in which "several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another" (1980: 36). Kristeva's articulation of intertextual theory helps this study establish new meanings through the literary interpretation of representational practices used by the writers in English in all the three novels under scrutiny.

Moreover, both Bakhtin's and Kristeva's findings are essential for the present corpus as they share an insistence that texts cannot be separated from the larger cultural stratum out of which they are constructed (Allen 2000: 36). When linking these arguments to the ideas of representation and intertextuality, it is necessary to add that the former can be regarded as a textual arrangement of elements which are constructed from pre-existent meanings from outside and inside the literary text. Thus our earlier discussion of relations between the text and the world, in which we take Hall's constructionist approach to the representation of the world in fiction, can be developed in relation to Kristeva's theory.

For this study, then, a textual representation may be interpreted as being not only a construction of different meanings, both used and new, but is also, as Kristeva suggests, "the destruction of the old position and the formation of a new one" (1986: 111). Such a process involves a certain alterity, which raises the idea of otherness or difference in the text. In this sense, intertextuality becomes closely linked to the discontinuity, alteration and difference which Gary A. Phillips identifies in Derrida's understanding of intertextuality (1991: 89). In his discussion of Derrida's deconstructive reflection upon text and intertextuality, Phillips argues that difference both within the text and between texts, suggested by Derrida, establishes "the boundaries/limits/conditions … that join and disjoin texts … from one another in the unending process of differentiation" (1991: 94). This idea correlates with Kristeva's argument on the deconstruction of the text, which endows it with some modifications, but still enables us to read it intertextually and to re-read previous practices of representation, identifying differences.

Now it is possible to apply Bakhtin's and Kristeva's theory to the ideas of intertextuality and representation that this study raises. What I have in mind here is that textual representation embraces intertextual reproduction. It reproduces what has already been produced by earlier practices of literary writing, using past and present backgrounds as a means of creation and conceptualization. The nineteenth-century Analysts saw the texts of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as combinations of earlier poems and fragments (Ong 1982: 19),[22] while Toni Morrison's *Beloved* consists of a number of different subtexts which revise the genre of the slave narrative. In other words, a text's new meaning derives from the transformation of recognizable elements and their expansion to the novel's semiotic system in which the past and the present, the old and the new, interact, giving the text its reference to the previous texts, and endowing it with its unique characteristics.

Q.D. Leavis identifies a number of intertextual relations in Conrad's novel *Under Western Eyes* in which Conrad alludes to Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment,* or Rousseau's *Confessions* (1985: 246-247). She emphasizes a striking resemblance between the moral predicaments of Razumov and Raskolnikov: Razumov betrays Haldin, and Raskolnikov commits a crime. However, they both sin against nature and the traditions of society. Stephen Bernstein, who also finds a great many intertextual representations between Conrad's novel and Rousseau's *Confessions,* argues that not only does Conrad borrow many of the elements which work on the literary level to draw the analogies, but also "the sublime", meaning that "it is within aesthetics that the value of this relationship can most helpfully be seen" (1994: 162). In other words, Conrad's novel offers many reasons why it can be read intertextually.

Under Western Eyes can be also read outside the text. This study suggests that the representation of Razumov and his deeds is an embodiment of what may be believed to be a collapse of human values in Russian society at the beginning of the 20th century. It is, in other words, the writer's attempt to convert the real into the symbolic, or to construct the image of Russia. It is a characterization which figures the age of mass insanity and the loss of faith which many other Russian writers such as Solzhenitsyn in *The First Circle*, Tolstoy in *War and Peace*, Pasternak in *Dr Zhivago* have also tried to demonstrate. Conrad maintains that "nobody is exhibited as a monster" in the novel; these are only the "emotional reactions of the Russian temperament to the pressure of tyrannical lawlessness, which, in general human terms, could be reduced to the formula of senseless desperation pro-

---

[22] The development of the Homeric theories of the so-called Analysts was initiated by Friedrich August Wolf (1759-1824), in his *Prolegomena* (1795) (Ong 1982: 19).

voked by senseless tyranny". He continues, "the most terrifying reflection is that all these people are not the product of the exceptional but of the general – of the normality of their place, and time, and race" ("Author's Note" 2003: vi-vii). In other words, *Under Western Eyes* represents the spirit of the age and the way of thinking of people of a particular period of time, which endows the novel with its historical context, and places it in relation to the other pieces of literary work about Russia.

We can find substantial intertextual relationships not only in the representation of the characters in these novels, but also in the construction of the image of Russia itself. Therefore the representation of the inhuman denaturing character (such as Selwyn Crane in *The Beginning of Spring,* or Razumov in *Under Western Eyes*), or the victim of the pre-Revolutionary spasm which spread in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century (such as Nikolai Nikolaievitsch in *The Birds Fall Down,* or Frank Reid in *The Beginning of Spring),* or the country "driven by the winds of change as the opposing armies and factions sweep over Russia" (Q.D. Leavis 1985: 247-248) before the Revolution in all three novels, can be read intertextually.

Overall, this chapter has introduced the concept of representation and the aspects it embraces such as stereotyping and constructedness. It has demonstrated the problems of mimetic theory which sets certain limits on representation, excluding it from any additional meaning and interpretation. And further, it has shown the constructionist approach opens new boundaries for interpretation of the text. Indeed, because constructionism produces new meanings through different images, it will be used as my main approach for the analysis of the three novels under scrutiny. These images will be treated as cultural constructs throughout the study because, as this chapter has argued, representations are created at a particular time in a particular society, shaping the cultural and social determination of texts. The construction of inhuman characters, victims, traitors, double agents and murderers in the three novels by Conrad, West and Fitzgerald highlights the injustices and riotousness of pre-Revolutionary society.

It can be concluded that in this construction, a significant role is given to language, which acts as a tool to produce meaning and to construct the image. Barthes, Lévi-Strauss and Saussure show that meaning constructed in representation is unfixed, and symbols used in delivering this meaning are arbitrary. Therefore, representation can be seen as an irrational construction based on stereotypical views and ideas. The latter serve as ideological tropes to impose the authority of the writers and to emphasize the "typical" characteristics of a certain people. By establishing clichés, analogies and generalizations, these stereotypical images

are made to demonstrate a relation to the whole nation. In other words, representation is a cultural construction which operates with the help of language, and behind which the ideological ambition of a writer is masked.

3 THE NATION AS CONSTRUCT

> … the Russians are raw, new, and not, I don't think, a nation at all. Not one of them is the chosen race, … "*the peculiar people"*
>
> Matthew Shiel, *The Yellow Danger*, 1898.

> … nations and national categories, thrown up as they are by the varying contingencies of history, are in fact little else than projecting screens, blank categories which we fill with projections, images, characterological rationalizations of the world's diversity.
>
> Joep Leerssen, "Nation, Ethnie, People", 2007.

This chapter will analyze problems of national identity, its fabrication and representation in the literary text, and in the three novels selected for this study in particular. The nation will be seen as a community in constant flux and with an ambivalent character. This results in Russia being perceived by most Anglophone readers as something different, and that is why its representation is constructed on the basis of stereotypes and fabricated ideas. In other words, discourse about the Other is the product of constructing the image through an imaginary perception of inward and outward vision of the nation. It is in a way the analysis of a paradoxical relationship between the universal and the different, that is to say, the two-fold perception of the nation.

I have argued that national formation is an imaginary community which inscribes itself in the real in that it represents the people as a singularity. Balibar and Wallerstein (1991: 77) write of "people" in relation to race, nation and ethnic group. These terms are used to indicate pastness as a mode of continuity in identity-building, that is to say, "persons of the same group are persuaded to act in the present in ways they might not otherwise act" (1991: 78), and they also function to represent discontinuity, that is to say, the nation has an ability to change its boundaries. "The people" is a construction that recognizes its "self" in opposition to other nations by fabricating a self-image and producing "the effect of unity by virtue of which the people will appear, in everyone's eyes, 'as a people', that is, as the basis and origin of political power" (1991: 93, 94). Reforms, social revolutions and political struggles bring ideas of transformation into any nation. The fundamental problem here is the ability of the nation to change in time producing itself continually as a national community (1991: 93). This "struggle", related to the socio-political and historical modifications of the nation on the one hand, and

its aspirations for preserving a given "ethnicity" on the other, gives rise to indeterminacy and the ambivalent nature of national characteristics. As a result, the nation is portrayed through its ambiguous placement between a national community as a "chosen people", signifying individualism, spirituality, or a certain idealism, and a symbolic difference between "us" and "foreigners". This doubleness results in the production of a twofold Other: on the one hand similar to all of "us" but, on the other, not quite. Such constructed binarisms constitute the imageme of the nation, and demonstrate its position within the politics of a colonial discourse. This chapter will clarify the distinction between the terms "invention", "fabrication" and "construction", and discuss their applications in the process of auto-and hetero-image-building.

As pointed out above, the nation is subject to continuous change. Geoffrey Lord argues (1996: 143) that most nations cover a heterogeneity that brings problems in expressing a whole nation, or articulating their difference from other nations. This can be applied to Russia, the construction and representation with which the present study is concerned. Thus by applying the constructionist approach, treated as a significant technique of representation, this chapter will discuss the ways Russia has been represented in some early modern English writing, and will examine the construction of the nation in the three novels, including some aspects of racial, or national representations generated by the "powerful" West and developed in later literary writing. Such notions as power and superiority on the one hand, and subordination on the other, will be discussed, because, as Cheyette points out (1993: 3), the former "have defined literary representations as fixed stereotypes, myths or images". In other words, it is the former that define the latter.

Edward Said's study *Orientalism* (1978) makes an analytic distinction between the idea of European identity as superior and of non-European peoples and cultures as backward. He argues that, apart from the real regional division between East and West after voyages and discoveries, there had been the imagined distinction of these two worlds from each other (1978: 39). The nationalistic ambitions of the more "powerful West" resulted in the appearance of a separate world, with its own culture and principles, as the antithesis of the West (1978: 40).[23] According to Said, the Orient, with its great intensity and complexity, embraces every land and nation which does not belong to Europe or the West. Yet he too implies that Russia is "Oriental" when he assumes that the traditional Orient, as well as

---

[23] This is to be taken in quotation marks, because, as Said argues (1978: 25), this strength is too often mistaken or "merely decorative".

Russia, has always signified danger and threat (1978: 26). This clearly puts Russia on the one side, with the West on the other.

However, as Said points out, these beliefs were not the result of the Oriental world's actions, "but rather the whole complex series of knowledgeable manipulations by which the Orient was identified by the West" (1978: 40). The standard cultural stereotypes, brought by the means of information and developed by poets, novelists, translators and travellers, reinforced the imaginative perception of a "mysterious Orient" (1978: 26), and constructed the nation on the ground of fabricated ideas and feelings. As Cheyette notes (1993: 3), the privileged cultural realm of literature remains essentially unthreatened by the naturalized construction of an eternal mythic nation that exists quite comfortably in the realm of "culture". Such imaginative representation singles out the nation from the rest of humanity, and articulates its cultural difference. Through the form of literary representation, it maintains cultural clichés and subjective viewpoints about the nation, extending the metaphorical connotation of its "otherness". Therefore, this study of the "cultural other" endeavours to analyze the construction of the nation as a subject discourse rather than a historical discourse in the three novels.

In addition, this chapter investigates the ambivalence of such constructions as a result of a contradictory representation. What lies behind this argument is that the nation can be seen as an enlightened and at the same time barbarous "Other" (see Cheyette 1993, Anderson 1983, Said 1978, Kiberd 1995, Chambers 1995). This opposition confirms that a racial difference may function as a twofold imageme that can be accommodated to a larger cultural space on the one hand, while it can always be represented as a "potentially disruptive force" on the other (Cheyette 1993: 19). Because of such ambiguity, the traditional racist division of the world can be and has actually been questioned by some scholars. For example, David Cannadine's study (2001), discussed later in more detail, expresses the idea of today's unequal world order in terms of its splitting into superior and subordinate cultures. His interrogation of these antagonistic positions posits the nation as an ambiguous formation, characterized by its duality and indeterminacy.

In this regard, the ambivalence of the imageme plays a crucial role in the formation of national identity. Because of their antagonistic nature, imagemes are articulated through various national images and become incorporated into assumptions and attitudes of a given audience. As a result of these national images failure to satisfy the audience, the opposite pole of the selfsame imageme becomes activated producing irony in the representation of the nation (Leerssen 2000: 280). Therefore the assertion of national clichés conforms with the trope of irony, and will be demonstrated in this study later on.

Since imagemes are revealed through the interplay between the auto-and the hetero-images, this chapter also analyses how the creation of imagological accounts is concerned with what Johnson calls the "uses and abuses of national images and stereotypes" (2005: 50). I will focus on some examples in which a duality in perception of the nation itself, and its representation by other nations, becomes explicitly controversial through the discrepancy between how the nation views itself, and how it is viewed by other nations. It is this distinction between the interior image world, and the exterior world "out there" that generates the construction of nations within and outside culture.

The studies of Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1983), Luisa Del Giudice's and Gerald Porter's *Imagined States* (2001) and Declan Kiberd's *Inventing Ireland* (1995) will help establish the ideas of the national formation as a fabrication, or construction in literary representation. Though they all discuss the problems of national identity and its construction as a "cultural project" (Porter 2001: 102), they treat these questions from rather different angles. While Kiberd's and Porter's works are mostly concerned with the constructions of the nation by others, or in other words, how the exterior image is created, bringing with it the idea of a stereotypical Other, Anderson's study investigates the idea of the interior image, or the interpretation of nationalism as the phenomenon imagined by the nation's fellow citizens. However, what holds all these approaches together is an attitude towards the constructions of images which produces the ambivalence in the perception of racial difference. This study tends to regard both processes, the interior and the exterior vision of the nation, as fabrications; or in Anderson's words (2003: 6), all communities are imagined. In this respect he mentions that people's ties "as fellow-nationals" to those they might have never seen were once imagined as well. For example, the French or Russian aristocracies as a class were also once imagined, and known later as a group of people who held a high social rank with a common culture.

Consequently, it can be argued that the process of construction through a fabrication of images in the formation of national identity is closely related to imagination, as the titles of the books above suggest. It is here, when the image is being created, that the imagination functions as a force to set a symbolic frontier between the "norm" and its "deviation", between "insiders" and "outsiders". It also operates in the process of stereotype construction, which, according to Hall (2003: 258), facilitates the binding of all of "Us" together into one "imagined community" and all of "Them" together into the Other. There will be a broader discussion of stereotypes in the later chapters of this work. However, this study regards imagination, in Anderson's sense, as a driving force for literary creation.

It is a significant element in the process from "creation" to "fabrication" of the image.

Part of the difficulty in this process is that it may also assimilate "falsity" into image production. According to Lopez (2004: 964-972), whose recent study of the social construction of race is very relevant to the present discussion, the etymology of fabrication literally implies "the workings of human hands, and suggests a possible intention to deceive. . . . it emphasizes the human element and evokes the plastic and inconstant character of race" (2004: 969). He refers to this concept as "racial fabrication", meaning that races are not biological groupings, nor can they be divided into three races (i.e."Caucasoid", "Negroid", and "Mongoloid"), as the European imagination of the Middle Ages suggested. Rather, they must be viewed as social constructions produced by humans, and not by abstract social forces. This involves imagination, which brings other social relations such as gender and class into the idea of race, and the nation. Lopez gives the example of how the native men of the American Southwest were represented by white Americans as cruel and indolent, while the women were depicted as fair and virtuous (2004: 970). This is because they were so perceived, and consequently, should be regarded as not given, but constructed. In other words, literary representations do not necessarily represent "reality" or express the actual state of matters: they construct images, presenting them as real.

Another more striking example related to the ideas of fabrication through imagination in constructing the image of national identity, and the Orientalization of Russia in particular is how Herodotus constructs the image of Scythians in his *Histories* (in the 5th century BC).[24] He places in opposition "the Scythian nomad and the Athenian city-dweller, or the barbarian non-place and the Greek oikoumené" (Certeau 1986: 68). He fabricates the image of the Other by producing "a barbarian space as distinct from Greek space" (1986: 68). In so doing, he combines a representation of Them as the uncivilized Other (the Scythians), or as Anderson puts it (2003: 13), "half-civilized was vastly better than barbarian", with the depiction of an enlightened Us (the Greeks), who, as a "great classical community, conceived of themselves as cosmically central".[25] Such a representa-

---

[24] The Scythians were a people known to the Greeks by the name of Scyths (Skythai), who belonged to the Iranian race, and became known as the first great pastoral nomadic group in Central Asia (Grousset 1970: 6, 7).

[25] Ironically, the traditional cultural exports of Western empires – literature, history, philosophy, and the fine arts – all relied heavily on the concept of the Greek classical ideal for their very foundation and legitimation of cultural superiority. The bipolarity of civilized Greek/Barbarian described by Herodotus in his *Histories*, was later developed into the image

tion also invokes the opposition between Russia and the West which is central to the present analysis.

The Scythians, who originally occupied the territory of the present Southern Russia to the Carpathian Mountains, in Central Europe, have been mythically identified as the ancestors of modern Russians, and the reference to Russians as Scythians remains part of European constructions into the 20th century (Neumann 1997: 141). According to Iver B. Neumann, this complicates the status of Russians as Christians, attaching to them the idea of a frontier civilization between Asia and Europe, and symbolically placing them in the same group as non-Christian people (1997: 141). The "Scythian myth" hints at an innate, oriental massiveness, formlessness and genius that separates Russia from the West (Bird 2003: 157). Yet, in Anderson's opinion, the ideological constructions of both communities (Scythians/Russians and Greeks) are imagined. They are invented, or socially fabricated with the help of a human imagination, and so the representation of both involves a certain proportion of falsity.[26]

In the articulation of national characteristics by the nation itself and by other nations, imagination produces discursive misrepresentation, a result of the ambivalence of the imageme. As Johnson expresses it (2005: 56), imagination is the power of inward visualization both of what is "out there" in the world and what is not. In order to understand the means by which that visualization is realized in the world, we need a study of imagology which shows that national identity embraces the auto-image and the hetero-image (2005: 50). In other words, in the formation of the nation, there are two strong features: the way the nation constructs itself and the way it is constructed by other nations. This is a twofold union which results in the nation being viewed as both universal and different, producing a contradictory imageme. It is this ambivalence which plays a crucial role in perceiving national difference.

Thus Russia developed the idea of "the West" from the mid-eighteenth century (Bonnett 2004: 44-47), enlightening both the image of the West itself and its own

---

of Greece as a unified entity, and portrayed the identity as having been directly related to the defeat of the barbaric (Bahrani 2003: 26-28).

[26] Hegel's description of the movement in human history proceeds from Ancient Eastern Civilizations such as those of China, India, and Egypt (all of these are generally treated as a whole) to the civilization of the Ancient Greeks to that of Christianized Western Europe which suggests that apart from the Greeks, there was the greater antiquity of some other developed civilizations (Miller 2002: 135). The awareness of other areas of the world suggests a threat to the idea of the monolithic history of human progress and the concept of Greek precedence in the origins of civilization (Bahrani 2003: 35).

self-image. "The West" became then a more plural concept for Russia. Because it was more technologically advanced, Russia, and the Russian elite in particular, generated the idea of Westernization, through which they tried to make Russia more European. By cultivating the West, the "Westernizers" (*zapadniki*, as they called themselves) made a clear attempt to enlighten the image of Russia, and to improve the underdeveloped European qualities of Russia. They were "carrying Western enlightenment into a backward society" (2004: 47), constructing the models of European identity and a new image of the Russians themselves. In doing so, they endeavoured to reach a symbolic proximity to the Western world, to integrate Russia into a larger cultural space in which, as they supposed, the image of the nation as uncivilized and Asian would be erased.

However, the way they saw themselves was not similar to the way the Russian nation was seen by others, which demonstrates the ambivalence of the concept of the nation mentioned above and the polarities of the imageme. The idea of Russia constructed by the West will be explored later in this chapter. Yet the model of Westernization served both the modification of the self-image of Russia in terms of its enlightenment as well as a turbulent practice with its own logic. Firstly, it provoked "ethnic discrimination and exclusion" (Bonnett 2004: 53), as it was only a certain group of people, the Westernizers, who promoted the idea of Westernization. Secondly, this interior discrepancy reinforced the image of Russia as the Other later on. As Malia puts it (1999: 163), the Westernizers managed to blur the negative image of Russia, but nevertheless it "receded ever farther into the background later on". In other words, the nation's image-building was completely determined by historically and culturally constructed national images as well as by stereotypes created by other nations.

The discrepancy in the perception of the auto-and hetero-images of the nation can be traced in the example of other nations. China at the time of the Republic imagined itself not as China, but as central (Anderson 2003: 12).[27] It constructed an image that drew Han and non-Han Chinese peoples into "a single national project", and asserted the regional centrality of China. However, it was represented by the West as Asian civilization, static and passive (Bonnett 2004: 69). It was constructed as the negative Other of the civilized West. Both images, the vision of the Chinese themselves and that promulgated by the West, demonstrate the contradictory nature of the imageme and the antagonism of forces of representation

---

[27] Pan-Asianism became a forceful expression there in the 1920s, when a mixture of images of West and East started to take shape (Bonnett 2004: 69).

dealing with national images. They are sometimes deliberately employed by Western observers of China to fabricate new identities.

The analogies of this social fabrication, or construction can be identified in the realization of the cultural project of unification of the Scottish, Welsh, Irish and English to obtain a single nation. As the recent study carried out by Gerald Porter demonstrates, the emphasis on the "outlandishness" of the Irish, Scottish, and Welsh on the one hand, and English domination on the other was the main function of the caricature accounts in the broadside ballads that Porter's study focuses on (2001: 101). As with all nations which articulate stereotypes through the polarities of the imageme, seventeenth-century England needed an other firstly to define itself as an "insider", and secondly to find the antitype of the Englishman or woman as an outsider. Such a fabrication, as Porter maintains, emphasizes difference, which is constructed to exemplify "typical" features of a certain nation and to illustrate its quintessential culture (2001: 125). It also shows that the construction of both the auto-and hetero-images of one's culture is connected with processes of social and cultural reproduction, which proceed very unequally.

As pointed out earlier, representation is concerned with symbols and signs which signify certain images. Hence, caricatures representing the Welsh, Scottish and Irish in the texts analyzed by Porter are constructed in a symbolic way (2001: 101-132). They establish national clichés through the interplay of oppositions which are in dialectical relation through irony. Ironic patterns involved in the symbolic representation simultaneously assert and deny that which is represented. That is why irony, in Leerssen's opinion, is very well suited to the contradictory ambivalence of the imageme, and is involved in the process of the construction of national stereotypes (2000: 280). Because the signs and symbols are used and even overused by the national narrative to represent another nation, the latter appears as "isolated but unindividualized", reductive or even comical (Porter 2001: 105, 113). Through such a simplification, texts assert a single voice in the representation of the nation and establish the authority of their creators. As a result, image construction manipulates through appreciation and ignorance, inclusion and exclusion, difference and sameness, which constitute the basis for representing one nation within the other. It is here that the imagination works in its full extension. It fabricates images through representational signs, which in turn work as lenses to shape the language and to experience the difference.

The assertion of a single culture and its typical characteristics in relation to others reinforces feelings of national superiority of the insider group over its outsiders. With respect to the English, this was particularly striking after the Second World War, when two of the novels studied here were written: a time in which, as

Menno Spiering claims, England experienced an identity crisis, and the English feeling of difference was reinforced through the work of intellectuals (1997: 270-274). The English novel, to a great extent, was then preoccupied with the image of the English formulated in relation to the image of the other. As Spiering maintains (1997: 270), Americanness and Europeanness then functioned as a touchstone of Englishness. The novels frequently portrayed the battle between English Protestant genuineness and European Catholic cruelty. The English characters were constructed as human, peaceful and non-violent compared to beast-like, aggressive, and coarse Americans and Europeans. The origin of this phenomenon Spiering finds in a historical and human tendency to regard the in-group as better, more developed and therefore as more human than the out-group.

The English imagination invented the positions of strong and weak, progressive and backward, and fabricated difference. For instance, in Kiberd's analysis, Ireland, like Russia, was constructed as foreign. While the Irish were so close in their relation to the English, Ireland was labeled as "not-England, a place whose peoples were, in many important ways, the very antithesis of their new rulers from overseas". The English presented themselves as "controlled, refined and rooted", and so they needed the Irish as "hot-headed, rude and nomadic" (Kiberd 1995: 9). This is because symbolic representation articulates difference and sameness, proposing an alternative which becomes "the reverse mirror of the ideal" (Porter 2001: 131). The elaboration of notions of English superiority resulted in a fundamental division between a legally privileged resident population defined as Us, and their subordinate colonized nation defined as Them (Frame 2005: 149). This idea will be central to the analysis of the relations between Russia as colonized and England as uncolonized space, emphasizing the power imposed by the dominant nation upon its subject.

Because the rhetorical effect of national stereotypes gains its strength from the articulation of difference and sameness, it is characterized by familiarity and recognition. Leerssen suggests that stereotypes function because of their intertextually established recognizability, and can be described in the cognitive terms of schemata (2000: 285). For example, Tom Cheesman has shown that the long-standing cliché of the "barbaric Turk" has been constructed through the oriental ideology of the Germans in relation to the Turkish nation. The nineteenth-century street ballad texts studied by Cheesman employed European-Christian identity as a dominant force, emphasizing the non-civilized nature of the non-Christian

world (2001: 141).[28] They represent the Ottoman Empire as a threat to German territory and as the enemy of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation (2001: 137). Like "the irrational Russian soul", which will be discussed later in this study, the stereotype of the barbaric Turk gained recognition through its constant intertextual repetition, as a result of which it has become commonplace.

As mentioned earlier, national stereotypes are constructed through the interplay between the auto-and hetero-images, producing the ambivalence of the imageme and generating contrasts. Like Russians, who strove to enlighten their image through the promotion of Westernization, Turks have seen themselves as a nation sent from Asia to the West (Bonnett 2004: 71).[29] Both nations tried to resist the identity imposed on them by Western ideology by creating new identities, namely "Turkishness" and "Russianness". However, unlike in Russia, the Turkish idea of Westernization did not mean the importation of Western culture into society. Instead, its intention was to enter Western civilization, but to preserve "authentic" Turkish culture as a folk or popular culture (2004: 73). This defined a new form of construction of Turkey as "not Oriental" and "not Western". This third position is identified by Bonnett as an instance of hybridity in which Western and non-Western elements come together (2004: 74). Whatever we may call this creation, it is, in every sense, imagined as well. In achieving a symbolic proximity to the Western world on the one hand, and maintaining its own cultural heritage on the other, new identities have fabricated themselves as ideal nations. They have seen themselves neither as an oriental Other, nor as a model West.

We have seen that imagined communities of self and Other are represented through conflict. As with Anglo-Irish representations, German-Turkish ones construct fantasies to fabricate distinctiveness. In other words, the process of fabrication or misrepresentation is a key concept in the creation of the imaginary community. Although Balibar and Wallerstein argue (1991: 93) that "only imaginary communities are real" because social communities are based on the projection of individual existence into "the weft of a collective narrative" and on the traditions of the past, this "reality" too is "fictional", in Said's words (1978: 54). This is

---

[28] Tom Cheesman studied German street ballads of the 19th century in his essay "The Turkish German Self: Displacing German-German Conflict in Orientalist Street Ballads" (2001: 136-163), focusing on the representations of German-German conflicts in terms of German-Turkishness.

[29] Ziya Gökalp, the chief ideologist of Turkey's creation as a modern nation in the 1920s, held the view of the necessity of Westernization as a way of avoiding the enslavement of Turkey by the West. His enterprise was grounded on the rise of nationalism, leading to Latinisation of the Turkish language, and its use as the defining feature of Turkish identity (Bonnett 2004: 71-72).

because all distinctions and differentiations are ultimately constructions. A familiar space which is "ours", and an unfamiliar space beyond "ours" which is "theirs" is a way of making distinctions that may be entirely arbitrary because "imaginative geography" (Said's term) does not require that "they" acknowledge the distinction (1978: 54). It is enough for "us" to set up the boundaries, and "they" become "they" accordingly.

Such a process involves a poetic imagination which completes our earlier discussion on the significance of imagination as an inevitable feature in the process of construction. It endows the objective space with "imaginative or figurative values, dramatising the distance and difference between what is close to 'us' and what is far away" (1978: 55). In other words, through metaphorical distinction and symbolic discrimination, literary representations of the Other construct stereotypical images of incompatible cultures to identify deviation and to emphasize their oddness.

Apparently, therefore, to define itself, a nation needs an other. Through the combination of the difference and the similarity, a diverse national character is created. As a result of such fusion, its nature is metaphorically hybrid, and is characterized by its ambivalence and antagonisms. This is what Bryan Cheyette (1993), talking of the representations of the Jew in English literature, identifies as an intention of national characteristics in both cultural perfection and racial difference (1993: 22). Cheyette's findings about the ambivalence of "the Jew" in the works of James Joyce, George Eliot, Rudyard Kipling and other English writers suggest a similar conventional placement of Russian identity in the three English texts under scrutiny. What Cheyette finds central to the notions of hybridity and transformable cultural identity in the national clichés of the Jews can be identified in the representation of the Russian nation by the three Anglophone writers.[30] This transformative capacity of national stereotypes serves as a tool in representing the nation as an enlightened congruence and a barbaric antithesis highlighting the duality of the imageme in the perception of the nation.

The equivocal essence of nation discussed above is closely related to the nation space mentioned earlier. In this regard, Bhabha's argument (1994: 141-142) concerning space as a "location" of the nation is relevant. He considers the space of the nation not as being simply horizontal, but rather metaphorically complex; it requires a certain duality in writing. On the one hand, a temporality of representa-

---

[30] What Cheyette calls "transformable cultural Hebraism" can be identified as an ability of the Jew to be transformed into both a tabula rasa and an "unchangeable racial other" (because of its capability to become transfigured into a higher realm) (1993: 2-6).

tion that moves between cultures produces the time of a horizontal society, while on the other, it produces that "nonsequential energy of lived historical memory" (1994: 141) that is beyond horizontal space. This twofold production facilitates the ambivalence of time and place that constitutes the problematic perception of the nation. This may also be a result of space itself being imaginary. As Said points out (1978: 54), there is an objective geography which sets the boundaries in social, cultural and ethnic ways. Yet there is the sense of unfamiliar space being "out there". People might feel themselves to be not-foreign outside their own community, and vice versa. This is because space, in Said's opinion, acquires emotional sense through a poetic process (1978: 55). In other words, distinguishing between "our" and "their" spaces is as imaginary as the idea of the nation.

Bhabha also regards the ambivalence of nation to be a narrative strategy in the writer's attempt to construct the nation (1994: 140). He argues that it functions as a symbolic power, producing a slippage of such categories as class, sexuality and cultural difference within texts. The latter are constituted through the lenses of the Other which is itself ambivalent by definition, and the agency of this definition is never pure, but always in a process of substitution and displacement (1994: 162). What lies behind this argument is a continual incompleteness of the symbolic systems of representation which are open to cultural translation. In other words, the ambivalence of national identity facilitates meanings as cultural constructs which are, in Bhabha's words, both "different and differential" (1994: 163). According to him, national identity is constructed through a process of alterity. It becomes a disruptive practice between art and politics, past and present – as its "resplendent being is a moment of pleasure, enlightenment or liberation" (1994: 175). Moreover, when constructing a representation of national identity, the "signs", in Bhabha's opinion, not only differ in content but also produce incompatible systems of signification (1994: 176). The arbitrariness of such systems, or signs, discussed in the earlier chapter of this study, result in social subjectivity, based on the "articulation of differential" (1994: 176). Therefore we are faced with instability when dealing with the concept of national formation.

Balibar and Wallerstein (1991: 77) discuss nation in terms of its inconstancy. For them a people (and they use this term in relation to "race" and "nation", which, according to them, are varieties of "people" in the modern world), is not merely a construct, but one which constantly changes its form:

> The myth of origins and national continuity, which we can easily see being set in place in the contemporary history of the "young" nations (such as India or Algeria) which emerged with the end of colonialism, but which we have a tendency to forget has also been fabricated over recent centuries in the case of the "old" nations, is therefore, an effective ideological form, in

> which imaginary singularity of national formations is constructed daily, by moving back from the present into the past (1991: 87).

Therefore national formation is regarded as being the product of a long "pre-history" (1991: 88) which, by its nature, does not belong to one particular nation. In Balibar's and Wallerstein's opinion, this formation has been constructed over a long span of time and within the framework of political units other than those which seem to us today original and typical of a particular nation. All this also raises the idea of ambivalence of national formation, and supports our argument about its imaginary fabrication. For example, the political theorist Mazzini denied the uniqueness of the Irish language, dances, literature and philosophy (Kiberd 1995: 116). For him, they were not the signs of authentic nationhood but rather a "brutal version of the tragic paradox" drawn from an approved set of texts of their parent country. In other words, a colonised society was seen as "mimicking the previous modes" (1995: 115), and so it was prefigured in the apparatus of the colonial period. Thus the outlines of Ireland emerge within the framework of England.

The capability of visualizing one nation within the other establishes the positions of authority through which the ambivalence can be also identified. The radical difference between civilized and barbaric, superior and subordinate raises the issue of power. According to Hall (2003: 258), power is usually directed against a subordinate or excluded group, establishing hegemony based on leadership as a form of power (2003: 259). It includes the dominant and the dominated by producing new narratives and new kinds of knowledge, such as Orientalism (2003: 261). Hall treats the idea of power not only in terms of its economic or physical exploitation, but also as a cultural or symbolic practice of representation. Taking the example of how black masculinity has been represented through history, he identifies a circularity of power and ambivalence in this production (2003:262, 263). Hall holds that black men have been represented as both hyper-masculine and super-sexual or as "childish", while sometimes their representation adopted an aggressive style. According to him, this was to confirm the imaginary amongst whites and to place the representation on two different levels: the conscious and overt level, and the unconscious or suppressed level. The symbolic power of representation, in Hall's opinion, refers to what is imagined in fantasy to be "real" (2003: 263). It is a hegemonic and discursive form of power which operates through culture, imagery and representation.

A striking example of this is the relation between East and West. As Said assumes, the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison to all the non-European peoples and cultures makes it hegemonic both in and outside Europe (1978: 7). Although the present study does not discuss the Orient as a mono-

monolithic entity, this positional superiority puts the Westerner above the non-Westerner. Said argues that "within the umbrella of Western hegemony over the Orient there emerged a complex Orient … governed not simply by empirical reality, but by a battery of desires, repressions, investments, and projections" (1978: 7-8). In other words, it can be asserted that when it comes to the enactment of the relationships between superior and subordinate, representation uses power in a highly symbolic imaginary, and even artificial way to emphasise displacement, exclusion and hierarchy. Within this representation, power establishes what Hall calls "subjectivization " (2003: 315), or in other words it produces the positions to which individuals, or in this case, the nation, are subjected. When a superior nation constructs a representation of the subordinate, power prescribes and shapes its practices according to certain norms which set limits on the latter. This works not only in writing but also in art. For example, a triumphal arch, a statue, or even a coin in antiquity signified power in the Roman Empire. They reminded citizens of their ruler; they were the tokens of extraordinariness and power, and they implied the obedience and honour of the subordinate (Wormald 2005: 107). Here, we are dealing with a world in which power in the representation of imagined reality is visualized. Similar instances will be identified in the three novels later on to demonstrate how the English as a superior nation constructed the Russians as subordinate through the technique of a literary visualization.

To sum up, the nation is constructed through a symbolic representation in which imagination and power are intertwined. They invent the positions to which a superior nation subjects a subordinate one; they are the positions of strong and weak that create the imaginary space of a community. This happens when we are faced with a representation in which the nation is seen by other nations as a different, backward and complex Other. Such a representation, as discussed above, is a result of human work, a fabrication through which the imaginary is presented as "real", and so the imperfection and openness of it to translation apply. In other words, literary representation of the nation is performed through a consistent attempt of writers to articulate difference and to distinguish between the coloniser and its subject.

The inconsistency of the national formation and its ambivalent "racial otherness" serve as racial and cultural signifiers to emphasize the presence of the dominant narrative. The nation is represented as an enlightened and at the same time savage Other. It is subordinated to the pictures created by the superior nation. Studies of the relationships between the superior and the subordinate nation demonstrate the construction of this duality, conclude that bilateral relations in a colonial context have often been formed within a series of cultural constructions, with the emphasis on mastery and estrangement persistently constructed through the ambivalence

and equivocalness of the subordinate nation. Thus racial constructions are ambivalent because they constitute an Other which is twofold: it is universal and different.

As the present chapter has shown, this ambivalence also stems from the misperception of the auto-and hetero-images of the nation and the polarities of the imageme. The ways the nation is constructed inside and outside its culture may vary, resulting in conflicts and producing ambivalence in the awareness of cultural difference. The examples of China, Turkey and Russia are the questions in point. Imagining itself as central in relation to the other cultures, as in the case of China, or symbolically westernizing themselves, as in the cases of Turkey and Russia, the nations' auto- images confronted their conventional placement as subordinate, Asiatic and less progressive civilizations constructed by the West. This problem in the perception of the nation is central to its representation in the framework of a colonial discourse, producing a constant debate between the master and its subjects. Russia constitutes a norm, a typical example of the foreign nation in relation to the English, and so will be discussed in this context later.

4 RUSSIA INVENTED

> The idea of nationality is in itself a conservative idea – the demarcation of one's rights, the opposition of self to another; it includes both the Judaic conception of superiority of race, and the aristocratic claim to purity of blood and to the right of primogeniture. Nationalism as a standard, as a war-cry, is only surrounded with the halo of revolution when a people is fighting for its independence, when it is trying to throw off a foreign yoke.
>
> Alexander Herzen, *My Past and Thoughts,* 1867.

The previous part of this work has discussed the complexity and ambivalence of the concept of the nation, showing how a literary representation of the nation is a practice through which writers both use their imagination and also participate in a collectively-imagined model to construct an alien civilization. They show the nation as strange and different, as perceived in their own selves. As a result, the idea of the Other is established because the foreign is so perceived by the interior, and consequently should be regarded as not given, but constructed with a certain proportion of falsity. Moreover, the fabrication of this distinctiveness results in the creation of an imaginary community which, in Said's words, possesses "fictional reality" (1978: 54). This imaginary community is defined through the boundaries between the protagonists' own space and "theirs", which are both arbitrary and inclined to modification. All this foreshadows Bhabha's argument about the complexity of space, which brings instability and ambivalence to the understanding of the concept of the nation (1994: 141). It also calls for a redefining and rethinking of the perception of Russia by western writers as an ambiguous Other while the West is a homogeneous entity as well as different nations. In such a differentiation, the world is visualized and represented in black and white, which suggests a false perception. In any representation of the different and exotic, there should also be something common and familiar, as well as vice versa.

This has become a particular subject of the renewed debate relating to Said's study *Orientalism* (1978), which has recently been challenged by some scholars (Cannadine 2001, Malik 2001, Irwin 2006). Kenan Malik's critical essay in support of David Cannadine's *Ornamentalism* (the title is a parody of Said's work) reveals a contradictory view of empire and its subjects (2001: 48). He argues that Cannadine's study questions the traditional racist division of the world into the categories of "the West and the Rest". Such a view has defined the positions of perpetual superior to perpetual alien, of chief to dependent, that need to be re-evaluated and redefined. Malik defends the idea of the universality of the world proposed by Cannadine, and argues that questions of race and identity in the post-

imperial world cannot only be treated from two antagonistic black and white standpoints. The British elite, for example, considered the structure of their colonies to be similar to that of Britain, and so their colonies and their inhabitants appeared less exotic than has often been supposed. As Malik puts it, "British imperialists loathed Indians and Africans no more or less than they loathed the great majority of Englishmen. They were far more willing to work with maharajahs, kings and chiefs of whatever color than with white settlers, whom they generally considered to be uneducated trash" (2001: 48-49). More romantic imperialists also saw overseas societies (like the Indian villages and princely states) as better, purer, less corrupted and more stable than the British Empire (Cannadine 2001: 67). In other words, Cannadine's book can be regarded as a challenge to the traditional racist belief of the world as divided into "the West and the Rest", and also a way of explaining the ambivalent doubleness of the Other in that Russia is partly represented as a site of spiritual redemption.

As discussed earlier, the impositions of power concealed behind the process of defining the nation stimulate the idea of compromise through which a dominant group determines a character of the subordinate. However, according to Lisa Lowe (2004: 1036-1037), in this process the former not only constitutes itself as the majority in relation to which the latter is defined as the Other, but may also create a new minority which represents a new set of relationships. They in turn stand for a different balance of power similar to the way Russia has been defined in literary representations as subordinate: it can also be perceived as a superior in relation to Ukraine, for example. This illustrates the way questions of power or hegemony are never absolute or conclusive, and can also be read as a construction used in the literary representation.

The invention of Russia in English literary writing was thus an imposition of English power and an acknowledgement of the Other, with its own culture, economy and *zeitgeist*. In early English writing, the civilization discovered appeared to be so enigmatic that the explorers (here I mean both travellers and writers) imagined it as alien and different. In Archer's opinion (2001: 5), the newness of the imaginary nation which Russia constituted for the English and Europe was marked with "profound instability" and ambiguity: the invented nation represented more than one world – at least two – for the English imagination (2001: 5). This stark doubleness of the Russian identity produced a set of representations in which the "mythic" construction of Russia was at the very core of a writer's textual production.

This chapter suggests that the problems in the attempt to construct the nation in the three novels under scrutiny stem from earlier representations of Russia's auto-

and hetero-images. In addition to some Russian classic writers, some English pioneer writers have influenced the practices of the representation of Russia by the three 20th-century Anglophone writers. By applying the method of intertextual reading I will demonstrate how these subjectively established practices of representation have articulated long-lasting national characteristics and stereotypical images of Russia. Constructed through the process of representation, these images have received their recognition by way of constant repetition and references to familiar imagery from earlier texts, and have therefore become commonplaces. In other words, this chapter aims to demonstrate that the creation of national characteristics is an intentional manipulation, and is subjectively constructed in the course of representation.

Russia's own self-image in the literary text seems to have been constructed as a two-edged, enigmatic phenomenon, provoking an uncertain perception of the nation as between an imagined Orient and a rational Western Europe. A pressing idea of ambiguity in the imageme of the Russian national character in some Russian writers' works, with their inward vision of Russia and, it might be supposed, more accuracy in writing, echoes the English writers' evocations of Russia. Because, as we have seen earlier, the representation of national images is fundamentally rooted in previous practices, in the work of both the Russian nationals and Anglophone writers, the image of Russia is distinguished by its profound inconsistency and equivocacy.

Moreover, the process of naming and defining the nation is regarded in this study as an imaginary construction; therefore the idea of Europe as a cultural sphere, and consequently England as a part of it, is imaginary too. Marshall Poe argues that in the fifteenth century, European travellers to Russia did not call themselves Europeans but just related themselves to a different system of states which excluded Russia and reflected a collective sense of difference (2000: 9). The English in particular needed an Other whom they imagined as a nation characterized by its opposites, and through whom they tried to realize their hopes and fears. Russia and the English, or Russia and Europe together, made up a universal whole. Distinguishing between them calls for more critical examination.

In order to comprehend how Russia emerged in English consciousness and literary thought and why Russia of the time of English discovery produced the image of an exotic land, constituting for early English travellers and writers the bizarre Other, we need to have a closer look at the political and economic conditions which appeared on the English scene at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries. They became inevitable prerequisites for the possibility of northern voyaging, new trade campaigns, travel accounts and later literary

works in which Russia consistently appeared as a place of universal slavery and barbarity (Poe 2000: 11). In other words, the spirit of a savage people that can be identified in the description of the Muscovites in early records reappears in twentieth-century writing about Russia in general and in the three novels under scrutiny in particular.

The "Age of Discovery" (that is, the 15th century) was a time that generated both political, diplomatic and trade voyages as well as European ethnography (Poe 2000: 14). At that time, the concept of Muscovy emerged in European consciousness and in the European imagination as a result of two developments. The first was that Muscovy defeated the other East Slavic principalities and united them as one indivisible state in a struggle against Mongol domination. The other was that after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the lords of Muscovy claimed that imperial greatness had transferred from Byzantium unto them as the "Third Rome", and that their Tsar had seen himself as the protector of Orthodox Christendom, resulting in a strong religious authority figure in the auto-image of the Russian empire or "Holy Russia" (Naarden & Leerssen 2007: 227). Moreover, distant from Europe and developed aggressively under the leadership of Ivan III, Muscovy demonstrated both an uncomfortable paradoxical proximity and opportunities for travel and commerce (Poe 2000: 16).[31]

It was clear that if the English wanted new discoveries and innovations, they had to deal with Muscovy, and therefore needed to know more about it. However, fascinated by Continental venturing, Columbus' discoveries and economic transformations on the Continent, the English could not speculate about a competitive response (Palmer 2004: 6). Being an isolated kingdom located between two great empires, the Holy Roman Empire and the Ottoman Empire, England experienced difficulties in many spheres of life, including business and commerce, and lacked global discoveries. As Palmer expresses it, "Englishmen were learning how to play their parts in a larger drama of invention and discovery" (2004: 9). Yet, although there was a sense of urgency in the air at the turn of the sixteenth century, the English did not yet imagine going to Russia (2004: 2, 8) as it was probably too distant, too northern and too exotic for the English mind.

Situated at the crossroads between Europe and the Asian steppe, a combination of the Greek-Byzantine styles, sixteenth-century Russia produced the image of a

---

[31] Under the rule of Ivan III, who formed alliances with courts farther to the west, the Muscovites attacked their neighbours: Sweden, Livonia and Lithuania. Ivan's military and diplomatic activity resulted in Russia gradually involved in European affairs, provoking curiosity and interest of the overseas travellers (Poe 2000: 13).

diverse and exotic land, a weird mixture of East and West.[32] The term "Rus" or "Muscovy" was less susceptible to precise geographical definition: its borders fluctuated and were often ill-defined (Milner-Gulland 1997: 3). As this study will show, Russian writers themselves were not aware of the part Russia played in Europe. Figes argues that "the idea of Russia could not exist without the West just as the West could not exist without the Orient. Living on the margins of the continent, they have never been quite sure if their destiny is there. Are they of the West or of the East?" (2002: 66). This indeterminacy lies in the imaginary geography, which cannot neatly situate the ambiguous nationhood. The imaginary borders of the place where the nation is located are uncertain and unsettling, and, like Columbus, who invented the New World in 1492, Europeans, and the English in particular, defined the new "civilization" as a part of the Old World. Archer argues that

> Our continued fascination with the acts of naming still distracts us from the full significance of the "Old World" in early modern thought after Columbus, the traditional three-part world was retrospectively and almost accidentally renamed as the Old World in another sense, by comparison with the New. The Old World was as much a European fiction as its rival, which was hardly new to its inhabitants. Africa and Asia, worlds in themselves in a sense, were themselves agglomerations of yet other societies, cultures, and economies, as was Europe. Finally, the New World was almost always conceived as a lost part of the Old World, a fold in its global immensity and temporal endurance (2001: 1-2).

In other words, throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries curiosity about the Old World, in Archer's view, increased, and the English in particular remained more concerned with the Old World than with the New (2001: 2-3). They tried to fabricate the image of the various old worlds, such as Northeast Africa, Southwest Asia and India, and Russia was not an exception.

By the late sixteenth century, the British Empire had already become forceful enough to exploit a less powerful culture.[33] England was more concerned with Russia than with any other nation during the Elizabethan period (Archer 2001: 112). It regarded Russia as a possible ally against the Catholic Church and the Holy Roman Empire, and a prospect for commercial opportunities. However,

---

[32] Kievan Rus' accepted the Greek Orthodox religion, and the architecture combined the elements of the Greek-Byzantine and Russian styles (Figes 2002: 155).

[33] Because of the economic difficulties in the cloth trade in the early 1550s, English merchants started searching for new cloth markets outside northern Europe. The English ranged around the Atlantic and the Mediterranean, pushing trade into Russia, the Levant, and into West Africa (Hornsby 2004: 12).

widespread education and a business mentality were lacking, and even the appearance of the merchant did not allow Russia to establish regular commercial relations with the West (Pipes 1995: 204). In Western eyes, Russia was considered a backward civilization, inhabited by nobles and serfs, with little political organization and no cultural or intellectual achievements.[34] This is how a typical Russian 16th century-entrepreneur was described: "Clothed in sumptuous caftans cut from imported brocades, with their tall, fur-fringed hats and high boots with pointed toes the *gosti* (guests) resembled wealthy Persians. Merchant wives painted their faces in exotic white and red tints" (Pipes 1995: 204). Russian noblemen wore clothes imported from Persia, and their soldiers carried weapons copied from the Tartars. The impression of strangeness recorded by nearly every visitor to Russia was reinforced by curious customs: the practice of kowtowing before superiors, imposed on the Russians by the Tartars, the absolute power of the ruler, the habit of even the highest nobles of referring to themselves as the monarch's "slaves" (*kholopy*) – these and many other features of Muscovite Russia amazed all visitors (Masefield 1910: 3-4). This Orientalized vision of the Russian character was constructed at a time when Russian merchants were venturing on business to eastern Europe and the Middle East. Such a vision of Russia started to take shape in some early English writers' works, and this study later shows how the account of the sixteenth-century merchant parallels the image of the twentieth-century businessman constructed in Fitzgerald's novel.

Daryl W. Palmer's study *Writing Russia in the Age of Shakespeare* (2004) is relevant here. He examines the works of Anthony Jankinson, Jerome Horsey and Giles Fletcher, who travelled to Russia as commercial agents and royal diplomats, as well as in writers like Shakespeare and John Fletcher who had never been to Russia and wrote popular plays that invoke Russian matters, albeit in Shakespeare only peripherally. His book is a fascinating study of the commencement of the Russian subject in early modern English travellers' and writers' accounts. Although the latter, in Palmer's view, are prone to exaggerate and show intolerance for the different (2004: viii), they are still instances of a common stereotypical vision of Russia which, according to this study, influenced later representations.

Because, as we have seen, England needed new discoveries and was in desperate need of increasing the demand for its commodities, the search for a northern passage to Cathay (China) in the middle of the sixteenth century was intense. The

---

[34] See Naarden & Leerssen (2007: 227). In his *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (1591), Giles Fletcher also describes the Muscovites as the people who "excel in no kinde of common arte, much leffe in any learning, or litterall kinde of knowledge" and "haue neyther reafon, nor valure to attempt innouation" (1966: 48).

profusion of detail of Chancellor's voyage to Muscovy, recorded in Richard Hakluyt's collection of travel documents, has survived to today, and gives a lively picture of the event. Although at that time the English nation travelled and explored in order to do business, Hakluyt's intention in collecting the records was historical, in order to examine national experience and to promote national confidence (Beeching 1985: 9-11). On the part of the voyage to Muscovy, he perfectly succeeded in this task. His representation of the Muscovites threw light on the new nation, informed the English of the new learning and introduced them to the world: "For they spread a report abroad of the arrival of a strange nation [the English], of a singular gentleness and courtesy . . . " (Hakluyt 1985: 63. Modernized spelling).

In his account, Hakluyt emphasizes a skeptical perception of the new nation discovered, and its difference in language, ways of life and economic level. He refers to the people as "the barbarous Russians", who travel in sleds not knowing any other manner of carriage and salute their saints even if they do not see them in their common household (1985: 63, 65). The image of people who have sacrificed themselves to idols all their lives is embodied in Richard Chancellor's first encounter with the Muscovites:

> They being amazed by the strange greatness of his ship, began presently to avoid and to flee: but he still following them at last overtook them, they (being in great fear, as men half-dead) prostrated themselves before him, offering to kiss his feet: but he (according to his great and singular courtesy,) looked pleasantly upon them, comforting them by signs and gestures, refusing those duties and reverences of theirs, and taking them up in all loving sort from the ground (1985: 62-63. Modernized spelling).

The submissive characteristics of the Russian "*Moufick*" (a simple peasant; original italics) also appeared in Giles Fletcher's *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (1591), where he argued that on meeting the Emperor or a chief officer, a poor Muscovite had to "fall down with knocking of his head to the very ground, as he doth vnto his Idoll" (1966: 46). Practicies of idolatry and kowtowing as well as the meekness and reconciling qualities of the Russian people are stereotypical features in the characterization of the Russian characters of the three novels too. They anticipate Frank Reid's position in *The Beginning of Spring* in relation to the Russian characters in the novel: the twentieth-century English merchant is petrified by Russia's isolation and at times incomprehensibility, and although he has lived in that land and has had to accommodate himself to its traditions, he perceives himself as a stranger (*Spring* 1998: 23, 47).

Because national representations are characterized by the ambivalent and contradictory nature of the imageme, the nation is never straightforwardly perceived from only one perspective. Thus although Chancellor drew attention to the barbarous habits of the strange people, he was also amazed at the majesty of the Emperor: "his seat was aloft, in a very royal throne, having on his head a diadem, or crown of gold, apparelled with a robe all of goldsmith's work, and in his hand he held a sceptre garnished, and beset with precious stones" (Hakluyt 1985: 64. Modernized spelling). Barbarously rich, the Russian Prince can be identified with the atmosphere of the barbaric pomp at Rusalochka (a typical Russian restaurant), described by Fitzgerald in *The Beginning of Spring.* A barbaric tradition of Russian hospitality and the great wealth of the Russian Tsars constitute a part of the Russian imageme which will later become transformed on to the level of myth and commonplace images in twentieth century representations.

As the account above is a literary representation, then, according to our earlier discussion, it is intentionally constructed on the basis of subjective viewpoints and imagination, suggesting a certain proportion of falsity. The travel accounts of the age of discovery, known in Russian historiography as *skazaniia inostrantsev* (accounts of foreigners), were characterized by subjectivity, intolerance, and often uncritical views of the early explorers (Masefield 1910: 4). The episode above is a typical example of a negotiation between "reality" and representation, in which Russia, as a foreign land, is approached with a freshness of vision, intentionally constructed and imaginatively represented. This is not to deny its "truth", but rather to suggest that the representation is pictured through a visual perception of oneself, and so should be considered an attempt to fabricate the representation of the imaginary nation. This early observation or travel narrative creates images which underlie later representational practices, and focuses on what is significant to the European eye.

The "discovery" of the nation and the attempt to define it gave the English more strength and power, and resulted in Russia being represented as a dependent nation and as a chaotic Other. George Turberville's poetic letters in verse to his friend (1568) follow this tradition, representing the Russians as "a people passing rude, to vices vile inclined" who inhabit the "barbarous" coast and have "no civil customs to be learned" (Hakluyt 1985: 129, 132). Echoing Chancellor's impression of the Muscovite habitat as a sacred place of worshipped saints (1985: 65), Turberville writes:

> The house that hath no god, or painted saint within,
> Is not to be resorted to, that roof is full of sin.
> Besides their private gods, in open places stand
> Their crosses unto which they crouch, and bless themselves with
> Hand (1985: 129).

As to their appearance, they are a people with "faces nothing fair, But brown, by reason of the stove, and closeness of the air", hinting at the Russians' not purely European features (1985: 130).

On the basis of this evidence, Archer argues that Russians were symbolically "blackened" along with Africans because of "the servile nature attributed to them in western European texts" (2001: 122). West's main character's (Nikolai's) dark skin (in *The Birds Fall Down* 1978: 21), or Conrad's "quite unusually dark" Mr. Razumov, with his dark hair (in *UWE* 2003: 2, 116), are not random representations but intentional practices. Through them, the writers explore the technique of blackening, which according to Bhabha, has a twofold function: on the one hand, it signifies birth; on the other, death. The black, in his opinion, is both savage (cannibal) and yet the most obedient and dignified of servants (the bearer of food) (1994: 82). The term "black" is also reductionist since it reduces people with many different cultures to one flat category (Sarup 1996: 180). Therefore the idea of blackening of the Russian identity in twentieth century English novels is treated in this study with the purpose of articulating a type of the reductive forms of representation attributed to the national characteristics of the Russian characters.

However, the identification of Russia with blackness was never consistent. The Muscovite was also associated with white slavery, which revealed the indeterminate character of the nation. For example, John Fletcher's choice of a Moscow setting for his *The Loyal Subject* (1618) represents a negotiation between eastern and western cultures: Russia constitutes an in-between place for English travellers to Persia and is represented as both European and Asian. The plot of the play itself suggests a number of intertextual readings. The young Archas, dressed as a woman called Alinda, with her "black" blood and white skin colour, can be linked to a wider representation related to a chaotic perception of Russia in the English literary text. The cross-dressing itself can be associated with the uncertainty with which Russian slavery is depicted. The identity in disguise is subordinated to the one which is revealed; the masculine body is enslaved and goes unrecognized while the female is revealed, and so occupies a superior position. Through such a representation, the character embodies a possible negotiation between a subject and its master, demonstrating simultaneously a conflict between independence and servility which English travellers and writers have projected on to Russia. The independence is embodied via a female character, which raises the idea of femininity as dominant. Like Said, who characterized the Orient as feminine in his study, Fletcher represents Russia through a female figure behind which the masculine is concealed. Thus the common stereotypical view of Mother Russia in

Conrad, West and Fitzgerald may be identified even in seventeenth-century English writers.

The representation of Russian civilization constructed in the second part of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) is one of the examples which supports the previous argument, and is evidently influenced by earlier records about Russia. Therefore it generates an account of a "confused otherness":[35] the protagonist Robinson Crusoe, followed by his companion Friday, embarks on a long-distant journey to China. On approaching the Muscovite frontiers, he anticipates arriving in a country "governed by Christians", in a place where, at least, "a face of the Christian worship appear'd; where the knee was bow'd to Jesus: and whether ignorantly or not, yet the Christian religion was own'd, and the name of true God call'd upon and adored" (Defoe 1953: 438). Instead, he finds mere pagans who sacrifice to idols and worship the sun, moon and stars. He calls them "the most barbarous, except that they did not eat men's flesh", which is always the ultimate mark of the savage (1953: 438). The brave Scots merchant whom Robinson Crusoe encounters the first among the inhabitants, asserts that "these Muscovites are but an odd sort of Christians" (1953: 438). In other words, we are faced with a world which is a mere recognition of difference. Its barbarous otherness is perceived as the antithesis of England, but is still imagined.

The weekly magazine *The Muscovite*[36] also rendered the image of Russia to the English reader. It appeared in 1714 and was structured through periodical essays. The protagonist is an Englishman who narrates a story of meeting Plescou,[37] a young Russian man whose viewpoints and ideas become the basis for a comparison between the political, social and cultural issues of Russia and England. Coming from a far-distant civilization, without possessing proper law, culture and certain restrictions (the way of describing the Muscovite community of that time) (Levin 1998: 17), Pleascou's story, narrated by the Englishman with the addition of the foreigner's personal comments and viewpoints, reveals the arbitrary nature of a strange and different country as seen by the English. The narrator states that Pleascou himself was "somewhat reminiscent of a savage creature brought up among the people [that is, the Muscovites] who did not know any other practice, but hunting, eating and sleeping. Their intellectual superiority over wild animals

---

35 Bryan Cheyette uses the same term in relation to the Jew in his work (1993: 11).

36 The title itself is regarded as odd by the English narrator (Levin 1998: 17).

37 In English, the Russian city of Pskov was called Pleascou, Plesco, Plescow. It is suggested that the writer may have heard that the names of some Russian cities derive from masculine names (e.g. Vladimir, Yaroslavl'), and did not consider that the city of Pskov is a different case (Levin 1998: 27).

can be mainly marked by producing a weapon which they later used to kill them" (1998: 19, my re-translation). In other words, the image of a barbarous, cruel people was re-imagined in *The Muscovite* magazine, and therefore in a similar way repeated the practice of previous English writings about Russia.

In this repetition, there was also a recurrent technique used: the protagonist who narrates a story about a foreign land he never visited, and represents it as real, uses his knowledge and imagination. This was employed even in classical literature, and later reappeared in Charles Montesquieu's *Persian Letters* (1721) and Oliver Goldsmith's *The Citizen of the World* (1762). In these works, as in *The Muscovite*, the writer uses the Other through the story of a foreign, exotic and distant country, to express the story of his own land, but in reverse.

Later the evocations of the Russian motif appeared, as we have already seen, in essays by Samuel Johnson. His journal *The Rambler*, published in 1750-1752 and known for its authority and popularity with the English reader, commented on the Muscovite family traditions and marriage raised in such a backward society as Russia. Johnson held that, according to the Muscovite tradition, men and women never saw each other until they were united in marriage, without the right of divorce. However, such state of affairs did not produce a great number of unhappy marriages. Conversely, "among a people so little delicate, where the paucity of gratifications, and the uniformity of life gave no opportunity for imagination to interpose its objections, there was not much danger of capricious dislike, and while they felt neither cold nor hunger they might live quietly together, without any thought of the defects of one another" (Womersley 2003: 119). Through this image of the Muscovite tradition, a stereotypical view of Russia is undeniably seen.

Interest in the nation started to grow when more and more European travellers embarked on a journey to the unexplored lands of Russia (Archer 2001: 102). The Muscovite community constituted a new perspective of representation for William Coxe, the eighteenth-century English innovator who once more "discovered" Russia during his voyage to Eastern Europe. Everything appeared in opposition (Wolff 1994: 32-36): he saw Moscow as an illusionary distraction, an irregular, uncommon and extraordinary city. Everything was in Asian style, and the Russians themselves matched a Russian-Scythian prototype. Russia's degree of civilization was measured in comparison to that of other European nations which were categorized as "civilized". As a result, a world of the "wildest fancy", with fantastic and humorous elements in it, was invented (1994: 38). The imaginary perception of Russia constructed a representation of what was "there" and what was not, yet within a specific cultural realm.

This repetitive practice of amplified, overstressed representation of the subordinate nation by the English was a technique developed in some 19th-century English writers' images of Russia to demonstrate its savagery, spontaneous thinking and primitive traditions. In the Western view of that time, Russia was a transit zone between civilized Europe and stagnated Asia, and backwardness became a more dominant trope (Naarden & Leerssen 2007: 227). Robert Browning's (1812-1889) poem "Ivan Ivanovitch", written in 1878 and later included in a collection of short poems *Dramatic Idylls* (1879), follows this convention.[38] The events take place in a small village, where the protagonist, Ivan Ivanovitch, is represented as a typically Russian hero, a God-obedient carpenter, or, as Browning refers to him in the poem, "God's servant" and a "northern giant" (1994: 590, 596). He becomes a judge over a peasant woman, Louscha, whose head he cuts off with an axe after she confesses that she let a pack of wolves devour her three children. Although she tells her tragic story to the village people, her head rests on Ivan Ivanovitch's knees as if he were a God figure, and therefore is addressed particularly at him:

> 'Tis you unharden me, you thaw, disperse the thing!
> Only keep looking kind, the horror will not cling.
> Your face smooths fast away each print of Satan . . . (1994: 594)

Ivan listens to her pleadings with attention and care, and it seems as if he is ready to forgive her, yet "Solemnly Ivan rose, raised his axe . . . " (1994: 594). In the unexpectedness of his judgment and spontaneous thinking, the effect is of unwilling murder. His impulsive decision is represented as if the property of a strong, barbaric people, endowed with instinctive forces, settled in their consciousness generically, and are superior to the fear of law.

The representation of the Russian characters in the poem as savage, vicious and servile is paralleled by vivid descriptions of the Russian landscape, from which, as it seems, they derive mystical forces to complete their tasks. The snow "hard as steel" (Browning R. 1994: 591), unbending trees and inordinate day allude to the crudity of the barbaric mind, which generates such deeds and judgments as the ones committed by Louscha or Ivan Ivanovitch:

> In that unnatural day – yes, daylight, bred between
> Moon-light and snow-light, lamped those grotto-depths which screen
> Such devils from God's eye.

---

[38] *Dramatic Idylls* (1879) is a collection of short poems about some dramatic events, in which Browning's poem "Ivan Ivanovitch" was recognized by European critics as one of the most important works in that poetic cycle (Alekseyev 1998: 253).

> Ah, pines, how straight you grow
> Now bend one pitying branch, true breed of brutal snow!
> (Browning R. 1994: 591)

The Russian soil, snow-icy tops of trees and sledges dashing through the immense space is the allegorized picture Browning uses to represent Russia. They are the symbolic devices which were repeated later by some 20th-century writers, including Conrad, West and Fitzgerald in particular, whose works, although contributing to the development of the overall representation of Russia, still stereotypically re-imagine it.

The plot of the poem itself is not random. Although in his descriptions of the Russian landscape, forest, and habitat, Browning uses a significant part of the material he collected from his travels and his three-months stay in St. Petersburg in 1838 (Alekseyev 1998: 255), the writer extensively relies on his own imagination as well as on the earlier images of Russia produced by the English and French writers such as Byron in his poem "Mazeppa" (1819), an anonymous English woman who visited Russia in 1855, and Frederic Lacroix in his novel *Les Mysteres de la Russie* (1845) (*The Mysteries of Russia*). In all these works, there is the theme of a Russian victim followed by a pack of wolves, a kind of runaway figure, swirling images and kaleidoscopic landscape.

Thus, as can be seen, a textual representation is not an independent piece of writing, but a not-yet-coherent web of previous texts. The examples above support the earlier argument that the meaning of a representation of the nation is created in relation to its historical and cultural past. Browning's case shows the dependence of the writer's literary production upon this past practice, which at some points functions more effectively than the writer's actual impression of the country. When in Russia, Browning never saw children eaten by wolves or men cutting women's heads with an axe. Instead, he was impressed by "mystic picture of the Russian forest, St. Petersburg palaces and the Neva fair" (Alekseyev 1998: 250). Yet, even the depiction of those appear in his writing in stereotypically negative form, supporting a plot of murder, barbarism and retribution.

However, apart from a persistent attempt to represent the nation as a primitive formation, Russia was also pictured as a universal society, or the English "proximate Other" (Palmer 2004: 21). This representation also stemmed from the early records of travellers to Russia, and demonstrated the uncertainty and ambiguity in the attitudes of the English towards the nation, as in literary texts by Shakespeare, John Fletcher and others. When Chancellor set out for England in 1556, the ship carried Osep Napea, the first Russian ambassador to England. When this exotic visitor reached London, it was a real event because he provoked curiosity and

admiration**.** Although his Oriental appearance resembled a barbaric people, the Russian ambassador seemed familiar with Western customs (Hakluyt 1910: 361). The appearance of Osep Napea among the English public was the time they broke their stereotypes and cracked their old English frames, for he was one of those proximate others who established the link between the two nations and made this alien people look more familiar.[39] This case is only one of the examples in which the foreign people visiting the Russian land found some analogies with their own, like Frank Reid in *The Beginning of Spring*, who is an Englishman but still detects a great deal of proximity between his homeland and Russia. In other words, Fitzgerald's character, as well as some other travellers and writers visiting Russia, concludes that, while entering an alien society, he is merely revisiting his own.

This has led to the construction of an image which, when analyzed, can be regarded as a version of the English themselves. As Palmer expresses it (2004: 235), Muscovites were not as different as they seemed to appear, and "seemingly essential categories of human being – male and female, Orthodox and Protestant, Jacobean and Muscovite – could be grafted onto each other", yet "the Jacobean audience could not see a reflection of their world in the doings of Moscow" (2004: 218). A good example of it is employed by Shakespeare's successor John Fletcher, whose *The Loyal Subject* (1618) is the only early modern English play set in Russia. Apart from the prominent idea of Russia being identified with slavery that the writer exploits in his text, some implications of proximity can be found. Although the modern critic Erwin Brody remarks on the "hidden message and the real center of the play being unsuspected" [40] (Brody 1972: 142), nonetheless Fletcher's juxtaposition of the Old World with the New is present.

---

[39] The German ambassador Sigmund von Herberstein's remarks on the similarities between Russian and English people reveal the idea of proximity between the nations. He asserts that, although the English noticed certain exoticism in the Muscovite land, they saw a world of customs and practices they understood (Herberstein 1969: 63). In support of this argument, Palmer in his study gives several examples of the similarities between Russian and English lives. One of them is the ongoing struggle for dynastic continuity. Ivan the Terrible was the child of his father's second wife like Elizabeth, and their path to the throne would be marked by violence (2004: 15). Vasilii had been married for twenty years but had no heir. Just as his counterpart in England was doing, the Great Prince was searching for a solution. He forced Solomoniia, his wife, into a nunnery and married Elina Glinskii. In 1530, the prince who would be called "the Terrible" was born (2004: 15).

[40] Brody argues that the play incorporates many actual characters and events drawn from 1598- to 1613 and known in Russian historiography as the Time of Troubles (1972: 9). The presence of a hidden Demetrius theme and the portrait of the Great Duke of Muscovia, the figure of the Russian Tsar Boris Godunov, the relationships between the Muscovy state and Elizabethan England are concealed in the main plot and represent the key to a full understanding of the play (1972: 141-142).

A similar contrast can be found in Fitzgerald's novel, in which the opposition between Frank, a representative of the New World, and Crane, an embodiment of the Old World's practices, is explicit. Crane's deeds find their clear counterpart in the traditions of the Jacobean court, with tyranny and secrecy involved, which are reflected by Fletcher in his play. The writer lingers over the image of a loyal subject called Archas, general of the Muscovites, who represents Russian honor and patience, but is in fact disguised as Alinda. Crane, too, is a twofold figure: his devotion to Frank and preaching of the virtues of life are merely a mask behind which his real nature is concealed. Palmer, highlighting a great many images in Fletcher's play which can be identified with actual Russian and English historical figures, argues that reading the play is a mirror reflection of Jacobean England (2004: 217). The characters of Burris and Boroskie represent the good and the bad counselors in the play, and cling to the figure of the Russian Tsar Boris Godunov. The link between Boroskie and the Duke echoes the relationships of Ivan and King James. In other words, Palmer is convinced that through a number of such disguises during the play, Fletcher is veiling the actual message of similarity between Russia and England. Fitzgerald's juxtaposition of the Englishman with the Russian in the novel drives the same idea.

Although Shakespeare points to comic Muscovite disguises in his *Love's Labour's Lost* (1595-1596), a similarity of practices between the Muscovite and English can still be identified in the play. In front of the ladies, disguised like Muscovites appear in "fhapeleff geare" and in their "rough carriage fo ridiculous" (Shakespeare 1906: 5.2.340), a description which corresponds closely with the accounts published in 1591 by Giles Fletcher, and is believed to be Shakespeare's primary source in his representation of the Russians in the pnay.[41] In addition, some references to the Muscovite tradition of oath-taking can be found too. When the King and his lords take their oath of not having any love affair with women for three years, Berowne comments, "O, thefe are barren taskes, too hard to keepe" (1906: 1.1.51). Like the other men, he considers the oath-taking to be an opportunity for breaking it. As a result, they fall in love and become revealed. In Palmer's view, this course was often associated with deceitfulness as a typical

---

[41] In 1582, a Russian ambassador, Theodore Andreievitch Pissemsky, was sent to London to find an English bride for the Russian Czar. Lady Mary Hastings, daughter of the Earl of Huntingdon, nearly related to Elizabeth, was dignified to participate in the ceremony with the purpose of becoming the Russian master's wife later on. Even though she refused to accept the Czar's offer, Lady Mary Hastings was known afterwards as the Empress of Muscovia, and the account of the Muscovites' arrival to England, with a broad description of their appearance and customs, was recorded in Giles Fletcher's *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (1591) (Shakespeare 1906: 347).

feature of the Russian character. As he puts it, "charged with a crime, the Russian could simply swear innocence by kissing of a cross"; nonetheless he goes on to argue that "this assessment probably needs to be viewed as part of an inherent tendency on the part of all humans to distrust the unfamiliar" (2004: 84). In other words, both plays exemplify the tension between the Other and its similarity that English travellers and writers have long attached to Russia.

Even though Shakespeare's and Fletcher's plays do not explicitly represent Russia, their evocations of Russian matters construct the image of the nation that Russia constituted in the English people's minds. Palmer's work is exceptional in maintaining that the representation of Russia as completely different was enshrined in myth. Stereotyping the Russians as people with a distinctive culture and soul (the "Russian soul") enabled many writers such as those discussed above to represent the nation as individual. Yet even in their practices of representation there are points at which a passionate reaction against the ideas of otherness and estrangement is evident.

The stereotypical vision of Russia as a site of difference and alienation established in the 17th century was continued at a later time. Voltaire's famous fascination with Russia in the Enlightenment is important here. Despite his passionate curiosity about Russia and devotion to Catherine the Great, he had never travelled there, but mapped Eastern Europe in his *History of Charles XII*, giving it an imaginary definition (Wolff 1994: 89-93). In his vision, Russia represented a double Europe: a Europe that was familiar with the traditions of a civilized world, while the other part of it was less civilized. He used the Linnaean system to identify individual species by presenting them in a table of related species. Thus Charles, uncertain of his route, advanced among the lost lands of Eastern Europe, with Russia considered in relation to Ukraine, Moldavia, Poland, and Turkey. These lands had not yet been finally defined by the time of his travel, and so Voltaire used a sort of literary reversal to conceal them first and then discover them for himself and for Charles.

This example illustrates Johannes Fabian's ideas about visualization which he describes in his work *Time and the Other* (1983), demonstrating how unfamiliar civilizations are learned through imaginary practices of collecting and displaying. He argues that the understanding of "outlandish images was a preoccupation of savants long before actual encounter with exotic people and travel to foreign parts, and for reasons to which actual encounter seems to have added very little" (1983: 113). In Fabian's opinion, *visualism* is the first perception which is used to produce knowledge of an unfamiliar culture so as to get a better understanding of it. In addition, he considers the presentations of this knowledge through visual

images to be particularly "well-suited to the description of primitive cultures" (1983: 106, 121). During the encounter with the alien, visualism establishes a distance between the observer and the observed. According to Fabian, it separates the former from the latter in space and time, creating the category of the primitive and assigning it to the entity of examination (1983: 31). The image of Russia could thus be constructed as much by the conceptions of travellers in the imagination as by actual travellers.

Voltaire's "findings" are completely vicarious and spiritedly imaginary. Although he is aware of Russia's geographical position, he paradoxically defines the nation as if it did not belong, or only partially belonged, to Europe. He creates an account of the image already familiar to him, yet presents it as unfamiliar. In other words, he himself rediscovers or revisits Russia in his writing, according to which the representation of the nation seems to be ambivalent. In this case, the writer uses his imagination and fantasy to "explore" Russia as an ethnographic laboratory. Thus we are faced with a world in between, neither European nor Asian, neither civilized nor completely savage. In this, this world is unlike others because on the one hand, it can be integrated into the universal history of civilization, while on the other it can be regarded as a non-place.

The image of Russia represented in these texts can be also identified in more modern texts. The 20th century reconstruction of Russia as ambiguous Other which can be found in Virginia Woolf's *Orlando* (1928) follows an 18th century stereotype. The writer's vivid description of the Russian Princess and her meeting with Orlando brings us a whimsical representation of an imaginary which seems to be different and strange, yet attractive to the vision of the protagonist. Orlando's background knowledge of the Muscovite generates a barbarous portrait of a pagan female which he anticipates on seeing Sasha's arrival at the Court:[42]

> He suspected at first that her rank was not as high as she would like; or that she was ashamed of the savage ways of her people, for he had heard that the women in Muscovy wear beards and the men are covered with fur from the waist down; that both sexes are smeared with tallow to keep the cold out, tear, eat with their fingers and live in huts where an English noble would scruple to keep his cattle (1998: 46).

On her appearing, Orlando admits that she has proved different from the image he has pictured for himself. She is "free from hair on the chin" and is "dressed in

---

[42] This is how Orlando refers to the Princess in the novel because the name stands for the name of a "white Russian fox … a creature soft as snow, but with teeth of steel", and so it may bite savagely (Woolf 1998: 43).

velvet and pearls", and her manners are certainly not "those of a woman bred in a cattle-shed" (1998: 47). In other words, Orlando has visualized Sasha before she actually appears to him, and in the protagonist's two visions of this woman a provocative ambivalence is explicit. This is because otherness, or cultural difference manipulates through analogies, generalizations, visualization and categorization which are both subjective and repetitive stereotypes, and can therefore be regarded as the imaginary devices to define the Other.

As a foreign woman in England, Sasha undoubtedly represents otherness for Orlando when he first sees her at a ceremony of the coronation of the New King (Gunes 2004: 61). The perception of difference which he observes in the Russian Princess is as "Images, metaphors of the most extreme and extravagant [that] twined and twisted in his mind" (Woolf 1998: 36). He calls her "a melon, a pineapple, an olive tree, an emerald, and a fox in the snow" (1998: 36) to categorize the new object, and to differentiate her as Other. He admits that there is "something hidden" in her, for her true origin is unknown: "something rank in her, something coarse flavoured, something peasant born?" (1998: 51). What is important in this representation is the attachment of the metaphors and symbols that Orlando coins to create the meaning of Sasha's identity for himself.

In other words, the writer represents the nation through imaginary identifications which are embedded in the protagonists' minds and images. Although *Orlando* is not a completely fictional biography in that parts of it may stand for some real-life personages, Woolf exploits an elaborate world of fantasy. She never was in Russia, but was always deeply and romantically attracted to it through her profound knowledge of Russian literature and her involvement in reviewing and publishing it between 1917 and 1946.[43] Woolf read travel records collected in Hakluyt's collection at the age of 15, a time when, using her imagination, she first "visited" Muscovy together with the Elizabethans (Woolf 1977-1984: 108). This probably explains the writer's dubious treatment of the Russian theme in the novel, used by earlier writers as well in which a fascination with the abundant Muscovy space, country's size, "a landscape of pine and snow" (Woolf 1998: 48) is mingled with the Muscovite "habits of lust and slaughter" (1998: 48), the barbaric tradition, style and behaviour. Such a representation raises ideas of ambiguity and controversial difference which are embedded in the image of the Princess as representing Muscovy. Not surprisingly, then, that more than forty years past, Rebecca West, Woolf's passionate reader and follower, will revise the same images in her

---

[43] Fifteenth translations from Russian were published by the Hogarth Press (see Kaznina 2000: 161; Briggs 2006: 89).

Russian novel, mentioning the endless Russian landscape and the beauty of Russian nature (*Birds* 1978: 76, 301) together with "the crimes of Tsardom" (*Birds* 1978: 213).

This indeterminacy on the part of the Muscovite raises the question of ambiguous identity, or a nation which cannot be neatly divided between reality and imagination, fact and fantasy. Russia, constructed on the ground of earlier literary representations, with the application of modern knowledge about the nation, still represents equivocal civilization. In other words, the attempt to visualize Russia, and to construct it through a literary representation as both a barbaric Other on the one hand, and an enlightened one on the other, is a shared perception of individual writers. The vision of the nation in black and white terms is not convincing enough to produce that range of images which go hand in hand with the concept of the nation.

As imagemes change over time, common western perception of Russia as essentially different has varied. Martin Malia argues (1999: 118-123) that a mythic construction of Russia has existed in both negative and positive versions. According to the negative version, Russia has been represented as a country of oriental despotism, a society to which European norms are alien. From the time of the reign of the autocratic Russian Tsar Ivan IV ("the Terrible", 1530-1584), who terrorized the Russian towns and nobility, until Stalin's dictatorship, with its show trials, purges and secret police, Russia, in Western eyes, has been a country of oriental despotism and autocracy (Naarden & Leerssen 2007: 227-229). Although such a commonplace image has been at times replaced by its more enlightened counterpart, the negative stance has been frequently reiterated.[44]

As to the positive version, Russia in Western eyes has appeared as a land uncorrupted by the ideas of western civilization. Its image has been accompanied by natural submissiveness, gentleness, endurance and patience of Russia's Slavic population (Naarden & Leerssen 2007: 228-229). However, in Malia's view, Russia is not essentially different from the West; it merely occupies the point of what

---

[44] At some points in history, Russia has been seen as progressive and civilized. Peter the Great's (1682-1725) political rule and his programme of Westernization were in favour of Russia becoming a European empire in the West and a colonial power in the Asian East. After that, the onset of Romanticism everywhere in Europe resulted in a new appreciation of Slavic cultures. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the rise of Russian culture was accepted with surprise and admiration, resulting in Russia being no longer represented by the crude image of boyars and serfs, but by the imagery of refined imperial court life (Naarden & Leerssen 2007: 227-228).

he calls "the west-east cultural gradient" (1999: 215).[45] Such a position is generated by the ambivalent attitude of the West towards Russia and results in the antitheses which lie behind its imageme. We will see how the twentieth-century writers incorporate the indeterminacy of the nation into the lives of their characters, and how they extend the long-lasting tradition to represent Russia as between civility and barbarism.

As pointed out earlier, the complexity of the imageme of the Russian nation is revealed through the interplay between the auto-and hetero-images. It is in the combination of both that the polarities and contrasts are produced, resulting in the ambivalent nature of the imageme. The quest into Russia's belonging has occupied a long literary tradition. The questions of autocracy, Orthodoxy and nationality (that is, Russianness), or national themes that Russian writers were primarily dealing with in the 18th-19th centuries, producing an reassuring vision of the nation from inside, have become stereotypically transferred into 20th century English representations of Russia (Naarden & Leerssen 2007: 228).

The Russian poet Aleksandr Sumarokov wrote "Another Chorus to a Perverted World" (1763), a satire of contemporary Russian life which describes a utopian overseas country, but in fact constructed the idea of Russia as a distorted society in relation to Western culture. In that country "minds are not drowned in hard drinking"; "they do not sell people (i.e. peasants)", or "lose villages in card games"; "governors are honest", and "merchants are not deceivers"; "all the noble children go to school there … even maidens overseas must have learning" (1957: 280). In fact, all these good things were absent in Russia at the time the poem was written (in 1763). This example shows that in the eighteenth-century Russia has also been seen as a nation characterized by corruption, immorality and difference, representing a mosaic of inverted mirrors, each of which is partially endowed with some familiar elements, yet not completely recognized.

---

[45] Malia examines the stages of development in which he identifies certain analogies in chronological order of events which have taken place in other European nations and Russia. For example, Prussia abolished serfdom in 1806, Austria in 1848 and Russia in 1861; or Prussia acquired a constitution in 1849, Austria in 1867 and Russia in 1924. The 1917 revolution breaks this rule, and raises new versions of the Russian myth. The Soviet State Utopia comes to replace the 18th century fantasy of Russia as an oriental despotism. According to Malia, both these fabrications have a great deal of falsity. In his opinion, it was a "looking-glass on the common European theme of modernity" (1999: 124). In other words, it was another revision of Europe's experience.

In some Russian writers' works Russia appeared through a juxtaposition between simple people and aristocracy with regard to the former being more "truly" Russian than the latter. Tolstoy, for example, presented a vivid picture of Russian society with its educational polarization in *Anna Karenina,* where he depicted both the Russian elite (the image of the educated upper class intelligentsia) and the peasantry (the image of the uneducated, uncultured *muzhik*). Dostoyevsky was more concerned with the enormous gap between the classes in Russian society, and therefore perceived many of its social problems through the eyes of bourgeois intellectuals to whom most of his characters such as Raskolnikov and Karamzin cling (Hauser 1999: 140). What unites both writers' works is the image of Russia, which is embedded in the morally authoritative figures of "simple" people (*narod*), supervised by the Westernized elite. Thus the peasant Platon Karataev in Tolstoy's *War and Peace,* a typical Russian character, embodies a collective Russian spirit, and may stand for the whole of Russia. He is represented as so powerful a character that he manages to influence the aristocrat Pierre Bezukhov, whose attitude and view of life change dramatically after meeting Karataev. Gorky's writing exemplifies a similar practice of representation. Works like *Mother* (1906) were more popular among workers than among the aristocracy because of the writer's interest in a strong working-class image (Kelly and Shepherd 1998: 26).

Kelly and Shepherd find part of this problem in terminology (1998: 28). In Russian, the term *narodnost'* has a range of translations, such as "nationalism", "nationality", "nationhood", and "national identity". In its turn, the Russian word *narod* can mean both "nation" and "people", in the sense of the "common" or "simple" people (*prostoi narod*). This, in Kelly and Shepherd's opinion, has become the source of the construction of the Russian national character, and led to an identification of rural Russia as more truly "national" than urban centers such as St. Petersburg and Moscow, where the influence of the West was greatest (1998: 29). This simplification of Russian identity resulted in the peasantry being represented as "the true bearers of the national character" (1998: 29), a "barbarous" simplicity which can be identified in English writing, as this chapter has analyzed.

The short story "The Left-Handed" (1881) by Nikolai Leskov is another example in which the image of "true" Russian identity – ordinary but powerful – is embedded in the representation of a working class character. The writer emphasizes the talent and wit of an uneducated Russian who is left-handed, one-eyed and decent. He demonstrates his skills to show his superiority over the English by making horse-shoes for a small metal flea. The latter in turn is shown to the Russian tsar by the English as a curious piece of progress in their crafts. However, the

Tsar does not believe that the Russians will ever attain the technological level of the English. They invite the craftsman to stay in their country, yet his devotion to Russia is the main reason for his return. Leskov contrasts the admiration of Western Europeans for the talented peasant with the brutal Russian police treatment from which the protagonist dies upon his return to Russia.

These works demonstrate a sort of idealization of *narod,* typical of late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century Russian literature generated by the Slavophiles, writers who imagined the peasantry to be the only group of society who were not corrupted by the Westernization of Russia (Tolz 2001: 82-85). They turned to pre-Petrine Russia, arguing that its institutions were superior to those of the West. The Slavophiles contrasted the idea of collectivism (*sobornost*) with the individualism of the West. They considered the Orthodox religion to be the main source of Russia's fortunes, and imagined everyone to be a Slav within the framework of Orthodoxy, and vice versa. They established the idea of Russia as distinct from that of the West and rejected Western, capitalist civilization. In other words, the Slavophiles constructed an idealized image of old Russia. The three Anglophone writers seem to reiterate this imageme. Russia in their work remains to be a country of peasants and barbarians. The simple Russian character is in the middle of their stories.

Some Russian writers and philosophers regarded this "truly genuine" characteristic of the nation as Asiatic. For example, this idea can be traced in Peter Chaadayev's *Philosophical Letters* (1836).[46] He emphasized that Russia was an isolated, rootless state neither belonging to East or West, and in order to progress, should repeat the development of Western civilization from the very beginning. He summed up:

> But, as for us Russians, who have come into the world like illegitimate children without a heritage, without a link with the men who preceded us on earth, we possess within our hearts no teachings prior to our own existence. Each one of us must try individually to mend the rift broken within the family. What is habit and instinct in other people must be forced into our heads with hammer blows … This is a natural consequence of a culture based wholly upon importation and imitation. … We are one of those nations which do not seem to form an integral part of humanity, but which exist only to teach some great lesson for the world (1991: 22).

---

[46] In this critical piece of writing, Chaadayev divides the Russian intelligentsia into two camps, which have become known as the Slavophiles and the Westernizers (Tolz 2001: 81).

Chaadayev's vision of the West as a unifying civilized principle excluded Russia, attaching to it a symbolically Oriental image, adopted by the 20th century writers in English later in their novels.

As pointed out in the earlier section, the nation is a formation in constant flux, and so the idea of Westernization launched by Peter the Great, consisting of military glory and territorial expansion, resulted in another Russia taking shape.[47] As Kelly and Shepherd express it, "pre-Petrine Russia had been a *narod*, a primitive form of society, non-differentiated, and homogenous. Peter's reforms had begun the process of transforming the *narod* into the nation" (1998: 33). Thus, such writers as Pushkin and Lermontov, prompted by their university education and reading of progressive Western theorists, have been regarded as the architects of Western images in Russian literature. They had a great ability "to inform society of all that is unhealthy and cause for anxiety", and so their different thinking was considered to be an asset to society (Leavis 1985: 244). In *Eugene Onegin* (1833), Pushkin shows the life of the educated class as the best feature of the nation, because the former had "absorbed the fruits of European civilization" (Tolz 2001: 215). Much later in some Westernizers' works, we can identify an attempt to compare their Russian protagonists with Europeans – with a Frenchman in Denis Fonvisin's play *Letters From France* (1770), with a German in Ivan Goncharov's *Oblomov* (1859), with an Englishman in Nikolai Leskov's "The Left-Handed". To sum up, the ideas of how the Slavophiles and the Westernizers have constructed the Russian nation can be expressed in Herzen's words:

> From a very early age, we shared one irrational, physiological, passionate feeling … the feeling of boundless, all-embracing love for the Russian people, Russian way of life, Russian frame of mind … All the Slavophiles' love was focused from the start on the enslaved mother … We Westernizers had been in the hands of a French governess, and only later found that she was not our mother, but that an exhausted peasant woman was (1982: 286).

Thus many nineteenth-century Russian writers tried to construct Russian national identity and invent Russia in their writing. The image of Russia has never been represented as that of a homogeneous nation. This cultural project, related to the attempt to define Russia's self-image, has resulted in a sort of debate between the two antagonistic poles of writers, the Slavophiles and the Westernizers, each of whom embrace a substantial proportion of Russian national identity. This is, in a way, a fabrication of a contest between the Asiatic and the Western, or a contest

---

[47] In the early nineteenth century, Russia's victories in the Napoleonic Wars strengthened national pride (Kelly and Shepherd 1998: 31).

between imagination and reason. The problematic issue here is to decide which part is more weighty in the novels the present study is concerned with. This study does not see the nation as belonging to either of these two categories, but that the representation of Russia in the three English novels has aspects of both, with significant differences.

The ideas of distortion, revisiting and repetition that this section has identified in literary texts with the representation of Russia are related to the organic concept of culture that the introductory section of this study has discussed. The otherness of the nation plays a double role: firstly, it lies at the basis of what Bahrani calls the "diachronic progress of civilization" (2003: 54), generating barbaric images in its representation. Secondly, it is woven into the Western narrative and has, in Bahrani's words, "the synchronic time of the Orient" (2003: 55, 56), producing the enlightened version in the representation of the nation. This temporal organization creates a sort of past time of the nation which is at the same time "an era of despotism and decadence" in which all systems are "projected backward in time" (2003: 57). In Bhabha's view, such temporality alienates the synchronicity of the imagined community, and in our case, Russia, creating "minority discourses that speak betwixt and between times and places" (1994: 158). This form of temporality also undermines the imaginary or mythic nature of the nation, the imagined, invented community, or state. Within such a metaphorically complex space and time, Russia exists.

The implicit assumption behind this is that in the works that this section has analyzed, and in the ones that will be discussed later in this study, there are implications for the hegemonic representation rooted in the old tradition of representing Russia as dramatically different. The writers have explored this ambiguity, fitting it into a category of backwardness and development. The imaginative perception of the nation has envisioned an emergence from barbarism to civilization. In so doing, Russia, like many other Eastern European countries such as Moldavia, Hungary, Ukraine and Bulgaria, has been invented by the West, and the English in particular, and subjected to the process of discovery, alignment, snobbery and intellectual mastery, being posed and identified as a nation between Europe and Asia. This perpetual distinction has been preserved in literary writing for centuries and has consolidated the image of Russia as the Other constructed in English literature in general, and in the three English novels this study is concerned with in particular.

5 PRE-REVOLUTIONARY RUSSIA IMAGINED

> The mightiest homogeneous mass of mankind with a capability for logical, guided development in a brotherly solidarity of force and aim such as the world had never dreamt of … the Russian nation! …
>
> Joseph Conrad, *Under Western Eyes*, 1911.

This chapter will explore in depth how three twentieth-century writers in English West, Fitzgerald and Conrad rely on the recognizable image of Russia from past practices of representation, as well as on early English texts discussed in the previous chapter. Some problems in the representation of the nation as subordinate and slave-bound on the one hand, and Holy on the other, conventionally linked to Russia in English writing and typical of the three novels, will be central to the present analysis. I will show how the ambiguity, discontinuity and distortion which have served for construction of the stereotypical otherness of the nation by some English writers for centuries, have generated a similar account of pre-Revolutionary Russia in three English novels. The lives and actions of the characters in the novels will help investigate these questions because they function as signifiers to represent the image of Russia as such. Such aspects of Russian national identity as its lack of reason, impracticality and eastern senselessness, embedded in the characters' images, will be seen as constructed within the cultural system which imposes its norms on its inhabitants.

The Birds Fall Down (1966) is Rebecca West's last novel, and can bear comparison with Conrad's political novel *Under Western Eyes* (1911). Both novels are concerned with the political change in early twentieth-century Russia, or rather they are concerned with the victims of that change. Though West's novel is founded on a historical event, using the portraits of people who were living at that period, the writer herself was not sure how much of the story had been based on fact, but she claimed that it might have happened in a parallel universe (*Birds*, "Foreword" 1978: 7). In Samuel Hynes's opinion, it is "her most completely imagined novel" (1975: xviii). Similarly, Conrad's "reflection bears entirely upon the events of the tale" (2003: v), with the addition of the author's personal vision and certain facts known to the whole world. Both novels challenge the realist strategies discussed earlier by introducing characters who are imaginary with respect to their lives and setting.

In the Foreword to *The Birds Fall Down*, West acknowledges her indebtedness to the writing of the late Boris Nikolaievsky (1887-1966) and Juliet Soskice, Ford Madox Ford's sister and a wife of a Russian revolutionary exiled in England, and

a pioneer translator of Russian literature from whom West first heard the story (1978: 8). Boris Nikolaievsky's work of Azef's spying activity (or Azev or Azeff), available at hand in the West's private library and currently owned by the University of Tulsa, was the one her novel is based upon. Juliet Soskice was the translator of Nicholai Nekrasov's *Who Can Be Happy and Free in Russia?* (1917), a poem describing the despair of Russian rural society in the 1860s and 1870s, which also became one of West's novel's influences.

The plot of West's novel presents the vision of a world falling apart, family disunity, a perpetual struggle between good and evil, happiness and sorrow, which was West's idea of the modern world and pre-Revolutionary Russia in particular. The story focuses on eighteen-year-old Laura Rowan, the daughter of a Russian mother, Tania, and an English father, Edward, who is engaged in a love affair with Tania's former friend Susie Staunton. Laura's grandfather, the Russian count Nikolai Diakonov, a tsarist minister, although wrongly accused of causing the assassination of several tsarist attaches and exiled, still believes in the Orthodox Christian Church, defends the Tsar and regards his undeserved banishment as martyrdom for the Tsar. While Laura accompanies Nikolai on a train to the Parisian countryside, they are accosted by a revolutionary Chubinov, who reveals that Nikolai's personal secretary, Kamensky, has been a double agent, betraying both the revolutionaries and the government. This news is too much for Nikolai to bear; he dies before he reaches Paris and Russia. The train ride and the political conversation in which only the male characters are involved become central to the novel, and help Laura, who witnesses the events, develop mentally through the realization of her antipathy towards men and her disbelief in their human feelings. The pessimistic dénouement of the novel, when Kamensky, plotting to kill Laura and Nikolai, is himself murdered by Chubinov, and the Rowans' family separation, emphasizes West's dark vision of the universe and her skepticism towards the Revolution.

West's realization of Soviet tyranny was far ahead of the time. She embraced Emma Goldman in the early 1920s for her anti-Communist propaganda and was influenced by Henry James and Joseph Conrad who had expressed their anarchistic political views in their respective novels *The Princess Cassimassima* and *The Secret Agent* (Rollyson 2006: 11). West regarded the Revolution as a mistake because it would replace the cult of the Tsar with that of the Bolsheviks (1998a: 2). In her opinion, both regimes used autocratic methods and functioned with "a total disregard for the very people they claimed to be liberating" (1998a: 3). This may be the reason for her novel's main character, Kamensky, serving as a double agent working for both the revolutionists and the reactionaries. This also demonstrates the writer's attempt to represent the nation as a twofold entity, situated

between two ideologies and political realms, each of which threatens human feelings.

Moreover, for West, the encounter with the Other (Russia) was associated with meeting Communism, which had become for her, in Victoria Glendinning's words, "the locus of the darkness that might extinguish the light" (1987: 225). The writer was obsessed as a result with writing a betrayal novel which could also embrace intrigue and terrorism – all evils of the system presented as exclusive and dominant (1987: 242). Having read a book of memoirs by a tsarist Russian, tutor and adviser to Nicholas II, West created her own version of him, resulting in the figure of Nikolai, the old tsarist count in exile in Paris (1987: 242). The novelist's constructed representation of Nikolai, who is oppressed, deceived, pitiful and committed to the Tsar, can stand for the whole of Russia. Although he represents the Russian old tradition, has reactionary views, and has a love of the Russian Orthodox Church that causes him to look sternly at members of other Christian sects as heretics, in Peter Christensen's opinion West puts the readers in a situation where they are likely to sympathize with him (2006: 91). In other words, the figure of Nikolai is the embodiment of Russia, simultaneously pitied and criticized, but still imagined.

Despite these problems in the political system, Russia, in Nikolai's vision, is a holy land chosen by God. It is idealized by the character even at the crucial moment of his life. Though honourably devoted to the Tsar, but exiled to Paris on unsubstantiated charges, Nikolai reveals that his faithful factotum in Paris is also, under another name, the chief double agent of the terrorist extremists. Nevertheless, he encourages Laura, his devoted granddaughter, the daughter of an English MP and a Russian noblewoman, who accompanies him all the way through, to return to Russia one day: "I hope you go back to Russia, Laura. Oh, God grant me this, since I am penitent; send my little Laura back to Russia. Our Russian society is the society which is precious to Thee, all the others are chance coagulations of pagan mobs. Russian society alone serves God" (*Birds* 1978: 306). However, recognizing the present instability in pre-Revolutionary Russia, he adds:

> It serves God, but not strenuously enough. It prays, but it does not fast. At present it simply tells each of its members to spare himself the trouble of deciding what he shall be and do here on earth, since the Tsar makes all such decisions for him and takes on himself the guilt of earthly power. (*Birds* 1978: 261)

Nikolai signifies the image of Russia and, as a signifier, he is imaginary and arbitrary. Russia connotes for him the tragic fate to which the nation is destined (in that Nikolai is himself betrayed and ejected from his country), and the country's

escape from it towards a better life (in that Nikolai's exile can be seen as a chance of starting a new life). Moreover, Nikolai is the eldest in the Diakonovs' family and is represented as a character with the most authority because of his similarity to the Tsar and his Christ-like figure: "his white hair and his beard were streaked with the barbaric gold glowing" (1978: 21). The Tsar, in Christensen's view (2006: 92), is also a Christ figure, giving a religious aura to the novel and a sense that something holy about Russia is now being destroyed. Nikolai's image occupies a liminal position, a symbolic placement of Russia between the images of the Holy land and barbarity, and to emphasize the opposed tropes in the imageme.

In Nikolai's passionate devotion to his land and its identification with Holiness we can detect the attempt to construct the nation as chosen by people of God (*narod-bogonosets*). This characteristic of the Russian people as "a unique consciousness of the reconciling qualities of Christianity" emphasizes the mission of ordinary people as the only bearers of inner goodness (Tolz 2001: 87). Thus, although we are faced with the life of an aristocratic family in the novel, the image of *narod*, or ordinary people, may stand for the whole of Russia. In this, a certain simplification of Russian identity is present, related to the Slavophile concept of the nation, to show the uniqueness and individualism of the Westernized Diakonovs and an Englishman, Edward Rowan. This may partially explain West's choice of an upper-class family as central to the novel, while simple people, or the whole of Russia, serves as the background to the protagonists' deeds. However, this milieu is a mass which Rebecca West's imagination has defined as Asia, with its lack of reason and impracticality.

The protagonist's family in turn is one with a Western mind, endowed with sense and rationality. Here Russia is entangled in the image of being a colonial power, and fails to accept its subordinate position in relation to the West. However, this construction, which divides the nation into two oppositions, is not completely determinate in that there is imagination and a lack of reason embedded in the Westernized family as well, with characteristics conventionally associated with Asia. In other words, unreasoning becomes here both a Western and a Russian attribute. This can be perceived in the Diakonovs' actions and beliefs, and in their orientally decorated home, with "a Persian rug and the oriental carpets" (*Birds* 1978: 60). This idea can even be traced in Nikolai's appearance: "His features were nearly classical yet were thickened as if by some blood not European, and the colour of his skin sent the mind to Asia" (1978: 21). This is related to what Bhabha calls "the fetish of colonial discourse" (1994: 78), or "the Imaginary" (1994: 79) within which such discourse is located. The description of skin and race are those visible, "fetishistic" (Bhabha's term) signifiers through which the difference of the Russian character is constructed. It provides us with a visible

perception of the nation to exercise power and to recognize the Imaginary in the identification of identity.

The darkening of Nikolai's skin colour to associate him with a slave, and to assimilate class to race can be considered to be a stereotype of racialized blackness used in early English writing to parallel Russia with slavery, and appears to have been intentionally coined by Rebecca West in her novel to emphasize the "authentic" Russianness of Nikolai. The protagonists' Asiatic thinking, discerned through their "true" elite Westernized belonging, enables them to imagine Russia as holy (Nikolai), or for Laura and her mother to return to Russia on the eve of the Revolution, or to believe in the old Russian Orthodox traditions like Kamensky. All these thoughts can be ascribed to "Rebecca West's novelistic study of original sin" (Wolfe 1971: 117). The tension between two different identities became infused into the characters to construct the ambivalence of the nation and the discontinuity of their minds.

This irresolution is also present in the way the writer represents the characters as living their lives in a way which in fact signifies death, suggesting the duality and pessimism of West's view of Russia. Laura's and Kamensky's relations are one such example. While Laura fears that Kamensky might kill her, he in turn is fully in love with her. This is what Wolfe calls "the murderous nature of love and the loving nature of murder" (1971: 127). In other words, people relate in a similar way to those whom they love and to their would-be killers. Even the innocent Laura is portrayed as a kind of murderer when she unknowingly kills the man who loves her. Realizing completely what has happened, she turns to God for confession and relief, even though, after all the peripeteias, she feels sceptical towards her beliefs:

> As I said, You created Kamensky, and someone had to do something. And if Chubinov and I did the wrong thing, remember you created us too. Yes, I know you said that it was my Christian duty to do everything I could to discourage Chubinov from killing Kamensky. But can you blame me for wanting to live as long as you did? And about it being my Christian duty, I don't know how far you really meant that. You so often didn't really believe what you believed, didn't you? (*Birds* 1978: 402)

We are faced with a world in which everyone is implicated in guilt and treachery, and everything is seen as an immense destruction through which the image of Russia can be read.

The title *The Birds Fall Down* itself bears a similar connotation, and invokes Hegel, who saw life dialectically as a clash of opposites (Wolfe 1971: 117). The opposition of the bird hunt and the mating ritual shows passion murdered by intellect. Part of the mating ritual of the cocks and hens involves leaping into the air: the birds leap just before mating, the moment when they are aflame with sexual passion, and it is at this time that the hunters fire their guns. A detailed description of the process embedded in Nikolai's words can be read as the main idea of the novel, as well as the vision of the nation experienced by its dwellers, the characters:

> They are active, this is the peak of their lives' activities, but their consciousness of it takes the form of unconsciousness. They go into an ecstasy, they move but they are in a sort of stillness, like dancing dervishes. They shriek. Then cocks and hens alike rise straight up in the air, shrieking, shrieking, shrieking in panic. It is then that we really shoot. We bring them down by hundreds. (*Birds* 1978: 80-81)

This is why he refers to this event as "a system", meaning not only a single bird hunt, but also society: "A system, perfect in itself, and exquisitely ingenious, is destroyed at the very moment when it is implementing its perfection, by another system, just as perfect and ingenious" (*Birds* 1978: 81). In his vision, there is "an indescribable fascination in what is happening", and he sees this event as God-given because it is God that cares "for the destruction of one system by another" (1978: 81). In this destruction, Nikolai sees punishment as given for the sins people are tempted to commit, destroyed by the system, which is originally sinful itself. In this act, as Rollyson maintains (1998b: 206), "there is a love of killing and a love of what is killed – the human paradox" which is presented on a social level. Therefore, the discontinuity of the characters' minds is revealed as a social fact (Wolfe 1971: 115). Through the representation of the characters and their lives, with their lack of reason and discontinuity of their minds, we can read Russia.

In *The Birds Fall Down,* West depicts double agents, murder, instability and political intrigue at the beginning of twentieth-century Russia as the manifestations of the treason of that particular time and of that specific society. Her story is neither about Bolshevists or revolutionaries, nor about the Tsar, but about Russia split apart, detached and distorted. In this condition, family relationships are intertwined with politics to demonstrate people's mistrust towards each other and their inescapable desire for breaking loyalty because they cannot act otherwise.

In *Under Western Eyes*, Conrad, too, constructs Russia as an illiberal state, corrupted by the dangers of communist ideology. It is a society endangered by anar-

chism and moral isolation, and engaged in pain and suffering. Conrad's exploration of crime, confession and betrayal is embedded in the image of Russia, representing them as inevitable patterns of a stereotypical construction of the nation in general as well as of pre-1917 Russian life in particular. The writer's obsession with anarchism or nihilism, political activity and destruction consciously echoes such revolutionary novels as Turgenev's *Fathers and Children* (1862) and Gorky's *Mother* (1907). Conrad did not highly value Gorky's work, but he appreciated Turgenev, and as a Pole, he might well have encountered Turgenev's work before Constance Garnett's translations (Ray 2007: 65). In addition, Conrad was persistently being Russianised and "Turgenevised" because his writing was frequently paralleled with Turgenev – a stereotype which was strongly developed after he wrote an Introduction to Edward Garnett's book on Turgenev in 1917 (Turton 1992: 168). Both Edward and Constance Garnett saw Conrad and Turgenev as writers following the same artistic tradition in terms of their language and character personalities. It is this similarity in verbal artistry between the two writers that also makes James Huneker claim that *Under Western Eyes* might have been by Turgenev.[48] In this sense, Garnett's translation became a disservice to Conrad, who felt great antipathy towards all things Russian.

Conrad's knowledge about the revolutionaries and the pre-Revolutionary politics which he explores in *Under Western Eyes* also stemmed from his friendship with Edward and Constance Garnett, who shared their interests in personal relationships with many Russian exiles in London (Kaye 1999: 15, 127). Among them, Sergei Stepniak, a man of many talents and charm, who fled Russia in 1880 and settled in London in 1883, is supposed to be one of Conrad's influences on whom the writer modeled his characters Razumov and Haldin.[49] According to Thomas C. Moser, Razumov resembles Stepniak in many physical characteristics, loneliness, the burden of his secret past and melancholy. He also echoes some of Stepniak's deeds when confessing to his crime. Like Stepniak, who was killed by a train he did not hear when crossing the railroad tracks, Razumov was hit by a tramcar which he did not hear because of his deafness.[50] In other words, the association of Russia with despotism and revolutionary activity in Conrad's Russian novel does not only come from Conrad's hereditary connection but also from the Garnett's home, where it was a constant subject.

---

48 See Huneker (1990: 23-24) and Kaye (1999: 120-123).

49 Sergei Stepniak fled Russia in 1880. When settled in London in 1883, he became a friend of the Garnetts, a political writer, a literary author, translator, lecturer and the editor of *Free Russia*, a periodical sponsored by The Society of the Friends of Russian Freedom (Kaye 1999: 128).

50 See Moser (1984).

The lonely, melancholic figure of Razumov thus embraces the writer's own experience as well as influences of things Russian. Razumov is an outcast who, being nobody's child, feels attracted to Russia as his heritage, imagining himself as its subject (*UWE* 2003: vi). Andrew Long holds (2003: 498) that Razumov lacks his organic links to Russianness, but he creates a fantasy. He imagines himself embraced by Mother Russia and thinks like a pure Russian. Although characters are ejected from Russia in both novels (in that Nikolai is sent to Paris, while Razumov agrees to travel to Geneva to become a spy for the Russian state), they are spiritually lured by it. Nikolai still believes in its recovery, and refers to Russia as "Holy", speaking of the future with optimism. He claims that "all Russians will be born committed to innocence", and "the kingdom of heaven will be established on earth", meaning that one day Russia will suffer a rebirth and things will go the right way (*Birds* 1978: 262-263). Such a representation constructs the image of Russia as enlightened and different from other nations in its sense of holiness.

Though contemptuous of Geneva, Razumov too often draws on his memories of Russia when juxtaposing the Swiss landscape against the majestic vastness of the Russian one. He remains an outcast, a lonely figure accompanied by his momentous dreams and fantasies. When he speculates on his life, he admits that, unlike him, other people have "somewhere a corner of the earth – some little house in the provinces …". But "he had nothing … , to whom could he go with this tale – in all this great, great land?" (*UWE* 2003: 19). He wants to belong to Russia because this sense of belonging might link him to other people – "the solidarity in mysterious origin, in toil, in joy, in hope, in uncertain fate, which binds men to each other and all mankind to the visible earth" (*UWE* 2003: 22). Russia is Razumov's only parent, and maybe the only parent he really wants. This mystical tie of holiness also serves as the ideological signifier discussed above. Moreover, unlike Nikolai's, or Laura's Russia in *The Birds Fall Down*, Razumov's is the land of ordinary people (*narod*), and not the Russia of the privileged class.

Zabel argues that the Conradian hero is a solitary. He is a man designed to live by self-law. He is Conrad's version of the man – a descendant of the self-willed heroes of Balzac, Turgenev, Dostoyevsky and Melville – who chooses "to live a life of egoistic self-regard or compulsive self-assertion: the existence *pour soi* or the fate of estrangement and isolation" (1966: 133). Like Kurtz in *Heart of Darkness*, or Nostromo, Razumov is Conrad's explicit attempt to construct the protagonist's lonely image, but this time upon the image of Russia itself. The latter too is isolated and different: as Razumov implies: "In Russia it is different" (*UWE* 2003: 79), or, as the narrator asserts, "In Russia, the land of spectral ideas and disembodied aspirations" (2003: 20). Even the ground is "inanimate, cold, inert, like a monstrous blank page awaiting the record of an inconceivable history" (2003: 19-

20). Thus Razumov's solitude and egoism find asylum in the "endless space" and under the "sumptuous immensity of the sky" of Russia (2003: 20), which give him the inspiration to inform on Haldin.

One of the most striking episodes in the novel is when Razumov walks the St. Petersburg streets, furious that Haldin has made him face a dilemma between the ordeal of guilt and confession: "Like other Russians before him, Razumov, in conflict with himself, felt the touch of grace upon his forehead" (2003: 20). He is not aware of the right outcome: "what is this Haldin? Do I want his death?" (2003: 22). Yet it is the Russian earth that puts him on a final track when he looks at "a winding-sheet – his native soil! – his very own!", then upwards at the "clear black sky of the northern winter with the fires of the stars" (2003: 21). "Don't touch it", his inner voice suggests to Razumov, while another says, "I'll kill him" (2003: 19). He finds great energy and inspiration in this picturesque Russian void, which generates an almost physical impulse to action. Struggling to rationalize his confused impulses of treachery and self-justification, he decides to betray Haldin (Zabel 1966: 134).

The theme of betrayal is intertwined with the image of Russia. It is there, between the representation of both, that the real basis of the novel lies. These elements noticeably prevail in both Conrad and West. West also constructs a series of interlocking scenes in the novel that stem from the effects of betrayal. In a way very similar to Conrad's, she constructs the characters' images in the constant presence of the image of Russia. We have the impression that Russia follows the protagonists everywhere throughout the novel, even though most of the events take place in France. In Zabel's words "The extremes of the forces are at work in Russia – tsarist tyranny and pre-revolutionary brutality or fanaticism …", and so the characters "are caught between these evils", which become the basis of most of their insight and action (1966: 141). Here we are faced with the ideological forces of the representation of Russia embedded in the images of the protagonists. This is the ideology which lies behind representation. By involving the characters in social practices and actions, the writers construct the representation of Russia within its cultural space, and make us read this production within the social conventions that the writers tend to hold towards Russia.

Q.D. Leavis (1985: 246-247) identifies this ideology as a driving force for establishing authority through committing a crime. As mentioned earlier, the intertextual connection between the theme of betrayal in Conrad's novel and the act of assassination in Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment* suggests a similarity of performances in a society where tyranny and injustice are at their extremes. Raskolnikov, maddened by the injustices of society, deliberately commits a crime,

crime, deciding to murder a money-lender, an old woman. Similarly, Haldin, after throwing the bomb, demands shelter from a fellow-student Razumov. However, the latter refuses him help, and informs on him to the police. Q.D. Leavis suggests that one of the reasons why the protagonists act in this way is that, by turning Haldin in to the police, Razumov establishes authority and superiority over him. Razumov wants desperately to belong to and to be acknowledged by the state's powerful authority, imagining to himself how his passionate confession would stir their minds. Yet he gets nothing but a short bow and a cold handshake (*UWE* 2003: 32).

In Razumov's actions and his mind, as well as in those of other characters such as Natalia, Haldin, Mikulin, there is a great discontinuity. Natalia, cut off from her homeland and from the other Russian émigrés, is represented as a lonely racked victim: "There was almost all her youth before her; a youth robbed arbitrarily of its natural lightness and joy, overshadowed by an un-European despotism; a terribly somber youth given over to the hazards of a furious strife between equally ferocious antagonisms" (*UWE* 2003: 209). Like Razumov, she is orphaned, and desperately hopes that he will take her brother's place to compensate for her loss. Yet their chaotic relations are based on a great misunderstanding. Not only are they misunderstood by other characters in the novel, but this misperception is also central to Razumov's and Natalia's relationships with each other.

This discontinuity can be also traced in the relations between the superior to the subordinate. Mikulin, who has induced Razumov to become a spy, is the embodiment of power which the latter cannot ignore. Razumov is "enslaved" by Mikulin, and by the obligation put on him. Furthermore, he is subjugated by Haldin's ghost and his continuous existence in the thoughts of those who loved him. Razumov is in a way envious of Haldin's death when he assumes that "in order to speak fittingly to a mother of her lost son one must have had some experience of the filial relation" (*UWE* 2003: 225). In other words, the relation of a superior to a subordinate is bound up with the association between Russia and slavery discussed earlier. This system is seen as sinful and destructive, an idea embedded in the image of the protagonists.

The characters are surrounded by agents of destruction (Razumov in relation to Haldin, Prince K. in relation to Razumov etc.) who cause discontinuity and ambiguous perception in that Russia is read as a bizarre Other because of the constant interruptions. In Helen Funk Rieselbach's opinion (1985: 83), Natalia is one of the agents of Razumov's destruction, which is particularly evident because the love story the reader is led to expect cannot succeed. She continues that "Razumov believes that to cause Haldin's sister to fall in love with his betrayer would

be an enormous crime in itself, but it is hard to imagine what devilish plan Razumov intended to put into effect after marriage: just what is it that would make Natalia cry out with terror and disgust?" (1985: 83). From this, we can assume that, through making Natalia and himself suffer, Razumov intends to take revenge. Yet this conclusion is dubious because, according to Orthodox belief, in so doing he may arrive at the stage of purification of their sinful souls (Young 1998: 169-171). From a traditional Christian view, the characters' pain and suffering may be considered to be the "work of perfection" required of those who wish to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Thus the protagonists and their activity are imagined within the cultural system which dictates its norms and beliefs and imposes its power over their lives. We identify them with Russia, "the land of spectral ideas and disembodied aspirations" (*UWE* 2003: 20), whose imperfect system can be read through the characters' images.

In *The Birds Fall Down*, similar ideas can be identified. West's heroine, the young Laura Rowan, who accompanies her aged grandfather, becomes closely involved in the action. She is left alone to witness his tragic story and death. After being ejected from the train in a French provincial town where she knows nobody, she becomes destined to take care of her own life alone: "She went back to the window and looked out through lenses of her tears" (*Birds* 1978: 263). It is the first time in her life that she has experienced grief and sorrow in such depth. She is not in Russia, but she realizes that if there had been more order and peace in that land, her grandfather would not have been exiled, and so she would not have been left on her own in a foreign country. There would not have been such a person as Kamensky, Nikolai's trusted advisor and friend who, as we have seen, is revealed to be a double agent, a traitor. Now Laura knows too much, and her figure becomes central to the novel.

Although she is quite sceptical about Kamensky's remark when he quotes Pechorin's words from Lermontov's *A Hero of Our Time* about the hatred of one's native land and eagerness for its annihilation (*Birds* 1978: 305), she now has a twofold feeling towards Russia. On the one hand, she feels a great patriotism, and as a result, she returns to that country with her mother at the end of the novel as the Revolution is approaching. On the other hand, she feels herself betrayed by it and finds some painful truth in Kamensky's words: "It couldn't be written by anybody but a Russian. Only a Russian could feel this, Miss Laura, and it is what all Russian who love Russia passionately must feel and do feel" (1978: 305). By saying this, Kamensky means a dubious patriotic feeling of hatred and love, typical of any Russian. This perception becomes very relevant to Laura's own view. Longing for her father to arrive, and finally receiving a message from Madame Verrier about his coming, she feels an immense relief and gratitude: "Laura took her hand

and kissed it, she was glad she was abroad where one could do such things. She looked towards the folding doors and said in Russian, "Grandfather, I'm safe, my father's here", and repeated to herself in English, "he's here, he's here." (1978: 321). In other words, Laura, with her experience of fear, confusion and instability is the embodiment of the same Russia which has cast its shadows on the characters' lives.

Kamensky, the double agent in the novel, is based on the case of Azef, who was the leader of the strongest terrorist organization in Russia during the early years of the twentieth century. According to Wolfe (1971: 125), West uses her knowledge of the tsarist agent, spying and pre-1917 Russia politics to make a brilliant character portrait. She never mentions Azef by name in the foreword to the novel, but she mentions the train conversation widely known to have led to his exposure (Christensen 2006: 85). Although Razumov is a different kind of character, it can be assumed that Conrad, too, borrowed elements from Azef's case.[51] Double agency is one of the elements which supports the idea of the otherness of the nation being represented through the uncertainty and disorder in the characters' lives and their setting. Kamensky and Razumov are hybrid characters. The former serves both the tsarists and the revolutionaries, with a contradictory vision of both systems, while the latter is an instable character who becomes a spy at the end. He is represented as a lonely victim and at the same time as a victimizer. The indeterminacy of the placement of the protagonists suggests that both West and Conrad are somehow exploring the ambiguity of Russian national identity. In other words, the writers construct the nation as being pulled both ways: as one of the characters expresses it, "we are a northern people, but a southern people too" (*Birds* 1978: 242). In other words, in probing their own selves, Razumov and Kamensky signify the ambiguity of their nation and its perpetual search for "true" identity.

However, like Conrad's constructions of the Russian setting and images full of betrayal and darkness, West's heroine's expectations are pessimistic. When Laura's father finally arrives, he expresses indifference to her, being completely wrapped up in his affair with his wife's best friend. As Mr Rowan himself admits: "the things went wrong as apparently they can very easily in Russia, if I may say so without offending you, Monsieur Kamensky" (1978: 328). In his reference to Kamensky lies a great philosophical double meaning in relation to the representa-

---

[51] *Under Western Eyes* was in its first stages in 1908 when Azef's case was being exposed. It also had a direct connection to the Plehve murder of 1904, which Conrad explicitly incorporated into his story (Zabel 1966: 124-125).

tion of Laura's situation in particular, and the whole of Russia in general, as observed by a man with a Western perspective (her father is an Englishman). On the one hand, we know that Laura's father is not aware of Kamensky's real character, and still believes in his devotion and friendship towards the Rowan family. On the other hand, Mr Rowan's comment suggests a certain suspicion of Kamensky as a Russian who might become exposed to the tests of challenge and moral probity which a tsarist Russia of tyranny and chaos might offer. Kamensky is the embodiment of a threat, endowed with that destructive force of humanity which Orwell exploits in his *Animal Farm* (1945).

Interpreted primarily as a satire on any totalitarian regime, and the Russian revolution in particular, Orwell's novel represents men as the tsarists who are deposed, while the pigs are the communists. None of the animals can ever behave as cruelly as those unconsciously power-hungry people (Davison 1987: vii). Although the philosophical meaning of the novel was intended to have a wider application, *Animal Farm* is very relevant to the Russian case (1987: vii). We can identify similar practices of representation in all the three novels: Kamensky or Mr Rowan (in *The Birds Fall Down*), Selwyn (in *The Beginning of Spring*), and Razumov (in *Under Western Eyes*) could all have been inhabitants of Animal Farm. In their anxious desire to gain power, they all become implicated in guilt. In their relations to the people closest to them, Mr Rowan and Selwyn can be compared to the farm animals in relation to their owner Mr Jones: the former depose the latter, which demonstrates what Wolfe calls the "lunatic" force of power (1971: 128).[52] The character of Kamensky parallels the character of Snowball: both function as secret agents whose conspiracy brings destruction. Razumov's figure can be juxtaposed against Napoleon: the actions of both end in annihilation.

The construction of their personal images transforms them into, in Auerbach's words, "something truly monstrous" (1953: 523), which establishes affinities with the situation in Russia. This study has already referred to the "passionate intensity of experience" and modifications of the characters that Auerbach has identified in Russian realistic writing. For Laura, Mr Rowan and Kamensky now represent a coalition which "she bracketed as enemies" (*Birds* 1978: 355). Pitifully enough, this "union" consists of two people, one of whom is her relative, the other her family's close friend. As Wolfe puts it (1971: 115), West's world, in which "strangers prove more friendly than close relatives, is bound to terrify" (he means

---

[52] Meaning "the idea-ridden public man who neglects the persons and things closest to him" (Wolfe 1971: 128).

Chubinov, who becomes Laura's real friend). The same situation prevails in the Aubrey home in her novel *The Fountain Overflows* (1957*)*, which is full of strangers and in which West has tried to explore, in Wolfe's words, "the opaqueness of people", the total strangeness of those who we live with (1971: 103). As a result, Laura remains the only stable character at the end of the novel, and becomes "more like a judge than a young girl" (*Birds* 1978: 322). She is rejected, betrayed, and left alone with two men, each of whom is a betrayer himself: "So strong was her sense of loss that her fingers closed on her handbag lest that went too. Everything seemed gone from her body except her heart, which felt as if it were made of glass and had cracked into a thousand sharp-edged fragments, which were holding together" (1978: 350-351). In this situation, she is represented as a spirited young creature, grown up enough to judge her life and people seriously. Abandoned as she is, she thinks to herself:

> There must be a crucial ending if people were as wretched as she was, abandoned, feeble, betrayed, unjustly sentenced, exiled, taken for less than they were, put below others who were their inferior. She supposed they died. Well, she hoped that, dead, her father would realize that he had killed her (*Birds* 1978: 351).

At this very moment of intensity and culmination, the image of Russia becomes particularly acute. When trying to tell her father about the conspiracy she knows about Kamensky, Laura finds it very easy to name those Russians who have been involved in secret activity, such as Gorin, Kamensky and Chubinov. Her father, on the other hand, "always muddled up Russian names" (1978: 352). When examining the consequences of these misinterpretations, Laura regards this as quite "odd for a man who spoke and read Russian, who had visited Russia several times, and had been married to a Russian wife for over twenty years" (1978: 352). All this gives her a sense of the renunciation of Russia, and as a result of Laura herself that her father practices as she inevitably feels her involvement and origin in Russian identity:

> It could only mean that he had turned his face against Russia. He wanted to reject the wild mating of consonants and vowels which made the Russian language, he would be unkind to the confusion of good and evil, of imagination and obtuseness, of delicacy and coarseness, which made the Russian character. He wanted to reject everything Russian, and she was half-Russian, so of course he would reject her and her way of thinking. (*Birds* 1978: 352)

Laura's striking characteristic is resignation, and although she is represented as a mature and intelligent young girl, she is not strong enough to rebel against her

father. It is not only the Russian language, with its discordance and variety, to blame for Mr Rowan's change in spirit. It is also the imposition of English superiority which is embedded in his character to express the submissive position of Laura as a half Russian character. When in Russia, Mr Rowan discovers a great deal of contrast and contradiction characterizing the nation. The discordance and diversity of the Russian language represents one of them. Lord Byron, who was himself "delighted with the poetic comedy of Russian names" (Wolff 1994: 141), wrote in the nineteenth century: "How shall I spell the name of each Cossacque Who were immortal could one tell their story?" (Byron 1996: Canto VII, Stanza XIV, lines 2-3). Mr Rowan, too, finds them odd. It is, in a way, West's attempt to show the tension between otherness, in that Mr Rowan perceives Russia with what Conrad calls "Western eyes" and similarity, in that Mr Rowan and Laura are family, that this study has also distinguished in early English writing. This occasional breaking down of binaries and establishing of interstitial positions constructs a multifaceted image of Russia and makes the novel so many-sided.

Although the scene takes place in France, the image of Russia works as an intertextual object. It does not physically exist in the episodes, but is in constant dialogue with the other images or voices in the novel and revealing the hybrid nature of such representation. As *The Birds Fall Down* was written after *Under Western Eyes*, there is a certain "permutation of the text" (in Kristeva's words), a transformation of the earlier narrative, or a fusion of the memory of several pre-revolutionary novels written by Conrad, such as *The Secret Agent* (1907) or *Nostromo* (1904) (Allen 2000: 35). The evocations of the former are clearly seen in West's characters and their activity: Verloc, the secret agent who betrays his wife; in their setting – a grubby, sordid London which can be paralleled with tsarist Russia. As to the latter, we find a great deal of imagination in West's novel, which alludes to Conrad's creation of Costaguana in that the events take place in the imagined country, not exactly mapped but defined by the writers through their representations. West's "Russia" on the train is a completely imagined country and becomes a symbolic setting for the events. Although the storyline unfolds on a train or in France, there is an awareness of reading a Russian novel, that is to say, a novel about Russia. Similarly, Conrad's St. Petersburg represents Russia as a place of alienation and liminality, never described with a profusion of detail, but simply as a place which contrasts with Geneva. These representational practices are used by Conrad and West throughout their novels, always with slight variations.

For Kristeva, it is this modification that endows a text with its otherness and difference. According to Winegarten (1984: 231), in Conrad's representation both revolutionary and reactionary, betrayer and betrayed, are all pitied together. In

other words, we feel similar compassion towards Razumov, Haldin and Russia in particular. The writer lifts the antagonists to a higher level. Zabel holds that Conrad puts himself to the test of reconciling his effort in sympathy with his known view of Russia. Conrad was bred to fear Russia as Poland's traditional enemy and oppressor, and in his letters on Russia, he expressed an open fear and contemptuous hostility. In Zabel's words, "his personal conscience to which he may have subjected himself, or his sensitivity to the debates of his compatriots stimulated in him a profound sympathy and loyalty in people, even in the Russians" (1966: 139). Thus, not only did he manage to "enter the Russian drama as a critic and observer – a man of 'Western eyes' – but also to penetrate it as a participant and a sharer in Russian destiny; he had to become a Russian to write the book" (1966: 136). In other words, Conrad's attempt to conceal the border between the oppositions of the characters in the text makes his writing different from West's.

Unlike Conrad, Rebecca West did not seek to pass beyond good and evil in the construction of literary images. There is a clear differentiation in her novel between the representation of virtues and villains, betrayed and betrayers. Laura unwillingly becomes a wholly-engaged participant in the events, as does Nikolai, who wants to go back to Russia so much that "his longing for his fatherland was terrible to witness" (*Birds* 1978: 278). They are on the same level with the image of Russia itself, which is pitied, and to some extent, represented ironically by the writer. These protagonists both believe in a complete recovery of the Russian state, and its "coming out into the light" (1978: 435). Laura's return to Russia with her mother confirms their vision of the country as a place where "nobody'll be poor, nobody will be oppressed" (1978: 436). Conversely, there are such heroes and heroines in the novel as Kamensky, for example, "who seems a very decent fellow", but in fact "is the same as this scoundrel Gorin" (1978: 352), or Susie Staunton, Tania's best friend, who, in Laura's opinion, "had some large, coarse reason for despising Tania" (1978: 350). West constructs the images of her characters on the principle of contrasts, representing them as the opposition.

However, on a larger scale these differences do not separate the texts from their main context. We do not completely lose our relation to the meaning of "the symbolic" (in Kristeva's words), or in other words we can interpret the representation of images from both novels in a similar way. Texts do not utilize previous textual units but transform them and give them a new position, a process which Kristeva calls "transposition" (Allen 2000: 53). Consequently, although we can find some accounts which pull against that attempt at producing something familiar, bringing some "otherness" into the text, we can nevertheless argue that this is done by the writers for different purposes.

As mentioned earlier, the meaning devoted to a representation is determined by culture and the time in which it is set. When reading Russia in the novels, it is early twentieth-century civilization itself which suggests the culture-determined meaning for the representation. Only "this land can generate lives of countless people", such as Ziemianitch – "the bright Russian soul" (*UWE* 2003: 18), Haldin – "murdering foolishly" (2003: 20) and Razumov, driven from benumbed fatalism to expiatory truth in his deeds. As the narrator says in *Under Western Eyes* (2003: 70), "I suppose one must be a Russian to understand Russian simplicity, a terrible corroding simplicity in which mystic phrases clothe a naïve and hopeless cynicism." According to Wolfe (1971: 121), the isolated nation or community, separated from other cultures, acts as its own audience and measure of excellence. In other words, the representation of the characters and their deeds in the novels is not a random choice of the authors, but rather a logical sequence, stemming from the conditions of the particular culture. Thus, had there not been a Russia in the novels, the construction of the setting and those of the characters would be completely different. This argument correlates with the previously-stated argument that representations are cultural constructs that cannot be separated from the larger cultural stratum out of which they are constructed.

Overall, Conrad's and West's constructions of the representation of Russia have intertextual connections. Both writers use a symbolic way of representation in their attempt to reconstruct the setting and atmosphere of pre-Revolutionary Russia. In doing so, they manage to construct a series of images, none of which is a mere reflection of the world, but rather a symbol that conveys meaning. Tsarist Russia, with its politics, is represented via unsympathetic characters' lives and deeds, such as those of Kamensky and Razumov, and anarchism and ferocity find their embodiment in Chubinov and Haldin (in *The Birds Fall Down* and *Under Western Eyes* respectively). Mr Rowen's and Laura's images – "a truly Russian girl, full of ideals" (*Birds* 1978: 211) – evoke a Russian pre-Revolutionary world of pain and suffering, frustration and betrayal. Although Nikolai is represented as a positive character who becomes a victim of the events, he accidentally causes affliction to those who love him such as Laura and Tania, and becomes an unsympathetic figure. Through a construction of all these images, West and Conrad demonstrate the enormous complexity and domination of the destructive forces that took shape in early twentieth-century Russia. As Laura remarks, the "good and evil, imagination and obtuseness, delicacy and coarseness which made the Russian character" (*Birds* 1978: 352) turned into fatality. Russia is perceived as a cataclysmic state through the representation of the characters.

With its political and social situation taking shape in the early twentieth century, Russia is represented as a complex Other and a subtle protagonist in Penelope

Fitzgerald's novel *The Beginning of Spring*. The events take place in Moscow in 1913 at a time of upheaval and social unrest. The central figure is an Englishman, Frank Reid, who runs his printing business and his home alone because his wife Nellie, together with their three children, has left him to return to her native land, England. Frank is represented as a very unstable character who cannot cope with his situation because of his inability to perceive and comprehend many of the events happening around him. His misperception of the world, which is shaken and as if ready to collapse, results in his wandering through a series of chaotic events each of which brings him a new misfortune. Frank's printing press becomes a semi-legal business in pre-revolutionary Russia as it is exposed to the "threats that livened the bloodstream of the city" (*Spring* 1998: 43). His home is fully out of control as he has never run the routines alone. Moreover, he is uncertain about having enough courage to take care of his three children, whom Nellie has sent home from the railway station, realizing that she cannot cope with them. As Dolly, the eldest daughter, expresses it, "she'd never had to look after us before, Dunyasha did everything. She had to send us back, we weren't a comfort to her" (1998: 21). Tired of his single parenthood, Frank hires a young Russian peasant woman, Lisa Ivanovna, to take care of his children: with her "pale, broad, patient, dreaming Russian face" (1998: 82), she disappears without a trace among the birch trees at night in what can be considered to be the most imagined and mystical episode in the novel. Overall, these images and life situations serve as signifiers to construct the most unstable and ambiguous image of all, that of Russia.

Fitzgerald completes this task in different ways. Frank is the embodiment of that otherness and proximity between Russia and England which this study has earlier discussed in detail. On the one hand Frank, born and brought up in Russia, is russified, becoming accustomed to the Russian way of life and tradition, while on the other he remains a foreigner, thinking that one day the likelihood of having to leave Russia may increase. When one of the anarchist students, Volodya, intrudes into Frank's life, visiting his press and trying to shoot him, he does not find enough courage to defend himself as he is afraid of putting himself under suspicion. He remains unshaken and does not call for the police. Volodya in turn is convinced that, even if Frank were ejected from the country, it would not make him suffer because he is a foreigner, and Russia is not his homeland. In Volodya's opinion, the worst that Frank could suffer as an overseer, if things didn't go right, would be deportation from Moscow back to Frank's home country. As he says: "A Russian can't live away from Russia, but to you it's nothing" (1998: 107). However, according to the Russian proverb: "Open the doors and here comes trouble" (1998: 108): unsuspecting, Frank becomes an object of mistrust when he is turned over to the police as a dangerous alien. It is only the old Russian tradi-

tion of bribe-giving that saves his life. Thus, living in a distorted country where the word for "bribe" becomes one of the first words to be learnt by a non-Russian speaker (*Spring* 1998: 22), Frank realises the inevitability of his position, which both discriminates against him and makes him adjust to the community.

Russia has long been regarded by the English as alien and different, and the appearance of foreigners in the land has often been associated with commerce. Even when the Muscovite mind was more than ever closed to external contacts, in 1553, Russia was opened to England for business purposes (Milton 1929: 13). The English remained the principal commercial power there until 1649 (1929: 9). In these works, English commercial supremacy in Russia was regarded as one of the manifestations of English superiority. The description of the English travellers voyaging to the Russian land and described by John Milton in his *A Brief History of Muscovia* (1682), in Archer's view "resemble Satan in the empty materialism of their quest for wealth in a land of slavery" (2001: 138). The whole passage is relevant here:

> The Discovery of Russia by the Northern Ocean, made first, of any Nation that we know, by *English* men, might have seem'd an enterprise almost heroick; if any higher end than the excessive love of Gain and Traffick, had animated the design. Nevertheless that in regard that many things not unprofitable to the knowledge of Nature, and other Observations are hereby come to light, as good events oft times arise from evil occasions, it will not be the worst labour to relate briefly the beginning, and prosecution of this adventurous Voiage; until it became at last a familiar Passage. (Milton 1929: 79-80)

In this sense, Frank, too, "as a business resident in good standing" (*Spring* 1998: 107), has occupied the position of authority, and has been asked for assistance in many situations: "He had a reputation for doing what he could, otherwise these people wouldn't have gone on coming to him, but all of them, at one point or another, reminded him that he was a foreigner who, even if things didn't go right, had nothing to lose" (1998: 107). His quest for material pleasure approximates him to Satan in Russia. As an overseer, he is the embodiment of Western materialism, which is juxtaposed against Eastern asceticism such as that of Selwyn Crane.

The scene where Frank visits Rusalochka and carelessly spends his money places him in a superior position to the one that other characters in the novel occupy. Thomas Mann's description of Russian holidaymakers is relevant here. "Barbarously rich" in their sables and diamonds, they are full representatives of the Russian inside-out world (Skidelsky 1999: 52). Frank strongly believes that Russia is a land where God gives people all the pleasures of life, and as he reconsiders him-

self to be a Russian, he feels that he should use his chance to explore this joy. As he says, "When I die, God will say to me, well, I gave you a life on earth, Arkady Filippovich, and what's more, a life in Russia. Did you enjoy it? And if not, why have you wasted your time?" (*Spring* 1998: 99). This is one of those many contrasts which oppose him to Crane, who cannot even criticize Frank because he does not understand him (1998: 99). In other words, Frank's otherness does not prevent him from occupying a historical superiority, and he still occupies a dominant position in relation to the Russian characters in the novel.

The description of Uncle Charlie's arrival from England at the Reids' house reveals the same idea. Fitzgerald describes him as "a distinguished relative from a foreign country" who is so affected by Russian hospitality and "the excitement of the servants' greeting" that he feels himself "less like a man on an awkward and distressing mission than a tripper on a day-outing" (*Spring* 1998: 129). Charlie immediately admits the difference between his homeland and Russia: the warmth of the Russian household, the interior of Frank's house saturated with oriental motifs, the lavishness of the food and a diversity of colours that evoke the East, make Charlie associate everything he observes with "the Arabian nights" (1998: 132). He says to Frank "you'll feel the difference when you come to the end of your ministry here and go back home again" (1998: 132). As in *The Birds Fall Down*, we are faced with a perpetual dilemma between the Eastern and the Western, imagination and reason, through which the ambiguity of the nation and the instability of the time are represented.

The allusion of Russia to the East was expressed by Milton in his *Paradise Lost* (1667), where he not only mentions Russia by the side of Persia and Greece, but also puts them in a position of equivalence:

> Down to the golden Chersonese, or where
> The Persian in Ecbatan sate, or since
> In Hispahan, or where the Russian Ksar
> In Mosco, or the Sultan in Bizance (1966: XI. 392-395)

Archer argues (2001: 65) that Milton locates the decadence of empire in the East while simultaneously criticizing the imperial ambitions of the restored Stuart monarchy. For Milton, Asia is a holy land, the seat of human community and civilization, but also a land condemned to a perpetual cycle of imperial rise and fall heralded by the primal Fall itself. In Archer's view, Adam's anger exemplifies how passion overtakes reason (2001: 79), or how the eastern tradition of the freedom of the imagination dominates western reason. This study has already identified similar ideas in West and Conrad. The destruction of the Garden of Eden represented by Milton can be juxtaposed against the idea of destruction con-

tained in the image of the birds falling down in *The Birds Fall Down*. In Frank's opinion, too, Russia is "centered on its holy citadel, impeded by Greeks and Persians and bewildered villages" (*Spring* 1998: 35). In other words, the association of "holy" Russia with the holy East results in an association in which oriental tradition seems to dominate the occidental. However, the idea encapsulates Frank's immense delusion and his inability to perceive the events which happen around him. In *Paradise Lost* Satan's venture through Chaos and the well-travelled bridge between Hell and Earth are associated with the discovery of Russia (Archer 2001: 138). Through a similar journey, Frank himself rediscovers and redefines Russia at the end of the novel, at the time of Russia's rebirth and Nellie's return.

Frank's utopian vision of holy Russia alludes to Razumov's constant recalling in *Under Western Eyes* of the nation's spiritual belonging. Fitzgerald portrays a man with English ancestry but rooted in ancient Russian tradition. In this we can trace the construction of a similarity between England and Russia, whose representation has a long literary tradition. Even in Frank's appearance, we can detect the oriental motifs of a traditional Russian costume, "unusual for an English business man" (*Spring* 1998: 10). Like Conrad's protagonists, Frank is a solitary hero who seeks his asylum and reconciliation in the land of Russia. Orphaned as he is, he calls himself "a child of Moscow" (1998: 39), trying to compensate for the loss of his parents. Although his bewildered feelings towards the country drive him to the idea of departure, he desperately hopes to find his destiny there. As he says, "dear slovenly, mother Moscow, bemused with the bells of its four times forty churches, indifferently sheltering factories, whore-houses and golden domes" (1998: 35-36) becomes his only parent. Thus his mixed feelings about Russia can be allied with a perplexing play of emotion and reason, with East and West. He is as hybrid as Russia itself. Into both, a substantial proportion of Eastern and Western traditions are compressed.

However, at some points in the novel, Frank is represented as a Western hero. As Selwyn Crane states, he is too pragmatic a character to "grasp the importance of what is beyond sense or reason", (*Spring* 1998: 11). He never loses his temper, and is, it seems, completely unimaginative. Frank cannot comprehend many of the events taking place because his pragmatic mind is not ready for any kind of improvisation. When he discovers Nellie's absence, he becomes obsessed with recalling details of his marriage so as to find a logical explanation for her departure, while Crane, who is responsible for most of the events that happen to Reid, encourages him to rethink his relationships with his wife and with the young servant. In other words, Fitzgerald's constructions of her protagonist create a two-

fold image of a character, who is, while assimilated into Russia, still a western-minded hero and a foreigner.

A considerable part of the spiritual significance with which the writer endows her characters is ingrained in the image of Selwyn Crane, who is a double agent in the novel. However, unlike Conrad's Razumov, or West's Kamensky, who serve both parties for their own good, he functions as a symbol. Crane acts as a birch broom, sweeping away the evil spirits that haunt Frank Reid (Noe 2001: 204). Thus, despite Crane's ability to bring misfortune into Frank's life, he also operates as an agent to enable him to ponder events and reconsider them. Noe argues (2001: 204-205) that, symbolically, Crane provides the punishing cut of the birch rod, which has traditionally been associated with a schoolboy punishment. The birch doubles with writing: the bark of some birch varieties is used in papermaking. All this is integrated into his character by representing Crane on the one hand as the poet of *Birch Tree Thoughts*, a collection of poems glorifying nature in which a birch tree is an animated feminine creature, and on the other as a man who preaches the virtues of life: "He is always on his way from one place to another, searching out want and despair" (*Spring* 1998: 11). Thus we see him first as if intended to cause Frank harm, as a man who orchestrates most of his misfortunes (that is, a symbolic representation of punishment), and secondly as the person who tries to rescue him, like a birch tree which is both a symbol of witches and a tool used to ward them off. Moreover, in Russia, the birch also symbolizes young women and spring. As Crane writes: "Dost feel the cold, sister birch?" "No, Brother Snow, I feel it not" (*Spring* 1998: 78). Consequently, the image of Crane contains signifiers such as his ambiguous identity, imaginative way of thinking and passion for the Russian birch which allude to Russia.

Crane is full of imagination, which contrasts with Frank's image: "Perhaps, though, 'reasonable' wasn't, in connection with Selwyn, quite the right word" (*Spring* 1998: 8). He looks "kindly smiling, earnestly questing, not quite sane-looking, seemed to have let himself waste away, from other-worldliness, almost to transparency" (1998: 10). He is fully representative of the Eastern tradition that Russia partly constitutes. Wearing "a high-necked Russian peasant's blouse, a tribute to the memory of Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy" (1998: 10), Crane is the embodiment of Tolstoy's asceticism. As most of Frank's adversity happens as a result of Crane's activity to some extent, Selwyn has control over Reid's life, resulting in his imagination overtaking reason, a feature of West's and Conrad's novels as a whole, in which the folly of reason, the embodiment of the Western tradition, and the rule of imagination, the image of the Eastern tradition, are set against each other. In other words, Crane is one of those characters in the novel who signifies paradoxically the folly of reason and eastern senselessness. Like Samuel Butler's

Higgs in *Erewhon,* who lives in a place, an anagram of nowhere, in which everything contradicts normal logic, Crane dwells in the land of Russia, a University of Unreason[53] which generates such figures as Selwyn, Kamensky (in *The Birds Fall Down*) and Razumov (in *Under Western Eyes*), and many others.

According to Skidelsky, it was the Russian philosopher Peter Chaadaev who first admitted the nation's backwardness and the restless frivolity of Russians – a kind of inversion of the Puritan work ethic – caused by the failure of the Orthodox religion to inculcate the basic civic virtues of duty, justice, right, and order (Skidelsky 1999: 53).[54] He continues:

> The eastern church has always been more otherworldly than its western counterpart. Rooted in monasticism, it has emphasized personal sanctification over involvement in the affairs of the world. Unlike the Catholic church, it has never developed a body of legal or political doctrine. Its delicate spirituality has proved incapable of laying the foundations of temporal order. Surely this is the root of that terrible and destructive dreaminess, the glory of Russian literature and the bane of Russian history (1999: 53).

This bottom-up society is imagined as completely different, yet it possesses some of the Western world's experience in reverse. Veiled ideas of perversion can be traced in representations of Russia in nineteenth-century literary texts, yet they are not presented as such. For example, Lewis Carroll, who visited Russia in 1867, was influenced by its "strangeness, bewildering natives and inverted alphabet", and so his *Through the Looking Glass*, published four years later, alluded to this feeling of exotic perversion (Skidelsky 1999: 180). Jules Verne's *Twenty-Thousand Leagues Under the Sea* and *Around the World in Eighty Days* (1876), which have become popular among Russian readers, also provide accounts of Russia in which she is as represented as intriguing and bizarre.

Pre-Revolutionary Russia represented in *The Beginning of Spring* produces countless lives in modified or reversed form. All through the novel, we observe how the characters' fortunes are gradually ruined in a country where destructive forces are working at their full extension. Fitzgerald's study of destruction is closely related to her exploration of the origins of sin. Yet, unlike West and Conrad, who

---

[53] To emphasize the whimsicality and absurdity of the imagined civilization that Samuel Butler's protagonist Higgs discovers in *Erewhon* (1872), the writer uses this term to refer to the Institution where Higgs goes to study, a place where students study anything that has absolutely no practical purpose.

[54] In 1836, Chaadayev first expressed the idea of Catholicism as being the only religion of European culture. Thus, as the Russians were Orthodox Christians, he regarded them as non-Europeans (Skidelsky 1999: 53).

see the foundation of sin in guilt, Fitzgerald identifies it with loss, a feature which unites all her characters. As one of them asserts, "what binds us together is the knowledge of the wrongs we have done to one another" (*Spring* 1998: 186). These "wrongs" are associated with deprivation: Frank, who is dispossessed of his wife, then his mistress, and later his friend (Crane); Nellie, who loses her family on her leaving home; the children (Dolly, Ben and Annushka), who are left with a single parent when they are deprived of their mother. However, because Crane is a child of the land of Russia for him "loss isn't a matter for regret but for rejoicing" (*Spring* 1998: 11). He understands dispossession "as a form of poverty" (1998: 11), but one in which people may take pleasure. According to his vision, one may obtain spiritual freedom by losing something and becoming poorer. Like Tolstoy, who attempted to live as a simple peasant and give possessions away not only because he wanted to make them richer, but also because he was a preacher of asceticism (Durant 1935: 627), Crane is self-disciplined. Even in Marx's words, some justifications of poverty might be recognised: "the proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win" (1958: 65). Thus, in Crane's vision, all the losers in the novel gain by becoming dispossessed of somebody in that they find freedom: and this applies even to Frank himself, who is "a child of Moscow" (*Spring* 1998: 39).

This philosophical thinking may stand for a variety of serfdom, and may be rooted only in Russia. Although Russian slavery is not openly depicted in the novel (even Frank's servant Lisa Ivanovna is exalted by having a love affair with her master), it is invisibly present. Instead, what really becomes explicit is the representation of loss which replaces slavery and functions as a cataclysmic device to reinforce the spirit of the setting. Love, too, is represented as a kind of loss in the book, an equivalent which has a certain affinity with West's portrait of love as a sort of death. As Tess argues (2000: 2), "love in Fitzgerald's books serves as a barometer of the characters' self-knowledge; it is rarely requited, and when it is, even for the most self-aware, it is often unsatisfactory". Even Frank's passion towards Moscow does not comfort him, as there are many things in his life which prevent him from fully perceiving it: "Frank's affection for Moscow came over him at odd and inappropriate times and in indistinguished places" (*Spring* 1998: 35). Almost all the characters in the novel suffer from imperfect love affairs. In this, as suggested earlier, there is the manifestation of that spirituality which relates the events in the novel to the place of their setting, that is, to Russia. As in Fitzgerald's *The Gate of Angels* (1990), which takes place in England on the eve of the First World War, where Angels serve as intangible signifiers of a new life and reconciliation between the protagonists, in *The Beginning of Spring* it is the approach of the Revolution that functions as a sign of rebirth. Nellie's return, the

beginning of spring and Frank's new vision of life are the constructions through which we can observe the inevitable change which the Revolution offers.

The atmosphere of instability and discontent that took shape in pre-Revolutionary Russia casts its shadow not only on the characters, but also on the setting. Although Fitzgerald does not picture a political situation in the country, her vivid depictions of the mood of the milieu enable us to perceive the subtle meanings. They are concealed behind such representations as the oriental odours of the place: "The air was thick with the smell of lamp-oil and cigarettes from Greek-tended tobacco gardens of the Black Sea" (*Spring* 1998: 54), or a diversity of tints of the Eastern sky, as if different from a Western sky: "a curious streak of bright lemon-yellow ran across the slate-coloured sky" (1998: 10). It is also the tranquillity of an account of autumn, replaced later on by a severe Russian winter, that creates a spirit of the time: "there was not a breath of wind, and under the glowing white sky tinged with pink from the horizon which seemed to fume with a warning of frost, the scant leaves were hanging motionless from the lime trees" (1998: 50). Fitzgerald's image of the Russian winter, when even the house is "deaf, turned inwards, able to listen only to itself" (1998: 187) is endowed, like Russia itself, with a solitude and isolation in which no other church bells are allowed to ring apart from the Orthodox ones (1998: 67). With the beginning of spring, everything changes:

> Now the sound of Moscow broke in, the bells and voices, the cabs and taxis which had gone by all winter unheard like ghosts of themselves, and with the noise came the spring wind, fresher than it felt in the street, blowing in uninterrupted from the northern regions where the frost still lay (1998: 187).

This is the time of a spiritual revival of Russia, represented through Frank's recovery, when he discovers the falsity of Selwyn's attitude towards him and the fiction of his feelings towards Lisa Ivanovna, who, as Frank finally admits, "is solid flesh" and "not an incident" (1998: 183). In other words, it is the time when a life cycle is finalized: everything settles down and works as a boomerang: "Frank opened the door, and Nellie walked into the house" (1998: 187). On this optimistic note, we approach the end of the story, although many things in it, like Russia itself, remain ambiguous.

Fitzgerald's optimistic view of a possible Revolution can be interpreted as the idea that revolutions should effect radical improvement. It is also Fitzgerald's attempt to construct the continuity of the world and to emphasize the cyclic nature of time. Although her characters are all the time affected by destructive forces, the novel has an assured dénouement that life is to be continued. Whatever happens, spring will recoil on itself! This is probably the reason why Fitzgerald

chooses spring and the birch to symbolically represent the resurrection of life and Russia in particular. Finally, as in Laura's case in *The Birds Fall Down*, we can also find a certain irony in the representation of Nellie's return to Russia and Frank's reinstatement on the eve of the Revolution. In other words, the dénouement of the novel can also signify Fitzgerald's pessimistic view of the future of Russia. The writer captures the spirit of time embedded in the images of her characters, through which we can read Russia.

The image of the nation constructed in the three novels, generates the representation of an ambiguous, unstable community symbolically located between the polarities of a Holy land and barbarity, between Eastern and Western civilizations. It is a world of treachery and destruction which produces double agents, traitors and losers disguised by their holiness and the preaching of Orthodox virtues. The stereotypical construction of Russian characters such as Razumov, Kamensky and Crane, or English-Russian characters such as Edward and Frank as dual personalities, exemplifies this idea. They are represented as the products of Russian society, a system contrasted with the English, resulting in the creation of a different national character, irrational, senseless and simplistic. With all this, the characters' paradoxical ways of thinking and acting seem to be incomprehensible to the Western mind.

6 TWO NATIONAL OTHERS

> Like the Jews that Moses led out of Egyptian slavery, the half-savage, stupid, ponderous people of the Russian villages and hamlets – all those almost terrible people … – will die out, and a new tribe will take their place – literate, sensible, hearty people.
>
> Maxim Gorky, *On The Russian Peasantry*, 1922.

> There is now only one master of the Russian land: the union of the workers, soldiers, and peasants …
>
> John Reed, *Ten Days That Shook the World,* 1919.

> Russians are simple people, not at all sophisticated, really, compared to Westerners [Kamensky].
>
> Rebecca West, *The Birds Fall Down*, 1966.

For centuries, English literary texts constructed an image of the Russian nation as either alien and different, or holy and chosen by God. These past practices of representation offered a binary model for twentieth-century writers to imagine Russia. The Russian way of thinking was often interpreted as senseless and whimsical, qualities which helped many Europeans to perceive the nation as oriental and underdeveloped.[55] Its lack of freedom and respect for the individual resulted in the rejection of reason and rationality as attributes of the Russian national character. The picture of backward simplicity which was generated by European writers in general, and the English in particular, initiated ideas of spirituality, simplicity

---

[55] After the European "discovery" of Russia by Richard Chancellor in 1553, the image of Russia as backward, Asiatic and oriental started to take shape (see chapter 4; Hakluyt 1985: 62-63; Pipes 1995: 204-205; Wolff 1994: 10-15, 30-35). In the first half of the sixteenth century Rabelais mentioned Muscovites along with Indians, Persians, and Troglodytes, suggesting that Russia was a part of an Oriental and even mythological domain (Wolff 1994: 10). Evocations of the eastern Russian motif later appeared in essays by Samuel Johnson. *The Rambler* (1750-1752), which he edited, commented on the Muscovite family traditions and the senselessness of the arranged marriage in such a patriarchal society as Russia (Boswell 1966: 1273-1278). The existence of slavery in Russia in the eighteenth century is associated by Wolff with an exotic Oriental experience: "Russian peasants could be bought and sold like black Africans" (1994: 64).

and eastern senselessness which were traditionally associated with the "authentic" Russian character.

Yet, as we have seen earlier, the construction of national characteristics takes place in the interplay between an auto-image and a hetero-image, resulting in the contradictory imageme of the nation. Therefore the attributes of "true" Russianness were not only shaped and defined by the English but also rested on the models offered by many Russian national writers, with some variations. Between 1870 and 1900, Russian novels were discussed in periodicals, and most educated British people would have become familiar with at least some Russian work (Neilson 1995: 96-97). Although not all Russian writers were comprehensible to the average English reader in that Tolstoy's and Dostoyevsky's works were difficult to interpret, the idea which remained clear to the public's knowledge was that Russia was not of Europe, and was different from England. This message was also commented on by Maurice Baring, the author of eight books on Russia published between 1905 and 1914. While believing that Russia was neither of the East nor of the West, Baring disagreed on many points with the prevailing interpretation of Russian literature, trying to make it more intelligible through his work. The existence of his work profoundly contributed to a break with the Russia-as-a-barbaric-land stereotype and opened a new outlook on the nation as cultural civilization.[56]

These ideas received attention from an English audience which became familiar with Russian culture through Constance Garnett's translations of Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, Turgenev, Gogol and Chekhov (May 1994: 33-36). These texts sparked interest and created an indisputable reputation of Russian literature in the English reader.[57] Many Anglophone writers, including West and Conrad, developed a general interest in and became conversant with things Russian through Garnett's work. Yet, according to Rachel May's study (1994), as an English translator of the Russian text, Garnett undeniably functioned as a mediator between two cultures, and a kind of invisible English narrator of the Russian stories, in which the voice of English authority was intertwined with many other voices within the text. Because of this, May maintains that Garnett's translations cannot be regarded as complete substitutes for the original Russian works, but a supplement of English literature.

---

[56] The Russian ballet dominated the London scene in 1911 and later Paris. Marc Chagall's and Wassily Kandinsky's paintings had an enormous success in Paris. Chekhov's plays became a triumph in England (Neilson 1995: 98).

[57] The novels of Turgenev and Tolstoy were popular before the First World War, and Dostoyevsky's popularity came in 1912 (Neilson 1995: 96).

May's argument suggests that many of those Anglophone writers, including West, Conrad and Fitzgerald, who became familiar with Russian literature through English translations (albeit the Slavic-English Conrad only partially), could not deal with the original Russian spirit, and the idea of Russianness which Russian authors initially put into their writing. Instead, what these Anglophone writers were tackling was the interpretation of Russian stories which were limited in Russian spirit. In these stories, Russian culture was revised through the voice of Englishness, becoming alien, binary, and at times simply incomprehensible. Because the reception of "foreign" influences is filtered through *a priori* assumptions of national character (Leerssen 2000: 270), these Anglophone writers as invisible narrators identified some "typical" attributes of the Russian character in Russian texts, which they assumed to be the characteristics of "true" Russianness, and developed them later in commonplace stereotypes.

The idea of the "Russian soul" became one of those characteristics of the Russian national character which the Anglophone writers appropriated to their work, but with a distinctive tendency towards exaggeration, oversimplification and generalization. Although C. Robert Williams argues that the emergence of the "Russian soul" (1997: 20) coincided in time with the emergence of Russians in the European consciousness (1840-1880), the earlier chapters of this work have demonstrated that the characteristics of this, such as the view of Russia as an exotic, unsophisticated and enlightened Other, were exploited by English writers much earlier. In other words, Conrad, West and Fitzgerald exploited both a revised version (that is, in translation) of Russia's auto-image as well as earlier English texts of its hetero-image. This combination resulted in the production of a highly contradictory, binary and predominantly intertextual imageme of Russianness in their novels.

It was Slavophile writers such as Leskov, Gogol and Chekhov who first constructed the peasant as a repository of virtues that the West lacked, creating a positive alternative to the previous external stereotype. They imagined Russia and the Russian character as unique and, unlike the European, not morally corrupt. As a result, Russians were distinguished by possessing a supernatural soul, and represented as more ample and unsophisticated than Westerners.

Williams investigated how Russia had defined its self-image by juxtaposing it against the West. This juxtaposition involved a number of different criteria according to which Russia placed itself in opposition to the rest of the world. Williams analyses some of them, such as Russia's collectivism, revolutionary transcendence, national identity and the creation of the post-Soviet states. Russia defined itself as an organic culture growing from the soil. Williams argues that the

concept of the Russian soul, or *Russkaya dusha,* itself reflects "the originality of not being a Western loan word, but it means the individual virtues of freshness, creativity, life, and imagination associated with natural man [sic] in general and the Russian peasant in particular" (1997: 5). In other words, the construction of this phenomenon established the idea of the Russian soul as a shared possession of all Russian people. This is to define the uniqueness of the nation on the one hand (that is, to demonstrate its difference), and to emphasize its simplicity on the other (that is, the plainness of the Russian character).

The latter connotation can be intrinsically related to simple village life, which derives from the soil. Linguistically, the words *zemlia* "soil" and *dusha* "soul", that is "Mother Russia" and "Russian Soul", are feminine, and draw heavily on centuries-old idioms in Russian literature, oral poetry, and folklore (Haarmann 2000: 2). In the Scythian religious pantheon of the seventh century B. C., where a Great Goddess called Hestia or Tabiti was worshipped, female power was apparent. The Sarmatians, who replaced the Scythians as rulers of the Russian steppes by the third century B. C., appear to have had even stronger ties with female symbols and cultures than their predecessors (Hubbs 1988: 9). The most striking evidence for archaic feminine authority in the family and community is in the religious rites of ancient and modern Russian peasant women (1988: 14). The origin of the traditional Russian toy Matrioshka, which represents a peasant woman stuffed with many children inside, is rooted in peasant feminine culture, and in fact might be a manifestation of the Mother Goddess Mokosh herself.[58] Mokosh was also "moist" to suggest her unity with the waters of the skies and the earth; she roamed the land to fructify the soil, and was linked with generation and nurture (1988: 20). Therefore, the term Mother Russia is a symbolic marker of Russianness that draws on ancient beliefs of earth-bound female divinity (Haarmann 2000: 15), which may explain why the Russian soil is symbolically allied with femininity and simplicity.

In other words, the complex idea of the Russian soul stems from Russian terms which are rooted in the national environment and psyche, and embraces both the collectivistic and nationalistic spirits of the nation. It also possesses what Dale E. Peterson calls a "double-voiced" discourse in that it articulates the presence of

---

[58] Before the spread of Christianity among the eastern Slavs, Mokosh was the only goddess in the pantheon of old Slavic deities. She was associated with fertility, and was the mother of the soil (Haarmann 2000: 4). Mokosh may originally have been the goddess of Finno-Ugric tribes, linked perhaps to the *kamennye baby* (stone women) of the first millennium as a clan mother. Finnish tribes still have a divinity called Moksha, who holds a child in her arms and is called a "Giver of Life" (Hubbs 1988: 20).

culturally distinct ancestral traits on the one hand, while on the other it dramatizes the historic contingency of a psychic "double-mindedness" that is understood to be the complex fate of bicultural Russians (2000: 9). As Figes expresses it, "if Russia could not become a part of 'Europe', it should take more pride in being 'different'. In this nationalist mythology the Russian soul was awarded a higher moral value than the material achievements of the West" (Figes 2002: 66). Therefore Russia, as the God-chosen nation, was intended to question the values of the Western world in English literary writing. The "Russian soul" thus refers to the spirit of Russian national identity and is located symbolically in the novels' characters' lives.

6.1 The "Russian Soul"

This section suggests that in the three English novels a substantial part of the Russian simplicity is allied with the idea of the "Russian soul", associated with the Russian character. Conversely, a stereotypical view of the Westerner as complex and sophisticated is set against this to demonstrate a conventional construction of Russia as subordinate in the writers' works. Such a contrast generates a symbolic power of representation to reinforce the duality of soul and difference, and to emphasize Russia's alienation. This becomes even more acute when Russian identity in general, and the features of the Russian soul in particular, are juxtaposed against Western attributes in the novels. Thus it will be the purpose of the present section to analyze the concept of the Russian soul, according to which the Russian character is viewed by the English (including the now-assimilated Pole, Conrad) as its antithesis. Such traits as simplicity, emotion, spirituality, femininity and a collective spirit are set in opposition to the sophistication, rationality, masculinity and "selfish individualism" (Figes 2002: 315) of the West. The writers insist on the nationalistic stereotypes of Russian national identity to demonstrate its inversion, and to show it in contrast.

According to Figes, the Russian soul is "bound up in the quest for spiritual meaning and perfection" (2002: 341), which is rooted in the Russian land, and takes its inspiration from those "Russian types – hermits, mystics, Holy Fools and simple Russian peasants – imaginary and real", whose destiny contained no reason, but belief in their "true" Russian Christian brotherhood (2002: 334). The novelists endow their characters with a collectivistic spirit, revealing the spiritual capacity of the Russian soul for the redemptive qualities which the Western soul may lack. Thus in all the three novels there is a juxtaposition of two identities, the Western and the Russian. Those protagonists who embody the western tradition of thinking such as Edward Rowan in *The Birds Fall Down*, or Frank Reid in *The Begin-*

ning of Spring are represented as masculine-type figures having pragmatic minds, full of reason and order. Alternatively, such typical Russian characters as Nikolai (*Birds*), Haldin (*UWE*), or Selwyn Crane (*Spring)* symbolically represent spirituality, emotion, anarchy and the feminine.

The novelists associate the Russian soul with simple people, a feature which partially stems from the symbolism of the Russian soil, such as *ravnina* "plain" (Haarmann 2000: 2). It is the land or the soil that draws simple people so that they can find their identity through nature. When describing the Russian character in *Under Western Eyes*, the narrator refers to Russian simplicity several times, meaning the Russian ability to experience intensely the spiritual and the abstract, which suppress the rational and the concrete. As the language teacher asserts, "It is the peculiarity of Russian natures, that, however strongly engaged in the drama of action, they are still turning their ear to the murmur of abstract ideas" (*UWE* 2003: 194). It is that state of emotion which enables Razumov to inform on Haldin when, on his way home, he holds "a flow of masterly argument" (2003: 21) with himself. He is surprised by a supernatural power that inspires him to feel "an austere exultation" (2003: 21). Thus, as a Russian character, he is capable of experiencing extreme states which are often contradictory: "Saint or devil, night or day is all one" (2003: 17). "It is a sort of sacred inertia" (2003: 20) of the Russian land which tests his soul to its limits. Whatever the extremes are, the Russian soul is endowed with an eternal spirituality. According to Haldin, "It has a future. It has a mission" (2003: 13). It is God-chosen and different from any other people's souls on earth. Both Haldin and Razumov strongly believe in Russia's messianic role. The former even predicts his own immortality on several occasions in the novel: "My spirit shall go on warring in some Russian body till all falsehood is swept out of the world" (2003: 13).

Moreover, being a collective notion, the Russian soul is a sign of Russian national identity. When referring to all the Russian people, Haldin evokes "The Russian soul that lives in all of us" (*UWE* 2003: 13). Such a generalization in the description of the nation ascribes to it simplistic characteristics which are typical of primitive and savage people. Haldin's father is said by Haldin to be "A simple servant of God", a "true" Russian man: "His was the soul of obedience" (2003:13). Ziemianitch, whose horses Razumov plans to use for his escape, is "A bright spirit! A Hardy soul!" (2003: 10), as Razumov declares when he finds him completely drunk at the moment of the mission. For him, Ziemianitch is a sort of "town-peasant" (2003: 10, 177) who can be identified with the Russian common man. Here Conrad satirizes Razumov's self-deceptions and naiveties, exposing his hero to certain limitations, which, according to Rieselbach (2003: 62), create two fatal poles of the Russian character, "the peasant incapable of action [Ziemi-

anitch] and the dream-intoxicated idealist incapable of perceiving the reason of things [Haldin]" (2003: 19). Such uncertain placement demonstrates indeterminacy in the thoughts and actions of all the Russian figures in the novel, as well as the instability of the Russian national character.

This image of Russia also appears in Norman Douglas's novel *South Wind* (1917), where one of the characters becomes a supporter of a Russian religious sect called Doukhobors, adopting that "inward sense of that brotherly love, that apostolic spirit, which binds together every class of the immense Empire – to revere their simplicity of soul and calm god-like faith" (1947: 137).[59] This brotherhood of souls represents the binding of educated Russians and peasantry in a single unity on the one side, with the English on other. Russia, as a God-chosen community, is thus defined by the novelists through principles opposed to those of the West, that is the English.

The idea of reconciliation also suggests the simple qualities of the Russian character. In Conrad's novel, the country is represented as inanimate and static. Though condemned to isolation, Russia does not want to "lend a hand" to the protagonist: "Razumov stamped his foot – and under the soft carpet of snow felt the hard ground of Russia, inanimate, cold, inert, like a sullen and tragic mother hiding her face" (2003: 19-20). Russia is represented as static and dead at the moment when Razumov is in search of a solution, seeking help. Such immobility and lifelessness may stand for the resignation of the Russian soul caused by Russia's alienation. In this "featurelessness and monotonousness of Russia" (*Birds* 1978: 67), the Russian character is located. Razumov's suffering is like a form of spiritual reclamation which he tries to identify with the native soil to find salvation. These ideas have long been considered by Russian writers such as Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, and Chekhov as "redemptive qualities of the Russian peasant soul" (Figes, 2002: 334), and, as this chapter attempts to demonstrate, are embedded in the Russian character to associate it with plainness and difference.

Cynicism is another aspect which demonstrates the paradoxical nature of the Russian soul. As the narrator in *Under Western Eyes* argues, "Russian simplicity often marches innocently on the edge of cynicism" (2003: 83). It is a characteristic

---

[59] The Doukhobors were a religious sect persecuted by the Russian government for being hostile towards the corporate structures of society, including their unwillingness to perform military service. Tolstoy's interest in the sect resulted in his involvement in helping the Doukhobors to emigrate to Canada in 1899 (Cross 1985: 53-54). The representation of Russian spirituality through the sectaries, settled on an imagined island in the Mediterranean in Douglas' novel, is obvious.

of oppression and revolt, and can metaphorically represent the extreme between autocratic and revolutionary forces in the novel. These two oppositions symbolically constitute the Russian character, which is oppressed and subordinated on the one hand, while on the other it is in perpetual struggle for its own identity. In cynicism lies the key to the interdependence of the oppressed and the oppressors. The former need the latter to demonstrate through suffering their own moral superiority. Razumov informs on Haldin, trying to persuade himself that he has done it for altruistic reasons: "Haldin means disruption", he thinks to himself (*UWE* 2003: 20). The latter represents the oppressor who wants more to demonstrate his own superiority, which is "a seat of power" for him (2003: 21), than to save the world from the potential "threat" of Haldin. Razumov's thoughts loom like those of a child because cynicism is also regarded as a naïve and child-like characteristic of the Russian soul. In Razumov's words this idea is explicit: "We are Russians, that is – children; that is – sincere; that is – cynical, if you like" (2003: 136). Although it is a common feature of Othering to regard the subordinate as childlike, it can also be juxtaposed against the freshness of a child's body and the innocence of its spirit. In this, a great deal of the spirituality and mysticism of the Russian character is concealed.

Cynicism parallels resignation, and constitutes a distinctive characteristic of the Russian soul. As slave-bound people, the Russian characters in the novels are represented as indisputably dependent on their English counterparts. In their simplicity, some of them are occasionally pictured as more human than their masters. These qualities of the Russian character are most clearly seen in Fitzgerald's novel. Korobyev, one of Frank's workers at the press in *The Beginning of Spring*, has steadily taken forty-seven kopeks a week off the wages of Agafya, who has also worked for Frank's enterprise. Yet when Frank tries to apply his will to punish Korobyev for his unfairness, Agafya, "covered with a white handkerchief [the mark of a peasant woman], went down on her knees before Frank and implored him to have mercy on Korobyev" (*Spring* 1998: 40). Her position of standing aside recalls Chancellor's first encounter with the Muscovite, and demonstrates the goodwill of an oppressed Russian character. Such a representation shows an idealized version of a peasant woman with an unsophisticated Russian soul on the one hand, while on the other it reveals the humility which, as Dostoyevsky believed, was the Christian essence of the Russian peasantry (Figes 2002: 336). She is subordinate to her western master, and the spirit of the nation resides in her enigmatic soul. Agafya is not individualised; she is in a way the embodiment of Mother Russia, with her collective national feminine identity whose the genuine representatives are simple people (*narod*), "true" bearers of the Russian soul.

One ethereal peculiarity of the Russian soul can be traced in its opposition to Western materialism. This is particularly distinct in the novels, because in all of them there are English characters such as Edward Rowen in *The Birds Fall Down*, Frank Reid in *The Beginning of Spring,* and the narrator Peter Ivanovitch in *Under Western Eyes*, who see Russia through Western eyes and represent the materialistic westerner. On the other hand there are also "Russian souls" in the three novels who are to some extent similar to Gogol's Manilov in *Dead Souls*, whose main business is dreaming. Without doing anything to fulfil his dreams, Manilov is inspired by the idea of building a garden rotunda with the superscription "Temple of solitary meditation" (1923: 33), alluding to the longing of the Russian soul. As the Russian soul is a collective notion, Manilov may have a spiritual affinity with all Russian people, as well as with Crane in *The Beginning of Spring*, who writes *Birch Tree Thoughts*, Lisa Ivanovna, who has "a patient, dreaming Russian face" (*Spring* 1998: 82), and Chubinov, who believes that "all Russians have to stay where the flood waters cast" them (*Birds* 1978: 211).

In *The Beginning of Spring*, the episode of Charlie's arrival at Frank's house supports the idea of Russia's non-materialism. Amazed at the prosperity of Frank's lifestyle, his brother-in-law is interested in the rent Selwyn Crane, Frank's accountant, has been paying for the house. As an Englishman, Charlie tries to view things in a materialistic way while Crane does not plunge deeply into the detail of his own enterprise. As Dolly expresses it, "Selwyn Osipych doesn't mind so much about the rent, he lives here because he likes to walk about at night among the unfortunate" (*Spring* 1998: 150). Thus materialism serves as a sort of distinctive criterion between Eastern and Western principles of life. Such a construction undeniably defines the opposition of identities in which the Russian soul functions as a signifier for a less powerful, oversimplified and illogical community.

According to the characters' words and actions, this illogicality is rooted in the Russian character and is a consequence of Russian emotions, which seem to be different to those of a westerner. Peter Ivanovitch, Frank Reid, and Edward Rowan resist intense emotional experience. The English characters are prone to pragmatism, which the novelists portray as being an English national property opposed to the Russian sentimentalism. Russians are often misperceived because they appreciate sentimental values (*UWE* 2003: 70). Peter Ivanovitch does not comprehend the Russian sentiments incorporated in the Russian soul because "vague they were to [his] Western mind and to [his] Western sentiment" (2003: 110). Being in company with other Russians, he feels himself "like a traveller in a strange country" (2003: 110). For him, Western nature is too complex (2003: 77) to understand unsophisticated Russian souls.

Similarly, Edward Rowan in *The Birds Fall Down* "can't believe in all this stuff about Holy Russia" (*Birds* 1978: 11) because these sentimental values are beyond his pragmatic mind. For him the Russian language, with its different sounds and motley letters, seems to be incomprehensible too because it is deprived of rationality and is endowed with "the wild mating of consonants" (1978: 352). Edward's white skin, easy walk, straight back and "blind half-smile" express formality, and depict him as a man who is "deliberately cooling his sentiments" (1978: 71, 364, 365). He undeniably provides a contrast to the Asiatic-looking Nikolai (1978: 32), the dreamy Laura (1978: 33), or the wild-mouthed and bearded Kamensky (1978: 353). Edward does not trouble himself to notice things as a rule, and if he feels something deeply, his light, blue-grey eyes become dark (1978: 71) – a device West probably uses to emphasize the hero's detachment, impartiality and coldness.

In *The Beginning of Spring* Frank has no imagination and is a pragmatic character. As Kuriatin, the middle-class merchant, asserts, "A Russian enjoys himself in a way quite unknown to the West" (*Spring* 1998: 139). Kuriatin is convinced that the Russian may experience extremes of emotion which a westerner is incapable of. It is as if Frank cannot feel, but judges everything that happens around him. When Nellie is away, he immediately seeks new connections and attempts to organize his life, hiring the young Russian peasant woman Lisa Ivanovna to take care of his children. Although he realizes the delicacy of the situation and anticipates Nellie's return (he writes to her every day), he decides that a temporal substitution would do him no harm, resulting in the fact that Lisa replaces Nellie in Frank's home and bed. Frank seeks refuge from guilt and trouble in practicality. His behaviour shows a lack of illusions and cool English common sense, creating a slippage between his Western identity and the Russian characters in the novel.

The rational and the emotional, or the Western and the Russian, are two antagonistic poles in which the latter is often demonized and seen as a destructive form of the former. Thus the discontinuity is present in the novels because it seems as if the Russian characters behave and commit their actions following their modes of feeling, and not in compliance with their logic. It is this emotional aspect of the Russian soul that enables Nellie to leave, or Selwyn Crane to orchestrate Frank's adversity in *The Beginning of Spring*. They cannot even find a proper explanation for their actions because (the spiritual state of) emotion is their driving force. Even Nellie, who is originally English, has been russified: as Crane asserts, "Nellie was turning towards the spiritual" (*Spring* 1998: 180). Her soul has become "wider", and she goes more often to "shirokaya" (1998: 180). In such a statement, the broadness of the Russian soul is emphasized, and is seen as a con-

sequence of the immaterial Russian attitude to life and the Russian way of perceiving things through the irrational.

The emotional, the impractical and the spiritual are associated in western patriarchal narrative with feminine identity. In Russian, the words "soul" (*dusha*), "motherland" (*rodina*), and "Russia" (*Rossiya*) are all feminine, and can be linked to a conventional view of the East and Russia as being in the image of women. In Helen Dunmore's novel *The Siege* (2001), Anna, the protagonist who tries to save her father's life in the siege of Leningrad, is often referred to as "my soul" (2001: 113, 158): her father rarely calls his daughter by her name. A Russian woman, long-suffering and succouring, does not necessarily need a name. Her identity is associated with her soul, which, we may suppose, only a Russian might possess.

In these three English novels, reference to Russia as a holy land is typically paired with the supernatural characteristic of the Russian soul. The God-chosen nation dwells in a holy land, and in the opinion of Volodya, is an anarchist student in *The Beginning of Spring*, "a Russian can't live away from Russia" (*Spring* 1998: 107). Even the Englishman, Frank Reid, refers to it as "mother Russia" (1998: 35), and regards himself as "a child of Moscow" (1998: 39). As Greenfeld expresses it (2003: 258), "the soul – the sign of Russianness – [is] derived from blood and soil. The people in the sense of plebs, the toilers, animals uncontaminated by civilization, had nothing but blood and soil. Therefore their soul – their nationality – was the purest". In other words, those who do not possess that blood and soil cannot have the Russian soul, and consequently cannot be Russian. In all the three novels, the frequent use of the image of "Holy Russia" or "Mother Russia" by the characters alludes to the Russian soul as the mother figure for all the Russian people. The enigmatic phenomenon of Russian national identity has the characteristics of femininity, such as purity of heart, endless patience, sentimentalism but never reasoning. They are also the distinctive features of the Russian soul.

Moreover, because, as Williams maintains, Russia's role in world history is to be a people chosen to bear witness to the apocalypse of this world, Russians are an apocalyptic people (1997: 286). According to him, the Russian Revolution was merely one episode in a series of cyclic catastrophes (1997: 286). It is a nation which dwells in a timeless world, and its people are condemned to suffer, sow, reap and survive as they always have (1997: 289). Therefore, as the Russian souls we are dealing with in these three novels are the inhabitants of pre-Revolutionary Russia, they are influenced by the eternal sense of an impending Apocalypse. Yet it seems that such presuppositions do not prevent these characters from living their normal lives. Family problems are central to the novels, and they have little

to do with the political situation in the country. In this, we can identify the restoration of order beyond the Apocalypse. Immortality is transcended by the Russian soul, which, like a messiah, will bear light from the old world to the new after the Revolution. As in *Doctor Zhivago* (1957) by Boris Pasternak, *The Master and Margarita* (1966) by Mikhail Bulgakov and *The Gift* (1937) by Vladimir Nabokov, which also have apocalyptic motifs, the approach of destruction on the one hand and continuous rebirth on the other cause these souls to imagine themselves as immortal. Even in critical conditions, they are destined to survive, and even if dead, they are resurrected.

A substantial proportion of the values which constitute the Russian national character are, in Greenfeld's opinion, a result of "the transvaluation born out of *ressentiment*" (2003: 250-253). By *ressentiment*, she means the existential envy of the West, a hostility which signifies the rejection of the ideals of the West as a model. This has unmistakably been an imaginary model, which in turn has led to another imaginary construction of the sentimental image of the "Russian soul". It serves individual self-esteem, which Kuriatin demonstrates when he makes a remark on Frank's inability to keep his wife. "By insulting Frank – of whom he was genuinely fond – he had restored himself to a superior position" (*Spring* 1998: 62). Frank's visible superiority to Kuriatin and other Russian characters (Frank's higher financial status and social position) generates envy and enmity in the merchant's attitude towards the Englishman and his ideals. He realizes that he cannot compete with Frank either in status or in business. Thus, by, at least, humiliating Frank verbally, he can reduce him to a lower position. This also explains why Kuriatin fails to honour his word when promising to supply Frank with timber. While using illness and some earlier misunderstandings with Frank's father as an excuse for his misbehaviour, he later appears in front of Frank tearfully embracing him and asking him forgiveness for being unable to fulfil the order (*Spring* 1998: 61). His typical Russian soul is full of extremes, resulting in illogical, spontaneous behaviour generated by his *ressentiment*. He denies reason not only because it contradicts his spiritual beliefs, but also because it serves as a mark of Frank's English identity.

Long suggests that Razumov's informing on Haldin in *Under Western Eyes* is also rooted in his *ressentiment* (2003: 501). Although it is not the covetousness of a Russian towards a westerner, it still reveals a similar perception embedded in the relationship between two Russian characters in the novel. Razumov is envious of the revolutionary because Haldin has a father, a family and a strong link to his land, while Razumov has none of these. Haldin's soul is "purely" Russian because it has an organic link to the land, a fact which Razumov tries to deny when he labels him un-Russian. Razumov sets himself against the anarchist, who is

irrational and consequently a "true" representative of the Russian soul. In other words, we are faced with the opposition between the nationalism and anarchism of Haldin, destructive by its nature, and the cultivated intelligence of Razumov. The emotional, the feminine and the anarchic are not only incorporated in Haldin's image but also idealized as an object of envy. The ideals of the nation, which Razumov lacks, are the elements which exemplify the intrinsically Russian, and become the signifiers of the Russian soul.

Ressentiment is the characteristic which might stem from the suffering and humiliation of the Russian peasant, the bearer of the Russian soul. Simple people, long-suffering, ignorant and oppressed, cannot behave like the aristocracy. According to Greenfeld (2003: 259), "they had no manners, they did not speak French, they were spontaneous and knew no limits in love and suffering". Such an image has been exalted by Russian and later English novelists and has constituted the very idea of Russian national identity. It has generated a collective individual who has been transformed into someone of higher social rank, such as Selwyn Crane, Kuriatin, Nikolai Diakonov, a Count and former Minister of the Tsar in *The Birds Fall Down* or Haldin in *Under Western Eyes.* Despite this transformation, they still embrace the characteristics of the Russian soul, and represent the spirit of the Russian character.

In addition, the Russian soul is often separated from the body. It is represented as if located in an independent spiritual stratum in which everything is subordinated to the law of spirit, and not reason. The soul can read, see and hear; it has its own sources to perceive life. The writers explore this function when the characters use "soul" to reflect on their state of mood, to reveal their feelings, and even to demonstrate their physical ability. When Selwyn states that "the thought of a man's childhood can touch his soul" (*Spring* 1998: 100), he means that the Russian soul is sensitive, and that childhood reminiscences are sentimental values which can easily destroy or encourage it. Frank does not want his "soul read this evening" (*Spring* 1998: 11), as if it is able to be seen. In *Under Western Eyes,* the soul is personified when Miss Haldin claims that she has seen "such a strange soul" (2003: 95), as if it had been separated from someone's body. In *The Birds Fall Down,* Nikolai, who strongly believes in Holy Russia, declares that "we must surrender our souls to God and our bodies to his servant the ruler of Russia" (1978: 262). He sees the Russian soul as a self-governing ideal which, like Holy Russia, serves God. Kamensky (*Birds*) perceives himself as an inseparable element of his home country when he tells Laura: "You are with me, you are with Holy Russia" (*Birds* 1978: 59). In these statements, the great attachment of all Russian souls to their land can be identified, firstly emphasizing their collective

identity, and secondly representing a sort of self-congratulatory blend of the poor peasant as a national hero.

However, the character of Kamensky in *The Birds Fall Down* is as if intended to question the metaphysical and collective characteristics of the Russian soul. He is a double agent in the novel, a character whose facelessness and self-division do not match a simple definition of the Russian soul. Kamensky believes that behind Russian simplicity, "evil" may be concealed (*Birds* 1978: 54). He does not trust this lucidity: he is convinced that an "innocent Russian peasant" can be "seduced" into any kind of terrorist activity (1978: 54). It is this inertia and the slave-bound nature of the Russian soul that enable him to comply with more powerful forces and to succumb to his fate. In this, he may first of all mean himself, Nikolai's personal secretary and a betrayer who let terrorists murder several of the Tsar's chief aides. He is described as "little" (1978: 24), which sets up an opposition to the broadness of the Russian soul and character, and is represented as concealing modesty behind his espionage selfhood. His role as a double agent not only demonstrates the indeterminacy of the location of Russian national identity, but also exposes the "simple" Russian soul to extremes. Through such a representation, Russia as a universal nation is interrogated. Although it lies on a vast inland plain, it is not as even and simple as it seems in Rebecca West's novel. *The Birds Fall Down* proposes the idea of the Russian soul as an injured phenomenon developed in "a stricken, down-coursing society" (Wolfe 1971: 116). The writer infuses this idea into the personalities of her characters, whose Russian souls, endowed with a corroding simplicity, still remain complex.

To sum up, the exuberant Russian soul is an inseparable part of Russian national identity, the construction of which has served as the anti-model of the English. It is a powerful image which underpins the limits of the nation by collecting its individuals under the same identity. It is "the idea of unity in multiplicity" (Greenfeld 2003: 266) which lies at the very core of the religious belief of the Russian Church (*sobornost*), in contrast to Western churches, which emphasize the individual. The Church is a whole as a consequence of the unity of God. This imaginary construction has provided a stereotypical and collective vision of Russia as the land of the peasant, or Mother Russia, or Holy Russia. The symbolic representation of the Russian soul in the three English novels supports this argument. The writers imagine the Russian characters in contrast to the English and treat them as the antitheses of English national identity.

6.2 Provincialism

This section will extend the foregoing discussion on the simplicity of the Russian character, which I showed to have been allied with the idea of the "Russian soul". I have shown how the Russian character is represented as simple and unsophisticated in the work of Conrad, West and Fitzgerald and symbolically creates a contrast and antithesis to Englishness. The writers insist on the emotional, feminine and collective spirit of Russian identity as if they were those distinctive features of the nation on which the whole concept of Russianness has rested for centuries.

Although the characters are represented as such, their images would not have been so impressive were it not for the setting, Russia, with its ambivalent space in which the city and its life are paradoxically imagined more as a turbid provincial void than a geographically positioned civilization. This is to emphasize the simplicity of the Russian character by associating it with authenticity and "Russianness", and to symbolically embody the alienation, ambiguity, femininity and backwardness implied by the concept. Therefore this section will examine the construction of provincialism as a recurring image that the writers in English explore at length. The main aim of this section is to show how the 20th century writers in English borrow and employ these ideas in their novels in order to emphasize the primitive and a savage nature of Russian identity. The latter is constructed through the interplay of auto-and hetero-images, revealing the dual and ambivalent nature of the imageme, and demonstrating the inconstant character of national characteristics discussed earlier in this study.

In order to understand the deep-seated image of provinciality extensively used by these writers, we need to recall our earlier discussion on intertextuality, in which it was shown that modern writers deal with what Abrams calls (1971: 186) "appropriation" of the texts written in the past.[60] Previous practices of literary repre-

---

[60] Although the true beginnings of the Russian theme in English literature are more properly located in the reign of Elizabeth I, a strong British interest in Russia also continued into the twentieth century (Cross 1985: 3, 56). At the turn of the century, the writings of Tolstoy, Turgenev, Dostoyevsky and Chekhov as the dominant Russian influences were widely read and discussed in England. Examples include R.L. Stevenson's *Markheim* (1884), written in imitation of *Crime and Punishment*, Olivia Garnett's novel *In Russia's Night* (1918) about the 1905 Revolution, Henry Seton Merriman's *The Sowers* (1896) (reprinted in 1908), concerned with the theme of revolutionaries, Hugh Walpole's novels *The Dark Forest* (1916) and *The Secret City* (1919) about a tragic love affair between an ineffectual Englishman John Trenchard and a Russian nurse Maria Ivanovna Krassovsky, who is swept away by Walpole's Dostoyevskian character, the Russian doctor Semyonov (1985: 50, 56-58). For more examples of the Russian theme in English literature see Anthony G. Cross. According to Cross, these show a consistent

sentation contribute a great deal to the code of present narratives by bringing a variety of connotations, situating a text within its cultural context and endowing it, in Bakhtin's words, with a "diversity of voices" (1981: 300). When integrated in the twentieth-century Anglophone novelists' texts, these voices interact through the interplay between past and present practices of representation.

As pointed out earlier, the imageme of Russia largely embraced the constructions of Russianness by Russian national writers active at the turn of the century. Many of them tended to portray Russian life against a provincial setting, or raised the problems of rural society as a contrast to its urban counterpart. They imagined Russia as provincial, representing it as symbolically central to Russian identity. Lounsbery studies the Gogolian province, or "horrid provincial backwater" as it is represented in his work, to argue that "provincialism (*provintsial'nost'*)", which often implies "narrowness, distortion, deathly stasis", has become a metaphorical motif for many Russian writers (2005: 259). In this sense, Chekhov's play *The Cherry Orchard*, which will be one of the subjects of this section's analysis, is not an exception and can stand alongside such works as Nikolai Gogol's *Dead Souls* (1842) and *The Inspector General* (1836), Fyodor Dostoyevsky's "The Peasant Marey" (1876), Nikolai Leskov's *Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District* (1865), Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* (from 1873 to 1877), and Ivan Turgenev's *Home of the Gentry* (1859) and "Hamlet of the Shchigrovskii District" (1849) as representing provincial places as the locus of darkness on the one hand and "pure Russianness" on the other.

Although Conrad's and West's novels undeniably raise these issues, and will be the explicit examples in support of our argument, this study considers Fitzgerald's exploration of provincialism to be more absolute and visible. *The Beginning of Spring,* written, as we have seen, in 1988 and set in pre-Revolutionary Moscow, represented paradoxically as a provincial place, can be fruitfully compared with *The Cherry Orchard,* written in 1904.[61] Set in the same country and in the same historical period, Fitzgerald's and Chekhov's works offer a perspective on intertextual practices of representation. The national clichés, used by the Russian playwright to represent the auto-image of his nation, have gained a new develop-

---

pattern with a conventional placement of Russia, distinguished by its highly spiritual soul (1985: 58).

[61] Chekhov has been staged more often in Britain than most native British dramatists. In the 1970s and 80s Chekhov was second only to Shakespeare in the number of productions, and a number of years have entered British theatre history as "the Chekhov years", when he left even Shakespeare behind: thus, 1944 was a year of *The Cherry Orchard*, and both 1997 and 1998 were Chekhov years again (Klimenko 2001: 122).

ment and have become reactivated in the work of the mid twentieth-century English novelist in her constructions of the hetero-image of Russia. Claire Messud argues (2007: 169) that to know the work of Penelope Fitzgerald is to know the influence of Chekhov. Their relation demonstrates how the Anglophone writer appropriated some "typical" characteristics of the Russian character, redefining their meaning in opposition to Western identity. Auto-and hetero-images of Russia in *The Cherry Orchard* and *The Beginning of Spring* articulate the dichotomy of the imageme and perform the variable nature of national stereotypes.

Therefore this section will demonstrate that the construction of Russian identity in the three 20th century English novels has been founded not only on the prevailing stereotypes shaped and reshaped by the previously written works in English, but has also sought to appropriate some 19th century Russian writers' representations of the image of Russia. By discussing the ways by which these two writers construct an account of the chaotic time and a parochial realm, this section intends to reinforce the idea of Russia being imagined by the writers in English as a home-like, provincial Motherland, troubled and ambiguous but still significantly more ample than its counterpart Western world.

The ability to imagine the nation as subordinate and a collective group is dependent on narratives that help define the boundaries of the shared and, as this study pointed out earlier, imagined territory. By situating the inhabitants in this territory, the narrative also creates their space, which becomes a confirmation of their nationhood, visible to all through representation. Although Jeremy Foster maintains (2003: 658) that the latter is supported by the historical record, this study has also claimed that literary reproductions and intertextual relations between the texts contribute a great deal to the emergence of the imagined community of nationhood, establishing a subjective meaning for its space. As discussed earlier, the expanse of the Russian landscape, the plainness of the soil and the stereotype of the birch tree generated the idea of the broadness and simplicity of the Russian soul and the feminine nature of Russian identity in many writers' works. In other words, the construction of the nation is closely linked to what Foster calls "an imaginative identification" with the country's physical territory (2003: 659). This leads to the idea of the national space or scenery, which is distinctive by its very nature and is typical only of its inhabitants, the Russians.

The discursive placement of the Russian community and its distinctive national territory were particularly striking in the representations of the Russian writers active in the 19th century and turn of the 20th century. The points of similarity between writers like Gogol, Dostoyevsky, Chekhov, Tolstoy and Turgenev have formed a general frame, attaching to Russia a recurring image of a provincial mo-

motherland. The Russian writers' narratives have often associated Russia with a miserable provincial setting, depicting provincial places not as just behind the time but as seeming to represent "an irremediable cultural and psychic void" (Lounsbery 2005: 260). As a result, the Russian novel has constructed a so-called symbolic geography that represents the provinces as both indecipherable and fundamentally similar to one another (Lounsbery 2007: 215).

Chekhov does not deal much with the description of the provincial location of the cherry orchard *per se*. Instead, he associates the whole of Russia with a small provincial place in which the orchard, symbolically central to Russian identity, is located. In other words, a symbolic geography equates Russia with the province, placing them in a similar position. In Fitzgerald's novel too, this approximation becomes striking when Moscow, although a capital city, is represented as if it were a provincial locality, assimilating a geographically defined centre into a symbolically imagined periphery to emphasize the compatibility and collective identity of the inhabitants.

The juxtaposition between province and urban centre is similar to the juxtaposition of provincial Russia and metropolitan Europe, affirming the more simplistic character of the former (Russia) and suggesting the superior position of the latter (Europe). Chekhov's ability to represent the whole of Russia and Russian identity in a provincial opposition to Europe sets him apart from his Russian contemporaries, at the same time placing him in an intertextual and contextual relationship with Fitzgerald's novel. In this opposition, the former is imagined as a place "where it is hard to make sense of things, a place where meanings are more likely to dissolve than to coalesce" (Lounsbery's definition of the province 2007: 215), while the latter is its antithesis. The Russia of *The Beginning of Spring* and *The Cherry Orchard* is made to occupy an insular realm, with a provincial relationship to European culture, to demonstrate the subordinate and unsophisticated nature of Russian identity.

In Chekhov's *Three Sisters,* Moscow symbolically represents hope, a non-existent place invoked by the characters, a capital, not in the sense of topographical reality but rather as an imagined opposition to the category of the provincial town N in which the events take place (Lounsbery 2004: online). In *The Cherry Orchard,* Moscow and Russia as a whole are assimilated to the specific provincial place where the orchard is located. Although the distant city is mentioned (Chekhov 1997: 349) and the characters' frequent invocations of Moscow as a travelling destination, a distant place of churches which "would be heaven!" to visit (1997: 337) are present, the city as a separate category does not apparently exist. Therefore, the location of the orchard can be simply described as not-capital but any-

place, because all Russian towns are the same (Lounsbery 2004: online). Lounsbery's transcription of the province supports this argument when she states that in Russian culture the semiotic distinctions between various regions are dwarfed by the difference between capital and province – a distinction so fundamental and with such determinative power that the provinces actually tend to collapse, semiotically, into the "not-capital" (2005: 264). In this sense, Fitzgerald's setting too functions as "not-capital", and represents the commonality and featurelessness which have become a mainstream tradition in the representation of Russian identity that the Russian and writers in English under discussion constructed at the turn of the century.

In other words, the intertextually established recognizability of the image of Russia has become a commonplace, which Leerssen finds central to the recognition of a place of stasis, a place where time moves slowly or stands still. It is a place usually glimpsed dimly in the distance, "a place with a somewhat ambiguous ontological status, liminal, half-ghostly" (1997: 287). Yet such a place possesses its own privilege: it is a place where a living past can be encountered, and is characterized by its othertimeliness or allochronism. A journey to such a place might bring one to an unexplored periphery which is situated out of time and space and can therefore become transformed into centrality (1997: 293). Thus the notions of centrality and periphery are themselves relational and unfixed, and cannot be objective. They are subjectively determined by the aim of an overall representation.

The cherry orchard is located somewhere near the city, within the homogeneous space of Russia. It is similar to many other small provincial locations situated around Moscow. As Angus Calder puts it, from a distance they might promise something, but on arrival each would turn out much the same (1976: 17). Having no definite time and space, the imagined place, which is only "fifteen miles from town" and "only a short drive from the train station" (Chekhov 1997: 340), is represented as an isolated world – a perfect setting for the pure, simple Russian character: "Listen to the birds in the orchard! What time is it?" (1997: 337). A row of poplar trees marks the limits of the cherry orchard (1997: 349), and so we are aware of this place having borders, but they are so blurred that they could hardly be identified to emphasize the ambiguous placement of Russian identity and the obscure nature of the space in which it is located.

A vivid description of a distant location of the cherry orchard which opens Act II gives an idea of the place being a periphery, a not-capital in relation to the city. The latter is situated "on the far distant horizon" so invisible that "on a clear day, you can just make out the city" (Chekhov 1997: 349). In other words, the center of civilization, urban life, is more like a presence in the play which can be vague-

vaguely sensed, and it is from there that the real threat comes. It is from there that the new owners of the dachas will arrive. This is to demonstrate that the progress and change that the newcomers are carrying into the provincial backwaters of Russia are not welcomed. The gentry seem to want to escape the threats of the real world, struggling against what Svetlana Evdokimova calls "the machine" (2000: 101). This shows that even though the gentry possess the characteristics of Russian identity, simple Russian people can adjust themselves better to this unpretentious, harmonious, pre-Darwinian-state world than to the new and progressive.

Not only is a provincial locality juxtaposed against a city, but a clear opposition between periphery and centre is expressed through the references to Europe; Russia versus Paris and Russia versus England (respectively) is an ongoing motif throughout both Chekhov's play (1997: 339, 340, 354, 366) and Fitzgerald's novel (1998: 46, 107). In *The Cherry Orchard,* the characters arrive not from Moscow or Saint Petersburg but from Paris, which sets the opposition between Russia as a province, a periphery, and Europe as the centre of civilization. While Yasha, who thinks that Russia is a place without hope, ponders his departure to Paris, Liubov Andreyevna Ranyevskaya recalls her life in France with sorrow and shame (Chekhov 1997: 354), juxtaposing it against her feeling "like jumping up and waving [her] arms in the air!" (1997: 339) when she is back home. Her dramatic attachment to the land and to the whole of Russia evokes the emotional aspect of the Russian soul this study discussed earlier. The heroine starts crying every time she looks out of the train windows because she adores the country so much (1997: 339) and is so happy to be back home that she "could die" (1997: 340). Without the cherry orchard, as Ranyevskaya exclaims, and consequently without Russia, her life makes no sense (1997: 366). As Volodya states in *The Beginning of Spring,* "a Russian can't live away from Russia" (1998: 107), unlike a foreigner such as Frank Reid, whose expulsion from Moscow would be the worst that he could suffer.

The juxtaposition of Russia against Europe is also striking in Fitzgerald's novel, which opens with Nellie's train ride from Moscow to London, a runaway English wife who leaves her three children to be cared for by Frank. Although she leaves Russia for her home country, the England that Nellie depicts in her letters to her brother Charlie reveals the picture of a country in turmoil, with a conflict between labour and capital, miners' strikes, and a limited source of coal (*Spring* 1998: 46). Moreover, Charlie, who arrives in Moscow from England to visit Frank, brings him no good news or positive solution to Nellie's absence. In other words, England, as a part of Europe and the civilized world, represents a frustration in relation to Russia. This is because all stereotype constructions are relational, and

every point can be contradictorily represented through antagonistic characteristics. The Englishwoman, Nellie, seems not to have seen any perspective in her European, progressive home country against which a constructionist discourse of imagined provincial, backward community of Russia might be juxtaposed. From this, it can be supposed that Russia is not more peripheral and backward than any other European country, but merely occupies a liminal state which brings ambivalence and duality into its imageme, and is therefore represented as a commonplace.

In *The Cherry Orchard*, a timeless and idyllic realm is threatened by changes that progress and such characters as Lopakhin, Gayev, and Trofimov bring with them. These innovations seem to be illusory, because the characters' anticipations of a happy future (Chekhov 1997: 341) suggest that they are dreamers similar to Oblomov or Manilov; as Stephen L. Baehr maintains, "there is no new life – only a dream of one" (1999: 109). The former peasant Lopakhin, now a rich merchant, is a typical representative of this change, suggesting to the gentry that they sell their cherry orchard to allow Ranyevskaya, the owner of the estate, to eliminate their debts by selling the land for dachas. The cherry orchard represents the old times, as opposed to the modernity and progress that Lopakhin, the railroad and telegraph poles bring with them. According to Lopakhin, the trees must be cut down (Chekhov 1997: 341). The cherry orchard is located in a provincial place to which Russian identity is ascribed because, as Trofimov says, "this whole country is our orchard" (1997: 360). This suggests that the cherry orchard is made to occupy the same position as Russia. The whole of Russia is like a village, a rustic place, "an environment of semi-savage people" (Gorky 1977: 25), idealized by the characters and imagined as "White, white, all white! … flowering with happiness …" (Chekhov 1997: 344) to demonstrate the purity and simplicity of the Russian nation. It is seen as a retreat, an opportunity for escape, and is therefore represented as more sincere and genuine than the morally dubious world of Europe.

Despite the positive innovations brought by progress, evolution is compared to a wild animal like Lopakhin "that eats up anything in its path" (Chekhov 1997: 356). Lopakhin, who is crude and cares about nothing but money, represents a new generation of businessmen. He is called "a money grubber" (1997: 340) and is ironically shown as apathetic towards Jewish musicians playing in the orchestra while he recalls a short snatch of music to himself: "Just a little bit of money makes a lady very French …" (1997: 354). Like Kuriatin in *The Beginning of Spring*, his peasant-like and formerly enserfed identity signifies the sweat and blood of the peasants and workers. His image parallels Kuriatin's in many ways: both characters have preserved their peasant-like features, which expose their Russian souls in a Russian way (that is, monstrous and prone to extremes of emo-

tions as discussed earlier), progressing from drinking, shouting, tears and laughter to violence and brutality. In their figures of merchants, both Chekhov and Fitzgerald incorporate the emotional and the practical. While the former aspect is typical of any Russian character (see our earlier discussion on the Russian soul), the latter is ascribed to the new type of businessmen in whom artistic sensitivity and money-grubbing features are combined (Kataev 2002: 284). By artistic sensitivity I mean the ability of Lopakhin, for example, to think not only of money but also to express the most heartfelt words relating to the Russian landscape: "Dear God, you gave us this beautiful earth to live on, these great forests, these wild fields, the broad horizons … by rights we should be giants" (Chekhov 1997: 358). The character of Lopakhin combines both good and bad qualities, and in this sense is similar to Kuriatin in *The Beginning of Spring,* who is frequently exposed to his "change of heart" (1998: 100). The scene where the Kuriatins entertain themselves by drinking vodka, hitting the bear-cub with a billiard cue, throwing cold water over it and getting it drunk (*Spring* 1998: 57-59) suggests the taste of "true Russianness" in which drinking is a social habit, never done alone.[62] Fitzgerald incorporates "the village habits of the great manufacturing city" (*Spring* 1998: 36) into Kuriatin's image. His outburst of aggression when he returns home and sees his glassware, china and tablecloth damaged shows him to be what Wolfe calls a "broadly drawn Russian type" (2004: 227). Although a successful merchant like the rich businessman Lopakhin, Kuriatin's savage identity includes vengeance and tenderheartedness, dissimilar characteristics which endow the novel with "true" Russianness.

Like all merchants and peasants, Kuriatin and Lopakhin are both obsessed with the chance to cut down trees (*Spring* 1998: 88). This phobia clearly approximates them to the "true" peasants who cut down the trees at Tolstoy's Moscow estate "to make ready money" (1998: 11). A beautiful cherry orchard which also gives fruit and is the most remarkable phenomenon in the whole province must be chopped down. The "mournful", "lonely" sound of an axe in the final act of the

---

[62] The bear acquired a special place in Russian folklore. According to legend, the bear was originally a man who had been denied the traditional bread and salt of human friendship, and had in revenge assumed an awesome new shape and retreated to the forest to guard it against the intrusions of his former species. The age-old northern Russian customs of training and wrestling with bears carried in the popular imagination certain overtones of a primeval struggle for the forest and its wealth (Billington 1970: 21-22). In the oral poetry of the Udmurts, also of Finnic-Permian affiliation, a taboo name for bear, the sacred animal, is *moko,* which comes from Mokosh, the Slavic goddess of fertility and vegetation, and is therefore related to female spirits of nature (Haarmann 2000: 4, 7). In 16th-17th century English writing about Russia, wild bears came to figure prominently, for the animals seem to have embodied the Muscovite rulers' audacious absolutism in a way that both writers and readers found irresistible (Palmer 2004: 19).

play symbolically represents the protesting voice of the Russian people and is often associated with the traditional weapon of peasant rebellion (Chekhov 1997: 384; Peace 1983: 152). The peasants of the 17th century used the same tool for terrorizing the provincial nobility, and the leaders of these revolts were publicly executed with a great axe in Red Square (Billington 1970: 27). Therefore, Lopakhin's and Kuriatin's peasant identities are revealed through their immense obsession with abolishing the trees and demonstrating their contempt for the provincial nobility or upper class people like Ranyevskaya and the Reids respectively.

Lopakhin describes himself as a person not much better than his father, who was "a dirt farmer, an idiot" who just got drunk and beat him up with a stick (Chekhov 1997: 355). Like him, Kuriatin can be considered his counterpart, complying with the stereotype of the Russian merchant – in Figes's words – "greedy and deceitful, narrowly conservative and philistine, the embodiment of everything that was dreary and depressing in provincial towns" (2002: 193). His tablecloth, glass and china are the only things to which he has been insanely attached. In *The Beginning of Spring*, Kuriatin's "absurdly old-fashioned counting-house, almost next door to his home, as though he wanted to keep watch over both at once" (1998: 60) is described as "dark" (1998: 61) and "half-savage" (1998: 62). This is to associate it with a peasant-like home: unlike St. Petersburg, pre-Revolutionary Moscow was a city with patriarchal customs, a strict religious life and Old Beliefs, and cloistered merchant houses built with their backs to the street (Figes 2002: 192). Kuriatin himself appears to Frank wearing a black kaftan reminiscent of the peasantry, from which comes "a strong, healthy human odour" (*Spring* 1998: 61). According to Gary Browning, the peasant serves as a symbol of Russia's familial and societal descent into moral degradation (2000: 525). In other words, Fitzgerald's Muscovites are represented as like peasants dwelling in a peasant town associated with provinciality.[63] This, in a sense, demonstrates the simplicity attributed to Russian peasant identity, and emphasizes the commonality and facelessness of the Russian locality and its dwellers, restricting Russian space to a common provincial void with no strict variations.

Apart from the slave-bound and peasant-like nature of the characters, the writers use other symbols to construct Russian identity. As mentioned earlier, the cherry orchard in Chekhov's play is associated with Russia, and therefore establishes a

---

[63] At the turn of the 20th century, Russian towns and cities remained essentially "peasant" in their social composition and character. Most of the workers in the cities' factories and workshops, laundries and kitchens, bath-houses and shops were either immigrants from the countryside or the children of such immigrants, who still returned to their farms for the harvest and sent money back to their villages (Figes 1997: 88).

close proximity between land, nature and the Russian self, which is oppressed and tied to the soil. Lopakhin himself admits his oppressed heritage, maintaining that his father and whole family slaved for the gentry (Chekhov 1997: 340). His symbolic attachment to the land establishes his link with enslavement, and relates him to what Peterson identifies as particularly significant for the expression of the Russian soul, culturally distinct ancestral traits that symbolize the inherited "bloodknot" of ethnic identity (2000: 9). Through this, Peterson draws a strong parallel between Russian and African American folk souls, which he regards as hybrid by nature, and in this the split nature of Lopakhin's identity can be distinguished, since he is both a merchant and a slave. His belonging to the land and the orchard symbolically blackens him along with Africans – an idea raised in the previous chapters of this study in relation to Russian identity.

This underpins the perpetual motif of Russian identity as being rooted in slavery, and being represented through constant evocations of serfdom.[64] Even the pastoral in the play has a specific historical dimension, associated with the system of slavery that supports the would-be paradisal life of the upper classes (Baehr 1999: 111). Chekhov's distancing of the flute at the end of Act I alludes to classical pastoral poetry: "*In the distance, beyond the orchard, a shepherd plays a pipe*" (Chekhov 1997: 349; original italics). Indeed Firs, the "shepherd" of the nobleman's former Eden, whose "misfortune" has ironically been the Emancipation that eliminated the "idyllic" garden where serfdom had flourished, even bears a symbolic pastoral name – a Russian transliteration of "Thyrsis", the archetypal shepherd in the pastoral poetry of Theocritus and Virgil (Baehr 1999: 111).[65] Although at the end of the play Firs, a symbol of old times and pastoral life, remains locked in the old manor house while the gentry leave their lost estate for the train station, a symbol of progress, both parties are shown as victims of the coming change. The former is left alone imprisoned on the old estate, and the latter are forced to leave their old lives without anything new to replace it with. As Liubov Andreyevna exclaims: "My life, my youth, my happiness, goodbye!" (Chekhov 1997: 384). Like all the members of the gentry, Ranyevskaya is solely attached to

---

64 English descriptions of Russia as an anti-civilization rooted in slavery date from Elizabethan times. Before the sixteenth century, the Mediterranean world drew its slaves largely from southeastern Europe and Russia (see John Milton's *Brief History of Muscovia* (1682), Philip Sidney's *Astrophil and Stella* (sonnet 30, 1581), and J. M. Archer (2001: 20-21)).

65 Although by Chekhov's time many translations of classical pastoral poems were using the more accessible transliteration "Tirsis", Chekhov was almost certainly aware of this older tradition (Baehr 1999: 118). According to Raymond Williams, the idyllic notes are sounded in the poetry of Theocritus and Virgil, maintaining a contrast between the pleasures of rural life and the threat of loss coming from the city (1973: 17).

her provincial connections.[66] This demonstrates that Russian identity is deeply seated in the simple, provincial, pastoral conventions that dominated much Russian literature from the mid-19th to the beginning of the 20th century.

In both Fitzgerald's and Chekhov's works, provincialism stems from Russia being a mother-figure who embraces people, providing them with warmth and shelter. Like Lavretsky in Turgenev's novel *Home of the Gentry*, who leaves a glamorous life in Paris for his country estate, or Pierre Bezuhov in Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, who flees from St. Petersburg to find comfort and wholesomeness in Moscow, or Chekhov's women in *Three Sisters*, who, craving for an imagined ideal place to live in, think of Moscow, the gentry return to Russia from Paris to find their salvation and comfort. Therefore the cherry orchard is feminized to make it a more provincial, more homelike place. Ranyevskaya seems to discern her Mother in her white dress among the trees, and the little white tree looks like a woman (Chekhov 1997: 344). Like the birch tree forest in *The Beginning of Spring*, which is animated (it has a voice) (1998: 173) and a sacred place for a woman and a man to join their body and soul (1998: 181), the cherry orchard also bears a similar connotation. Yet if in Fitzgerald's novel the forest can be seen as an escape from slavery, as in our earlier discussion, in Chekhov's play the cherry orchard signifies slavery, and consequently the slave-bound Russian identity. Trofimov, a graduate student, admits that the cherry orchard was owned by several generations of the gentry whose slaves worked hard for them, and whose voices and faces still hide behind the cherry trees. He is convinced that slavery has left deep traces on the present gentry (Chekhov 1997: 360). In other words, the cherry orchard is made to occupy the place of the signifier, which stands for a troubled, feminine and alien Russian identity.

As stated earlier, the notions of centrality and periphery are themselves relational, and can therefore be subjectively established by means of representation as either dominant or dominated. In *The Beginning of Spring,* the image of Russia as a Mother figure and Moscow as a shelter creates the vision of a peripheral realm, with its provincial relationship to England. Fitzgerald's treatment of the city, which is, according to the writer, a home-like provincial place, demonstrates this idea: "there was nothing you couldn't get repaired in Moscow, a city which in its sluggish, maternal way cared, as well as for the rich, for the poorest of the poor"

---

[66] The nineteenth-century gentry (*dvoriane*) were highly interested in their provincial connections and holdings, interweaving personal and family networks with the institutions of autocratic government (Cavender 2007: 20).

(*Spring* 1998: 70). Muscovites have always taken comfort in the image of their city as a warm and friendly "home" (Figes 2002: 168). As Peter Wolfe asserts,

> Fitzgerald's Muscovites have a lower standard of living and fewer economic opportunities than do Parisians or Berliners. Yet, like all big towns, Moscow boasts a large, complex business community, crowded shops and markets, where piles of cash change hands, and dangerous slums. Most vitally, everything in it connects. It is a budding manufacturing hub, a capital city, and a metropolis that feels like a village (2004: 215).

In contrast to Norbury, which is "neither town nor city" (*Spring* 1998: 36), or the whole of England, which is "a place of nothing but trouble and strife" (1998: 46), Moscow, although pre-Revolutionary, with its chaos and confusion, still remains the centre of well-being.

The provincial and home-like characteristics of the city of Moscow are accompanied by its Oriental and feminine image.[67] Fitzgerald's description of "slovenly Mother Moscow", with the churches "impeded by Greeks and Persians and bewildered villages" (1998: 35) coexists side by side with the mental picture of the city as provincial, where "a circle of pig-sties" and "cabbage patches" seem to have been an unattainable part of Moscow's identity. The characters, too, experience comfort in the city: Frank feels a great affection for it, and Nellie was at home there, too (1998: 36). The writer's account of the city, which "sinks back, seemingly with relief, into a village" (1998: 36) is made to emphasize the solace with which this place must be perceived as an unsophisticated and rustic realm.

The Beginning of Spring is not the only novel of Fitzgerald in which a view of Moscow as a rustic distant world is explored. Her first novel *The Golden Child* (1977), a comic murder mystery, focuses on the ancient gold-covered corpse of an African ruler in a London museum. The Moscow setting in the third chapter is also of a similar kind. As the Englishman Waring Smith approaches it by train, his perception of the city gives him a sense of a distant, enormous void, with "the interminable fields, sometimes blankly white, sometimes with rye straw poking up above the snow" and at long intervals there are "villages adrift" (1999: 73). For him people look more like "pack animals" than "a pastoral flock" (1999: 73), and "beyond a kind of well of dense Thibetan [sic] darkness" he could distinguish the corner of Red Square" (1999: 75). At that very moment Waring's imagination brings him to Leningrad as an idyllic place with "the wonderful expanse of the Neva under ice" (1999: 75), which reflects "ice-light" (1999: 75) as opposed to

---

[67] See our earlier discussion on Said's vision of Orientalism as feminine.

the 'Thibetan' darkness of Moscow.[68] While the former is the centre of civilization, the latter is represented as a backward and provincial outskirt of the domain. The English character sees the perceived objects (i.e. Moscow) through the self-effacing agency of apparatus that moves him through the world and allows him to make comparisons (Foster 2003: 665). Panoramic perception distances the viewer from the perceived object, and places him in a reflective relationship towards it – in other words, it promotes a transformation of consciousness cognate with the transformation into a locally-attached individual, into an observer of an "imaginary nation" (2003: 665). Although part of the novel is set in the Moscow of Soviet times, it is not much different from the early 20th century city Fitzgerald represents in *The Beginning of Spring.*

The description of Moscow as a provincial, Oriental city is also suggested by Emma Goldman and Theodore Dreiser in their work. Emma Goldman, who visited Russia just after the Revolution wrote in her book *My Disillusionment in Russia* (1923), that in Moscow, "there was life, motion, and movement, quite different from the stillness that oppressed me in Petrograd" (1923: 32). Like Theodore Dreiser, who compared Moscow to a "half-Asiatic city" (1928: 33) in which, from the Moscow River bridge, one might see "the most Oriental scene in Europe" (1928: 30), Goldman has an orientalised vision of the city.[69] In contrast to Europe or Petrograd, as she maintains, Moscow gathers the proletarian and the aristocrat, the Communist and the bourgeois, the peasant and the intellectual, who are all bound by the common desire to sell and buy, to trade and bargain. As at the Oriental bazaar, "here one could find for a sale a rusty iron pot alongside of an exquisite ikon; an old pair of shoes and intricately worked lace; a few yards of cheap calico and a beautiful old Persian shawl" (1923: 34). All the purely material distinctions which so irk or gratify in the western world are completely swept away in Moscow (Dreiser 1928: 39). In other words, Moscow unites people, erasing all racial and social boundaries between them. It ascribes their multiple identities to a common type of people, simplified to the category of the provincial, which becomes a distinctive feature of the Muscovite community.

Both the feminine image of Russia as well as the convivial characteristics of Moscow have thus contributed a great deal to the construction of provincialism as

---

[68] In 1924, after the death of Lenin, the Party transformed the city of Peter into the city of the Revolution by renaming it Leningrad (Malia 1999: 313).

[69] The American writer Theodore Dreiser sailed from New York to Russia in October 19, 1927. He spent eleven weeks travelling around the country and visiting such cities as Moscow, Novosibirsk, Novgorod, Kiev, Kharkov, Stalin, Rostov, Baku, etc. His view of Russia is recorded in his book *Dreiser Looks at Russia*, published in 1928.

a phenomenon, resulting in the provincial, or "the village habits" (*Spring* 1998: 36) of the characters being central to their identities in both Chekhov's play and Fitzgerald's novel. The hospitality of the Russian household undeniably sets the Russian people side by side with oriental practice. In Christian Muscovy as well as in Moslem Arabia, food and friendship were difficult to find, resulting in the development of warm traditions of hospitality (Billington 1970: 21). At the lowest level peasants presented the ritual bread and salt to all arrivals;[70] at the highest level, princes welcomed visitors with elaborate banquets and toasts (Billington 1970: 21). Moscow was the food capital of Russia, a city of gourmands with a rich folklore of the fabulously fat, upon which its own self-image, as the capital of plenty, had been fed (Figes 2002: 162-163). In *The Cherry Orchard*, Firs recalls how in the old days dried, pickled, preserved cherries were sent to Moscow: "they were soft and juicy and sweet, and they smelled just lovely" (Chekhov 1997: 341). Cherries are physically linked to the Russian landscape and the land, and can be regarded as more natural and simple products than, for example, the crocodiles (ironically) that Ranyevskaya ate in Paris (1997: 341). The writers reflect on the plainness and naturalness of Russian food, which can be associated with the simplicity of Russian identity. Moreover, nowhere, either in the play or in the novel, do we encounter the description of exotic food many of the Russian nobles used in their households at the end of the 19th and the turn of the 20th centuries.[71] Instead, such simple traditional Russian specialities as *stschi,* tea, *kvass*, rye bread, pickled vegetables and berries, soups and *kasha* are present in all the writers' works under discussion to emphasize the rootedness of the Russian food tradition in peasant culture.[72]

Fitzgerald's depiction of food consumed in the Reids' house is similar to what many noble families devoured in the Russian provinces. Mary W. Cavender, who has studied the cultural identity of the provincial nobility in the province of Tver', argues that none of the delicacies made for the table were strictly reserved for jam, pickles, and preserves (2007: 79). The Russian tradition of saving preserves for the future originally comes from peasant village homes where the scarcity of food and poverty of the domestic establishments necessitated the practice. There-

---

70 "Bread-salt" (*khleb-sol*) is a famous and ancient Russian term for "hospitality" (Milner-Gulland 1997: 22).

71 In the Sheremetev household nearly everything was imported from Europe. Even basic items found in Russia (oak wood, paper, grain, mushrooms, etc.) were preferable if from abroad (Figes 2002: 22).

72 The peasantry lived mainly on rye bread, supplemented by cabbage soup, buckwheat gruel, vegetables, mushrooms and berries, and washed down by *kvass*, a drink of fermented bread (Calder 1976: 14).

fore, the Russian habit of preparing food in large quantities and eating heartily is rooted in a peasant provincial culture distinguished by its simplicity and abundance. In the 19th century, the peasants grew mainly cabbages and cucumbers, which, next to bread, constituted the most important items in their diet (Pipes 1995: 143). Fitzgerald's description of the variety of foods in Frank's dacha alludes to peasant provincial food culture and vividly reflects the idea of conserving:

> Tea was drunk with pickled lemons, which stayed in the dacha from one year's end to another in large barrels in the store-room, along with the salted melons, the pears in vinegar, the soused apples, the pickled cabbage, the pickled onions and plums, the pickled mushrooms. The mushrooms, strung from the ceiling, were sorted into the slimy buttery ones, the fleshy rusty ones, the white ones, which were in fact brown, the huge pine-tree ones, the red-capped Aspen ones, the Birch Tree ones, gathered from the north side of the trees, which never dry out (*Spring* 1998: 169-170).

On the other hand, she also shows how the Russians have always had a taste for entertaining and feasting. Russian tables are distinguished by the abundance of food: "large dishes of ham, seethed onions, fiercely pickled cucumber and mushrooms, raw beef, mountains of butter, black, white, and grey bread, cheese, piroshki, caviare pancakes and unidentifiable fried objects" (*Golden* 1999: 77). This demonstrates the broadness of the Russian soul and "true" Russianness. The scene where Frank meets Kuriatin at Rusalochka (a typical Russian restaurant) supports the idea. The characters are placed with barbaric pomp in surroundings where all people's emotional and physical desires are cultivated and can only be realized when supported by food:

> The walls were frescoed from smoky ceiling to floor in red-gold and silver-gold and painted with dancing, embracing and tea-swilling figures overlapping with horses, … , huts prancing along on chickens' legs, simpering children, crowned frogs, dying swans, exultant storks and naked women laughing in apparent satisfaction and veiled, to a slight extent, by the clouds of a glowing sunset (*Spring* 1998: 97)

The heavy smell of food scent and waiters in frog coats, "the great silver tea-pots, each like a kettle-drum" (1998: 97), "the trolleys of strong alcohol" (1998: 97), "the demonic tea-rooms" (1998: 98), "the great golden organ" (1998: 98), "a massive gilded chair" (1998: 98) – all these metaphorical expressions suggest the extensiveness of the Russian character, Oriental ritual, and a barbaric tradition of Russian hospitality, mentioned even by Chancellor during his exploration of Russia in 1553. Like Frank Reid, whose perception of Rusalochka "conflicted with his idea of what was sensible" (*Spring* 1998: 97), the 16th century English visitor

too was amazed at the rich service and heavy doses of spices which fired his nostrils (Palmer 2004: 32). Therefore Charlie, Frank's brother-in-law, who arrives from England to visit the Reids, compares the housekeeping at Lipka Street to the Arabian nights, suggesting an ironic association with eastern tradition (*Spring* 1998: 132). He tries to accustom himself to the Russian habit of drinking tea with lemon (1998: 127), which makes a difference when compared with what he has become used to drinking at home, called "dreadful English tea" in West's novel (1978: 26).

Drinking tea is an unattainable part of the socializing and gathering of the Russian people "not only at the stated hours, but if they could, all day" (*Spring* 1998: 40). In West's novel, the Russian tea served in the Diakonovs' house "is real tea from Russia" different to "that rubbish from India" and "even that appalling staff from Ceylon" (*Birds* 1978: 26). The tea always appears in large quantities in "a big Russian samovar" (*UWE* 2003: 143), a "true" token of the Russian peasant culture, and a feature of the peasant hut (Calder 1976: 14). In *The Beginning of Spring*, the constant presence of the Russian samovar, which is so cherished and loved by the characters that it is referred to as "a dear little samovar", or "samovarchik" (1998: 99) to physically belittle it in size, is as if symbolically attached to every Russian home, and consequently to Russian identity. The writer implies that a "true" Russian is able to empty it alone: "Toma appeared with a samovar, the small one, presumably suitable for the master of the house now that he was left on his own" (1998: 8). The most vivid description of a tea-drinking scene is represented by Fitzgerald in her novel *The Golden Child*: "samovars and large kettles were wheeled up and streams of tea shot accurately over the shoulders of the guests into thick white cups, while more savomars were banged down on the overloaded table, which, though strong, rocked dangerously" (1999: 77). Fitzgerald refers to Russian cutlery as "heavy" and "suitable for a boyar" (1999: 77), to emphasize the arrogance of the Russian people and the pretentious nature of the Russian household. Such a representation invokes Russia's auto-image, employed, for example, by Chekhov and Gogol in their work where small provincial places and their dwellers try to imitate Europe in order to be seen as less provincial in relation to the real centre (Lounsbery 2005: 266). In other words, they strive to pretend to be more sophisticated and more significant in order to compensate for the conventional image of the provinciality attached to them.

Overall, this section has pondered the significance of the understanding of Russian provincial identity as a part of the image of the nation constructed by the 20th century English writer and the 19th century Russian. The comparative analysis supports our earlier argument concerning the constructed nature of representation and intertextual practices between past and present literary pieces of work. The

construction of a pre-Revolutionary province-like setting by the English writer in her novel suggests an interpretation of the representation of the time and place portrayed by the Russian writer in his play. Fitzgerald's vision of Russia informs a series of 19th-20th century narratives in which Russia is represented as a complex, paradoxical realm with dreary cultural space and ultimately reversed values. Her writing resonates with West's and Conrad's works, and is intertextually linked to Chekhov's play, where the imaginary provincial place, with its backward and static void, is associated with the whole of Russia. The latter, as what Leerssen calls, "the allochronic periphery" (1997: 285), is characterized by its liminal state and monotony. Being identified with the province, the Russia in the English novel and in the Russian play represents a culturally distorted and geographically isolated realm. It should be noted that, although Moscow is a capital, symbolically it is represented like a province. While Chekhov draws on images established by Gogol, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky and some other Russian writers (Lounsbery 2005: 261), the meaning of the province and provincialism in *The Cherry Orchard* is transformed into a positive notion through the tendency to collect and embrace the whole nation under the same category, to situate it in the same imagined territory, opposed to the European.

In both writers' works, that is, in the novel and in the play, the settings, with their ambiguity, and a sense of periphery, set an opposition to central and powerful European culture, represented by England and France respectively, and imply that provinciality is a hallmark of Russian identity. The references to Paris in the play and to England in the novel illuminate distant civilizations, a space beyond the provinces and the Russian village-like "capitals" where the characters are located. The existence of the sophisticated European world as the centre ratifies Russia as the periphery, originating what Raleigh calls a dialectical relationship between them. Its inner mechanism rests on contradictions and oppositions, and is a sort of "*kto-kogo*" (that is, who dominates and who is dominated) dynamic applied to the historical stage (2000: 131). What this study has identified as being a particularly striking characteristic of such a relationship is its symbolic nature, derived from representational practices which accommodate and develop stereotypical images such as the provincialism of Russian identity.

Although Fitzgerald was an English writer who never visited Russia and had to undertake historical and anthropological research in order to construct the background for her story, and Chekhov was a native of the country, a great deal of affinity is perceived in their writings. Only because the latter was born, lived, and died in "a land of peasants" (Varlamov 2005: 85), and maintained close ties, travelling through Russia and writing with regard to the category of "the provincial", ignoring all regional differences (Lounsbery 2004: online), can his piece of work

be considered to be more "authentic". While Chekhov's Russia is associated with the cherry orchard and the peripheral place in which it is located, and Fitzgerald's Russia is allied with a homelike, big-village Moscow, both writers implicitly ascribe Russian identity to the category of the provincial with its irredeemable features of backwardness, remoteness, subordination and ignorance. Such a representation symbolically defines the nation, and is crucial for an understanding of the impulses behind English 20th century writing on Russia.

7 THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN HISTORY AND FICTION: APPROACHING "THE REAL"

> Things mean something and are "true" only within a specific historical context …
>
> Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 1972.

According to Hayden White, fictional discourse is "interested in the real – which it approaches by way of an effort to fill out the domain of the possible or imaginable" (2005: 147). By *the real* he means not the truths historians would recognize, but "a kind of testimony" (2005: 148) of what the Russia we encounter in the novels must have been like before the Revolution. In other words, this chapter suggests the possible, the imaginable which occurs when writers of fiction, and the ones under discussion in particular, construct their representations in a historical context (that is, pre-Revolutionary Russia) to transcend the historical condition of the past not through the "realism" of the representation, but via imaginary representation. It is in a way an artistic treatment of the real – since in all the three novels the events are said take place at a real time in a real place – that the writers exercise when representing the world of the Russian pre-Revolutionary time by determining the ways meaning is expressed through images and symbols.

Roland Barthes' discussion (1967) of historical discourse, which he regards as being "an imaginary elaboration", is relevant here (1997: 120-123). According to him, historical representation is endowed with a double operation: at one point, the referent is detached from a particular narrative, and becomes external to it, while at a second point, it is also the signified which becomes confused with the referent. In Barthes' words, "the referent enters into a direct relation with the signifier, and the discourse, solely charged with *expressing* the real, believes itself authorized to dispense with the fundamental term in imaginary structures, which is the signified" (1997:121). This is what happens in all the three novels under discussion: pre-Revolutionary Russia operates as an "unformulated signified, sheltering behind the apparently all-powerful referent", that is, an imagined representation which endows the narrative with a "*realism effect*" (Barthes 1997: 122). In these relations, the signified, or the pre-Revolutionary time, remains disengaged from the narrative, allowing the real and its expression to come together, and, in Barthes' words, to succeed in establishing a new meaning (1997: 122). This new meaning signifies a dependence between proximity and distance and creates a sense of an actual historical past manifested through the imaginative forms of the representation.

Although the historical narrative is detached, or even excluded from the main stories, history emerges from the western writers' encounter with the Other.[73] The chaotic and ambiguous representation of the characters is what the setting of pre-Revolutionary Russia as history projects onto their lives. Such a representation is not unique, and Russia as the Other has also been frequently explored by writers in English outside the pre-Revolutionary setting. The nation, as we have seen, has conventionally been stereotyped as barbaric, exotic or holy, a practice which intertextually links all the previous practices of representation to the twentieth-century writers' construction. Conrad, West and Fitzgerald seem to have traditionally relied on what Ian Chambers, speaking of the West as the apparent custodian of history and maker of the image of the unknown other, calls "a naïve metaphysics of truth (absolute, total, complete) as though it were the property of the West" (1995: 78).

Theoretically this chapter relies on New Historicist positions which separate the categories of "literature" and "history", and regard them both as what Linda Hutcheon calls, "human constructs" and "human illusions" (1989: 4). The important point, highlighted by such New Historicists as Jerome McGann, Stephen Greenblatt, Marilyn Butler, and David Simpson, is the dialectical and highly contingent nature of the relationship between literature and its context, in which no firm assertion of truth can be made (Folks 2006: 133-135). Moreover, when a text is placed in a time-and place-specific context, the dialogue with the past results in estrangement from the narrative (Ankersmit 2003: 255). In other words, the situation in pre-Revolutionary Russia is moderated by the narrative, and is not provided with a great deal of detail within the storylines. We read the Russian past through textual reproduction, having only a sense of its presence, because "a past can only be known from its texts, its traces – be they literary or historical" (Hutcheon 1989: 4). This results in the historical representation becoming implicitly engaged in the narrative of the novels, and the riotousness of the time as well as the ambiguous image of Russia are evident from the writers' imaginary construction of the characters.

Jim Reilly regards the "unrepresentable" and "unspeakable" (1993: 21) nature of history as being a feature of 20th -century-fiction's technique of representation.[74]

---

[73] The term "the Other" is used in terms of the discourse on Orientalism.

[74] See Jim Reilly's study *Shadowtime: History and Representation in Hardy, Conrad and George Eliot* (1993), in which he deals with the exploration of the historical thought and representation in the works of George Eliot, Hardy and Conrad (*Romola* 1863, *The Trumpet-Major* 1880, and *Suspense* 1925 respectively).

According to him, history is a sign which "acts as the evidence of its absence" (1993: 10). This indeterminacy is "an indicator in little of the complexity of historical meaning". Reilly maintains that historical representation abandons the space of representation, and becomes unspecified (1993: 20-21). As a result, while history is rendered and muted, we are aware of its continuing influence on the narrative – an idea which can be identified in all three novels under discussion.

This chapter will explore the construction of historical meaning and its approximate integration into the paradigm of fiction in the three novels under discussion. Setting their stories within a time-and-place-specific context, the writers employ their imaginary characters' actions as well as some literary devices (such as a train ride) to approach the real of that time and place. They allude to early 20th century Russia to create a historical background in relation to the narrative. The dialogue between the historical past and the contemporary narrative is activated, and, although the historical is detached, there is a constant awareness of its existence. This muted presence of details of the immediate pre-Revolutionary period does not seem to have affected the representation of Russia by the three writers under discussion. They still attribute to the nation all the stereotypical characteristics such as riotousness, otherness and indeterminacy which have been traditionally ascribed to Russia by writers in English for centuries (see our earlier discussion). This chapter seeks to explore how those historical representations and the contemporary narrative are intertwined in the novels, and how the writers create Barthes' "*realism effect*" to reinvent the past and to construct "their" pre-Revolutionary Russia.

In order to investigate this, I will take a closer insight into the writers' exposition of the historical narrative. Conrad's representation of the main characters (Haldin and Razumov) as antagonistic forces, their perception of historical time from two different angles, and West's literary treatment of a train ride and Slavic conversation, will be analysed to support the argument. And my analysis will demonstrate how the writers' techniques work to represent the cruelty and maleness of the pre-Revolutionary time and depict Russia as a chaotic and ambiguous nation. The image of the train as a sign of both progress and destruction will be explored. In addition, the imaginary construction of the forest in Fitzgerald's novel as a refuge for the troubled Russian identity and a place of salvation will be treated as a device with a similar effect. In other words, this chapter is intended to demonstrate how, through all these literary techniques, these largely Anglophone writers approach the Russia of the time, simultaneously making the past distant from the contemporary narrative.

The political situation in pre-Revolutionary Russia is mediated by the texts, exemplifying how representation gives us apparent access through narrative to experience, or the real, simultaneously maintaining a distance between them. The riotousness of the situation comes to us through representative images which subtly stand for the shifting image of the nation. It is this historicity that creates the background and contextualization to represent the image in a framing of place-time specificity (Hall 2003: 101). By using submerged and concealed meanings, the technique of representation detaches the reproduced object, that is, the pre-Revolutionary setting, from the narrative, converting it into a symbolic background for the stories. History is incorporated into the discursive practice, producing the contextualization of the past through the symbolic construction of a representation. In other words, it is through the historical location of the representation that we gain the meaning from which we know that the real setting of the three novels is not England or France, but, in Wolfe's words, (1971: 124) "the crumbling bedrock described in the most prophetic poem of our century, Yeats's 'The Second Coming'".[75] We know past Russia via the text, which rewrites it to make a story. Consequently, our knowledge of pre-Revolutionary Russia can only be textual, and not historical.

Under Western Eyes, Conrad's last political novel, raises questions of society, politics, and the Russian historical past. As we have already seen, this book had a personal resonance for the writer, as its subject is the Russian character, despotism and revolution from which Conrad, as a Pole, had suffered through his nation and family under Russian occupation (Zabel 1966: 117).[76] Therefore it is understandable that the writer's pessimistic vision of Russia, his fear of Russian despotism and autocracy, and the disregard of the political consequences have become the subjects of his writing. Conrad's concluding remarks on the novel, as well as on Russian history, are embedded in the paragraph written three years after the Revolution of 1917 and added as an "Author's Note":

> The ferocity and imbecility of an autocratic rule rejecting all legality and in fact basing itself upon complete moral anarchism provokes the no less imbecile and atrocious answer of a purely Utopian revolutionism encompassing destruction by the first means to hand, in the strange conviction that a fundamental change of hearts must follow the downfall of any given human

---

[75] See our discussion of the poem in the Introduction.

[76] Zabel argues that Conrad was born in Russian-occupied Poland in 1857 as the son of one of the most active participants in the Polish National Committee. Three of his uncles had been killed or exiled during the Polish rising against Russia in 1863-65, and his father, poet, translator, patriot, and member of the "Red" or extremist wing of the Polish cause, had been arrested by the Russian authorities in 1861 (1966: 125).

> institutions. These people are unable to see that all they can effect is merely a change of names. The oppressors and the oppressed are all Russians together; and the world is brought once more face to face with the truth of the saying that the tiger cannot change his stripes nor the leopard his spots. (Conrad 2003: vii)

Although Conrad's flexible identity in no way creates no easy sense in which he constructs the image of Russia from a purely "English" cultural perspective, the division between East and West becomes crucial to the novel, creating the drama of a historical past, with elements of tragic irony. As the narrator refers to the events: "it is not a story of the West of Europe" because the characters' lives' and actions' contrast "the different conditions of the Western thought" (2003: 15). Conrad's text explicitly juxtaposes East and West, suggesting its reading as a typically English imperialistic and dominant representation of the Russian nation and identity in which the Other (that is, Russia) is constructed as a threat to the western civilized world. Russia is perceived as different and is even controlled by the Western narrative through the English narrator.

The plot of the novel, which in the light of the present discussion can also be referred to as "history",[77] is integrated by the writer in the narrator's words, although there are in fact several other layers of narrative, including a level of "thought", or free indirect narrative. The language teacher's judgments about the nation exemplify subjectivity in the representation of the image of Russia and all the Russian people, referring to the familiar imagery of previous representations of Russia as a despotic and autocratic state. Here Conrad's earlier political novel *The Secret Agent* (1907) undeniably comes to mind, with its Mr Vladimir, the Russian representative in London, through whom the writer explores the battle between English and Russian political ideas. In both narratives, one can easily identify Russia as a land of despair and political reaction.

In addition, Conrad's narrative refers to a number of English turn-of-century political texts which were popular at that time and from which the public's knowledge of Russia came (Neilson 1995: 93-96). During that period, the presence of the "Russian theme" in Victorian novels, featuring terrorists and anarchists, was reinforced by Russian political exiles in Britain. The arrest in 1898 of Vladimir Burtsev, a Russian revolutionary living in London for assisting in the assassination of Nicholas II through the pages of his provocative journal *Narodovolets*,

---

[77] In early Modern English usage (1500 to 1700), "history" and "story" were interchangeable and applied equally to accounts of imaginary events or of events supposed to be true (Reilly 1993: 27).

facilitated such novels as George Griffith's *The Angel of the Revolution* (1893), with its anarchist central character Maurice Colston; Henry Seton Merriman's *Prisoners and Captives* (1891); and G.H. Henty's *Condemned as a Nihilist* (1897), as well as some other novels dealing with the Russian theme. In all of them, a nihilist hero, similar to Conrad's Haldin, appears as central and a victim of the autocratic, tyrannical Russian government. The fiction of that period portrayed Russia as a military threat to Britain and her Empire, a despotic land ruled by a brutal government.

Moreover, three of the most prominent British journalists of that period, Stead, Mackenzie Wallace and Dillon, wrote extensively on Russia. Their specialized knowledge and their own prejudices about Russia played a significant part in English public opinion (Neilson 1995: 95-96). They expressed skeptical views towards the Revolution and a belief in the necessity of reform. Wallace's long career in matters Russian and the influence of his two-volume study *Russia*, which first appeared in 1877, gave his voice a special authority. The British reader was condemned to a realization of Russia as a fertile land for producing anarchists, terrorists and nihilists of a similar kind, who rebelled against their government and suppressed its autocratic ruling. Thus, Conrad's *Under Western Eyes*, with the contribution of the writer's own Russophobic standpoint and Slavic-English experiences, became a part of the literary canon of the time.

This is clearly seen in Conrad's novel's narrator's vision of Russia through which Peter Ivanovitch not only demonstrates a stereotypical quotation and a commonplace image of the nation of that time, but also reveals the writer's own perception of Russia. Conrad's disbelief in the democracy of the Russian state and the positive change that the Revolution might bring, earlier expressed in his "Autocracy and War", an essay written on the occasion of the Japanese defeat of Russia in 1905, is bound to his family history. It is also intertextually collaborative with the writing of that period and historically predetermined. His ideas about the Revolution as an anti-human and unfruitful form of upheaval, as well as about Russian autocracy as a mechanism for which "the only conceivable self-reform is – suicide", permeate his novel (Conrad 2008: 94). In *Under Western Eyes,* the narrator insists that it is the Russian way of thinking and despotism which causes Razumov's problems. He refers to the latter as the result of a "historical autocracy", which "represses ideas, guards its power, and defends its existence" (*UWE* 2003: 15). In his vision, Russia has succumbed to this fate, suffering from "the shadow of tyranny lying upon Russian lives in their submission or revolt" (2003: 72). The autocratic order is represented through the figures of Prince K. and General T., who are regarded as the embodiment of power and perfection, and whom Razumov therefore addresses as "your Excellency" (2003: 30-31).

In the images of these two, the incarnation of the autocratic principle, rooted in the old tradition of Muscovy, is fused. As an absolute ruler with a despotic philosophy, Prince K. is endowed with the image of the "popular Tsar", which, according to Figes, has a historical attachment to Muscovy (1997: 6). In his personality, there is a kind of a glorification of the Romanov dynasty, which coincides in time and place with the setting of the novel. One of the main principles of the power of the Romanovs' dynasty was personal rule, which means that the Tsar's will should be unrestrained by laws or bureaucracy, and "he should be left to rule the country according to his own consciousness of duty and right" (1997: 6). Thus the assassination of Haldin has been carried out on the authority of the Prince's will because, as the narrator asserts, "autocracy knows no law" (*UWE* 2003: 49). This demonstrates the reinvention of the Russian historical past incorporated in the images of the characters. Moreover, as Razumov is a representative of the simple Russian soul, he sees "the tsarist figure" of Prince K. as a father-figure, being completely convinced that Prince K. truly understands him. Razumov calls him "a dignity, a great personage" who "once had pressed his hand as no other man had pressed it – a faint but lingering pressure like a secret sign, a half-unwilling caress" (2003: 24). As a Russian with a simple peasant soul, Razumov thinks of the autocrat as a godfather. For him, Prince K. is the *Tsar-Batiushka,* [78] whom the Russian student acclaims with enthusiasm. Through such a representation, the Russian historical narrative, or *the real,* undeniably intrudes.

A historical representation is both absent and present in the novel. Haldin is the embodiment of the Revolution. He is one of those rebels whom the General "detests", calling them "perfect unbelievers" and "brutes" who deny God and possess "subversive minds" (*UWE* 2003: 31). As Haldin is the only one who tries to struggle against the system but fails, the revolution is represented as a Utopia, which, in Razumov's words, "inspire[s] in the mass of mediocre minds a disgust of reality and a contempt for the secular logic of human development" (2003: 60). By representing Haldin as political reformer rather than terrorist, Conrad follows the tradition of that time in portraying the Russian nihilists as rebels for liberty and human rights rather than anarchists and socialists (Neilson 1995: 108). Haldin is a man with a different psyche and values, who shows his discontent by using the anarchist form of a political crime, which, in his opinion, is not murder, but war (2003: 13). Being one of those people who has grown up, in Pipes's words,

---

[78] As in the Russian folk tales, this name, which meant Father-Tsar, was given to the Tsar by peasants to show their full respect and devotion. The peasants were convinced that the Tsar knew them all personally by name, understood their problems, and could satisfy their demands. According to Figes (1997: 11, 12), the naïve peasant myth of the Good Tsar worked as propaganda to the benefit of the crown.

"under the regime of extraordinary and temporary laws [sic]" (1995: 317),[79] his vision of the future is in a "new revelation" which will come to Russia to replace the "modern" and "false civilization" (*UWE* 2003: 13). His capriciously destructive and illusive philosophy reflects the chaotic and unmanageable historical time and setting. He experiences history not as progress, continuity and cohesion, but as dissonance, disconnection and aimlessness. Haldin's situation and thoughts constitute the opposite of Razumov's position and vision of life. As discussed earlier, the latter suffers from isolation and a need for continuity, which Pettersson, for instance, associates with the continuity of Russian history (1982: 155). The confrontation between these two characters is concisely embedded in Razumov's writing:

> History not Theory.
> Patriotism not Internationalism.
> Evolution not Revolution.
> Direction not Destruction.
> Unity not Disruption. (*UWE* 2003: 41)

In these five lines, the idea of Revolution as anti-historical, irrational, self-destructive and fragmented is summed up, giving the novel its historical space-time contextualization through narrative, and the representation of Haldin's image. The latter encapsulates the characteristics of the time: anarchism, crime, and revolution. These lines, in Zabel's opinion, also represent the antagonism of forces which Conrad knew in his own history, and demonstrate his "deep-seated historical pessimism" (1966: 126). Through such an allusion, the representation reinvents the past, and creates a historical legitimacy, veiling them behind a literary representation. Jie Lu calls it disenchantment, or disjunction between historical moments and literary production when "history returns, not as truth, but as category of representation" (2001: 254). The latter, as discussed earlier, is in the process of continuous construction and redefinition. Therefore, the historical narrative which is transcribed through writing (that is, representation) into fiction, is never absolute.

Recent critical discourse (Jenkins *et al.*) has regarded history as dominant and oppressive, who opined that its mastery drives the narrative towards appropriation of the subordinate by the superior. Russia, defined earlier as the subject of the

---

[79] Pipes refers to all revolutionaries as to the people who were arrested, kept in jail, and sentenced to exile by the political police of the imperial government for performing any secret activity, the causes of which Pipes sees in the government's proscriptions and prohibitions, which "pushed the citizens into opposition ranks, where they became receptive to extremist appeals" (1995: 315).

British Empire in English writing,[80] emerges through the myth of historical tradition as withdrawn and irrational. Thus Conrad's attempt to rewrite Russian history might be regarded as being caused by his dual perception: firstly, as he himself asserts, by the obligation of absolute fairness, imposed on him historically and by inheritance ("Author's Note" 2003: v), and secondly, by his desire to demonstrate his non-Slavic allegiance and to look at Russia with his "western eyes".[81] The result of such an approach is incorporated in the constructed, non-absolute nature of representation, which challenges our historical knowledge of pre-Revolutionary Russia.

The same is true of Rebecca West's novel, in which, as in Conrad's work, there is a constant sense of history and a progression of historical time and action, although fictional historical narrative is blended with it. As in Conrad's work, in which the story is narrated through the western eyes of the teacher, in West's novel pre-Revolutionary intrigue is seen through the eyes of Laura, Nikolai's half-English granddaughter. Mostly set in France, the episodes unfold with a constant sense of the presence of Russia and its historical time. The historical knowledge of events, which returns to us in the form of representation, has undergone a complex transformation from the account in the memoirs which West originally heard into Laura's words.

The Birds Fall Down offers a new meaning for interpretation through a number of literary devices which establish a proximity to the real. One of these devices is the male conversation which West symbolically uses to criticize the male public world (Rollyson 1998b: 203), and probably to represent the cruelty of the pre-Revolutionary time. This central conversation, which, according to West herself, is founded on a historical event (*Birds* "Foreword" 1978: 7), takes place on a moving train. According to Wolfe (1971: 123), Nikolai's and Chubinov's conversation ventriloquizes the Slavic spirit: its sudden revelation of idea and consecutive argument expresses Slavic selfhood. When one of them starts to talk, he continues at length. However, in this barrage of speech, there is West's personal attitude to the revolutionaries, who "talk and talk, and what they reveal is a monstrous inhumanity" (Rollyson 1998b: 2). Laura, who becomes a witness of the conversation and an unwilling participant of the train ride, remains silent.

---

[80] In early English discourse, Russia was associated with slavery of one sort or another, and a connection between Russia and blackness is evident in English texts (Archer 2001: 111, 124). See also our earlier discussion of Shakespeare's, Milton's and Defoe's works. The images of Russia constructed by some English writers produced the portrayal of the ambiguous, imagined nation which became, in Said's words, "the subject of expert writing" (1978: 238).

[81] See Kaye (1999), and Smith (2007).

This is the reason why Rollyson refers to this discourse as "cocks-at-war" – "the males vying with each other for mating privileges, so intent that they do not hear the firing guns, which bring them down" (1998b: 205).[82] Through this, West, as we have seen, manages not merely to construct the revolutionary spirit taking place in tsarist Russia, but is able to demonstrate how male character unfolds from the practice of political intrigue. This long dialectical exchange, in which two different perceptions of the world collide, is the embodiment of Hegelian theory, threatening human feelings.[83] The very essence of the conversation is despotic and unjust, and therefore takes place on a train, which represents the erosion and decline of human ideals and the oppressive nature of the time. Chubinov's story represents a collective image of the Russian character or life of that time, with its suffering, injustice and ambiguity – all the evils that his discourse embraces to approach the real. As the narrator asserts, "In Russian conversation there always seemed to be a crowd of faceless personalities doing violent things" (*Birds* 1978: 125). This discursive construction of the Russian pre-Revolutionary world, embedded in the words of the characters, shows how meaning determines one's place. Chubinov, who appears as an outsider on the train, brings with him that negative motion of change which symbolically conveys destruction and violence. West's male world is "deep, deep in the dust of tedium" (*Birds* 1978: 305-306). Therefore the Russian pre-Revolutionary past intrudes through inhuman Russian spirit the male train debate.

This brutality is not only embedded in Chubinov's words but also in his image, which reminds one of a kind of timid destroyer, an anti-western figure who, according to West, looks Russian (*Birds* 1978: 95-96): "he was middle-sized, lean and pale, with unkempt hair and meagre beard and moustache, all mouse-brown, and grey eyes behind spectacles" (1978: 95). He is not neatly dressed, and, like the hill-people in Kipling's *Kim* (1901), believes that "all Russians are all beggars" (1978: 303), Chubinov, too, represents commonality. Although, in Laura's opinion, he likes her grandfather very much (*Birds* 1978: 98), his behaviour proves the opposite. His noble bearing makes him snobbishly think that he is superior to Nikolai (1978: 96-97). Yet the writer does not place her characters in a

---

[82] Starting writing the novel in 1943, West originally gave it the title "Cockcrow" thinking of the treacherous nexus between family, politics, and art (Rollyson 1998b: 191). This title can be regarded as symbolic in relation to the train conversation, which represents, in Rollyson's words, "an assault on English complacency" (1998b: 206).

[83] Hegel was convinced that the dialectic requires not the apotheosis of the present state but its total destruction. Seemingly impossible changes suddenly become possible by considering the fact that history proceeds through contradictions. The Russian Hegelians, such as Kamensky, found in his theory a call to revolution: to the destruction of "God and the State" (Billington 1970: 326).

position of hierarchy. Instead, she aligns both men by letting them share the same interests in politics, experience betrayal by the same man, and become implicated in guilt: "Oh, God,' exclaimed Nikolai, 'were you the son of my friend, a party to all those crimes?' 'Why, so were you,' said Chubinov" (*Birds* 1978: 119). This is West's version of a man whom she extensively explores to represent the world of uncertainty, duality and the eternal battle between good and evil.

Her world is patriarchal, equated with the male principles which she integrates, in Wolfe's words, "into the skeletal system of her feminism: perhaps men are more destructive than women because they are more given to pragmatic action" (1978: 117). Therefore Laura, who during the conversation on the train tries to interrupt the argument between Nikolai and Chubinov, remains unheard to emphasize her rootedness in the home, in contrast to men's absorption in public affairs.[84] Symbolically, this represents a collision between the female figure of Mother Russia and the male image of the riotous historical time when the Revolution is approaching.

Apart from constructing Russia through the images of her characters, West also uses the train as a symbolic device to represent the chaotic universe of that historical place and time and to offer an approach to realism. In Russian literature too the train has either symbolized apocalyptic events or has been the setting which eventually leads to them as in Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* (1904), Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* (1875-1877), Dostoyevsky's *The Idiot* (1869) and *Demons* (1873). In Blok's poems "The Last Day" (1904), and "The Twelve" (1918), and Briusov's "The Pale Horse" (1903), the modern city is associated with the train. It is depicted as a labyrinth with "many doors and no exits", populated by people with "small compressed, cubic souls", and dominated by "steel fever" and an "electrical uprising", creating a vision of a train as a symbol of apocalypse (Billington 1970: 507). Therefore, by setting the main scene in drafty train stations, a moving train and a claustrophobic location, West, too, represents the fast-moving rhythm of twentieth-century life, leading to the inevitable distraction of the characters and the madness of the universe.[85] She describes train stations as

---

[84] When English writers describe the fate of women in Russia, their accounts usually emphasize their repression (Palmer 2004: 165). Therefore West's placing of Laura's image in the shadow during the male conversation embodies a mode of the Russian subordination and oppression.

[85] The industrialization of time at the beginning of the 20th century produced a fast-moving rhythm of life which was represented by many writers through railroad imagery. Trains not only link places together, but also destroy the space between them (Schivelbusch qtd. in Lounsbery 2007: 224-225). Therefore West's description of the train station and her treatment of the train's space as threatening to human's space alludes to the lunacy of the world and also to the Revolution as a destructive force.

chaotic places in which "an atmosphere of threatening and causeless rancour, as of a revolution without an object" (*Birds* 1978: 89) is constantly present.

This situation is related to the one the characters have departed from (that is, Russia), emphasizing Laura's and Nikolai's perpetual struggle in gaining a better life. Like Jack London's *The Iron Heel* (1908), in which the plot predicts the growth of a totalitarian regime and portrays society controlled by capitalists called The Iron Heel, in West's novel Bolshevism, as a product, is shown as a fight between land and iron. Williams, for example, associates revolutions with trains because, as he expresses it, "the general revolution accelerates time like a railroad train" (1997: 295). The image of apocalyptic metal (either heel or train) is mingled with the image of the train which dashes through the chaos of the Revolution towards the future, leaving the past and Russia behind.

Billington emphasizes that, during the Civil War, the train symbol was given new suggestiveness by the Bolshevik use of brightly-ornamented propaganda trains and Trotsky's repeated forays to the front in an armored command train. He continues that, in Russian literature, the Civil War was portrayed as a nocturnal collision between two armored trains, red and white, moving from East and West to a fated collision in the heart of Russia (1970: 507). For example, in Vsevolod Ivanov's painting novel *Bronepoezd No 14-69* [*Armoured Train No 14-69*], the train is represented as a "blind" beast which "runs through the bonfires" (1985: 58), "defending itself with might and main against the bullets, and behind its steel-reinforced walls there are soldiers running from carriage to carriage" (my translation 1985: 59).[86] It seems as if there was no way out of this metallic structure which is carrying people towards their death.

This frightening, speeding, massive machine disconnects its passengers from the "real" world, emphasizing its unity with their troubled identities. As mentioned before, the train is a symbol of a transition from the past to the future, from the old to the new, from east to west, and consequently, from Russia to the West. It utilizes Russianness, making it an ideal setting for Slavic storytelling. As in *Kim,* where the train of the great British Empire becomes an Indian train full of Hindus, Sepoys, Muslims and Sikhs speaking their languages and symbolically appropriating the train through dialogue and conversation, or the Jewish merchants[87] from

---

[86] See also the chapter "Train No. 58" in Pil'niak's panoramic *Naked Year* (1920), and Nikitin's story "Night" (1923).

[87] After the decision made by Tsar Nikolas I in the 1840s to develop the Russian railroad, the third-class train carriage was the place inhabited by Jews starting their transatlantic passage to America, Jewish horse traders, and even Jewish horse thieves (Garrett 2001: 67). According

the cities of Eastern Europe, who conduct business, speak Yiddish and talk about their families, the Russian characters in the novel make it *their* train as well. As Leah Garrett expresses it,

> On a train, you lose your connection not only to the natural world but also to natural time. Whereas the coach is like an homogeneous family or the closed social units of the premodern world, the train is like a heterogeneous city, with myriads class divisions and the concomitant class hatreds. Whereas the coach moves in natural time, the train moves in city time, which is frantic, compartmentalized, and disconnected from the natural world. The train is thus a symbol of the breakdown of the unified natural world into fractured parts of the industrial machine. The machine is anonymous and inhuman. It lacks familial, natural, and spiritual ties (2001: 73).

From this we can conclude that in West's novel the train symbolizes not only mobility and modernization, but also, in Garrett's words, the "arbitrarily oppressive rhythms" (2001: 70) of the time and setting. Unlike in Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* (for example, Anna's death on the tracks), or in Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard* (where the train denotes the end of the era of the landed gentry), the train connotes no single perspective in *The Birds Fall Down,* and therefore contributes to the profound discontinuity and apocalypses associated with pre-Revolutionary Russia.

In West's novel, this symbolic connotation of the train is complex but repetitive in terms of its meaning: as its destination is France, the train runs towards the west, which is the future, to escape the approaching end. It runs from Russia and its historical past. On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, its monstrous expression (that is, its length and the iron it is made of) is itself apocalyptic. As a result, it comprises people such as the characters Laura, Nikolai, Kamensky and Chubinov, who, as if imprisoned inside, cannot flee from their destiny and total upheaval. The significance of the image of the train is maybe as unresolved as the entire philosophical idea, incorporated in West's novel. As one of the characters asserts, "meaning is one thing and doing is another" (*Birds* 1978: 90). Thus, by placing her characters and the crucial scene in the space of a train the writer shows the irresolute nature of the characters' lives and situations in pre-1917 Russia. The train ride and the conversation there symbolize the movement of change, maleness and cruelty of the world in which women and Russia, as a Mother figure, become outsiders.

---

to Garrett, the great Russian train system became for many Jewish writers something that they conceived of as Jewish rather than Russian.

A similar allusion to the real that the writer constructs through the symbolism of the images is traceable in Fitzgerald's novel *The Beginning of Spring.* Lisa Ivanovna, a Russian peasant woman, whom Frank employs, as he himself says "on a temporary basis" (1998: 131), is a typical representative of the Russian *narod,* the image perceived not only by the West, as shown earlier, but also by the pre-Revolutionary intelligentsia.[88] Alexander Etkind (2003) maintains that, in contrast to British cultural anthropology, which tended to be an imperialistic study of usually distant Others overseas, Russian ethnography of the 1860s was an imperialistic study of its own people perceived as the Other (2008: 566). In Etkind's opinion, it was the intelligentsia, including some Westernized Russian intellectuals such as Shchapov, Kelsiev, and Mikhailov, who constructed their own "exotic" people, producing Orientalizing knowledge and practices directed at their own people. They created "an Orientalism of the Orient, internalized and projected onto the national body" (2008: 588).[89] This idea is encapsulated in Lisa's character, and her position in relation to the other characters in the novel.

Like all simple Russian peasants before the Revolution, Lisa is alien and exotic to the noble Frank Reid, who by the very definition of his hybrid identity demonstrates a kind of double estrangement from the heroine. Firstly, he is an upper class man, and secondly, he is English. Thus Lisa is subordinate to Frank because she is one of the typical representatives of the 80 per cent of the Russian population which was, at the beginning of the 20th century, classified as belonging to the peasantry, and of whom, according to Figes, the educated classes of the cities knew next to nothing (1997: 88-89). In this mutual incomprehension and the cultural gulf between the "Two Russias" (Figes 1997: 89), as well as between Frank and Lisa, lay the roots of destruction.

Frank's and Lisa's total difference is striking, and is emphasized in a variety of ways to show the former's privileged position and the latter's rootedness in peasant culture. She is like a shadow of her people – faceless, silent, inert, with a potential sense of guilt. She expects Frank to forgive her all the time, not even knowing what wrong she has done: "What could you possibly have done wrong?" Frank enquires, and continues, "I don't know what your unspoken thoughts are,

---

88 A widespread attitude on the part of educated Russians towards the "masses", in which egalitarianism and elitism were closely intertwined, reflected the idea. It was up to intellectuals to articulate the people's interests on the people's behalf (Tolz 2001: 95).

89 Such misunderstandings were a constant theme in the history of relations between educated and peasant Russia (Figes 1997: 87). The isolation of the peasantry from the rest of society was manifested at almost every level – legal, political, economic, cultural, social and geographic (1997: 89).

but I've got no complaints about what you do … I forgive you, Lisa" (*Spring* 1998: 156). She is the embodiment of the Russian historical past because her slave consciousness is a hallmark of her class identity. The black shawl with which she constantly covers herself to conceal her body, the attempts to remain invisible while being present at the same time so that "one would hardly notice she was in the room" (1998: 154), the ability of the heroine to speak only when she is spoken to, "as though the natural condition of life was peace" (1998: 153) serve as symbolic signs of the Russian a collective identity to approach the real of that time and to show the commonality of the image of the simple Russian woman constructed at the turn of the 20th century: "Frank looked far and near for a sight of Lisa's black shawl. There were hundreds, perhaps thousands of black shawls and a great many young women in charge of children" (1998: 160). Her pale (to symbolize facelessness), "dreaming Russian face … reminded him of another face which he had seen recently, though he couldn't remember when or where" (1998: 82). Such a representation undeniably constructs the bound-slave, collective identity of the Russian peasant of that time.

This unity in multiplicity is also represented through the dark forest of birch trees. The Russian forest has been always regarded as being the nursery of Russian culture.[90] Unlike the desert nomad who was surrounded by barren sand, the typical Muscovite dwelt among rich woods, from where he could extract logs for his hut, bark for his shoes, fur for his clothing, moss for his floors and pine boughs for his bed (Billington 1970: 21). The word *izba,* which means "heated wooden building", was the one most widely used in Muscovy to describe a dwelling place. It is also present in Fitzgerald's novel, in which Moscow is full of half-burned down wooden houses, such as Frank's family house (*Spring* 1998: 34), or wooden houses that "stood at intervals" along a side-road (1998: 17). The sense of living in the forest and being surrounded by trees is rooted in the novel, and is represented through the Russian habit of dwelling in overheated wooden houses and huts with outer street doors and the shutters closed (1998: 53), like the Kuriatins' home.

In James Meek's novel *The People's Act of Love* (1962), set in the Siberia of 1919, the forest imagery plays a large part, and is frequently involved in the discussion about the Russian soul and character. It is associated with a pastoral world, with no money and no corruption, which evokes the Russian soul as a pure

---

[90] Russian chroniclers of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries use the name of a dominant city referring to *zaleskaia zemlia*, "the land of wood", or "the land of forest". Even in modern times, popular folklore taught that the primeval forest had extended all the way up to heaven (Billington 1970: 21).

and enigmatic phenomenon. When speaking of the Slavs to whom the Russian nation also belongs, one of the characters Matula admits that they have "the sense of the forest" and "Asiatic forest souls", meaning that their souls are uncorrupted and different from those of the westerners (2005: 164). He believes that their souls live in a tree in the forest, and when they die, the tree falls (2005: 164): "We Slavs all have part of our soul lodged in the forest", he says (2005: 164). Therefore the mystical episode in which Lisa (in *The Beginning of Spring*) guides Dolly (one of Frank's children) to the forest at night, reveals her attempt to escape from her identity and her desire to bury it in the "deep thickness of the wood" (1998: 174). Like Meek's character, Lisa believes that the forest will protect her: "The birch tree forest … always gives a chance of life" (*Spring* 1998: 172). The image of the forest is historically attached to Russian identity, and symbolically becomes a part of it.

As Lisa seeks her salvation in the forest, the dark Russian forest in the novel is as if a symbol of freedom from oppression and hegemony. Because the law in tsarist Russia tied people more strictly to one place, they were fonder of wondering, and therefore "freedom" for them perhaps meant more than "freedom" anywhere else. (Calder 1976: 19). The limitless expanses of the Russian land and the unspoilt wilderness of its nature metaphorically offer a resolution and an escape from oppression. Forest in the novel, in Selwyn's words, is a "more free and natural place" where under the sky "a man and a woman can join body and soul and find out what work they have to do in the world" (*Spring* 1998: 181), and where the birch trees, with their "human hands, moving to touch each other across the *whiteness and blackness* [italics mine]" (1998: 174), welcome everybody, regardless of race, class or gender. As Lisa feels herself isolated both emotionally and psychologically, she seeks asylum in *her* peasant pastoral world.

To transcend the historical past, my selected writers not only use their characters, but also some vivid imagery to symbolically represent the nation. A train ride in West's novel or a birch forest in Fitzgerald's are devices which endow the novels with new meanings and open new challenges for their interpretation. To escape her troubled identity, the pursuit of freedom through the forest represents an asylum for Lisa, and acquires a special symbolic meaning for the other characters in the novels. Although for Nikolai (in *The Birds Fall Down*) the forest means extremity and danger, he thinks that "even a woman should not always stay in the garden", but sometimes walk in the forest "for her soul's sake" (*Birds* 1978: 71). The forest is seen as salvation, a reservoir of naturalness and imagination. It is a pastoral world which even in the Russian chronicles of the formative early period represented a kind of evergreen curtain for the imagination, shielding it from increasingly remote Western urbanity (Billington 1970: 21). Like the train in

West's novel, which symbolically dashes from the Revolution through chaos to a new life, the forest represents the possible, the imaginable that the writers suggest to reinvent the Russia of the past.

In conclusion, this chapter has demonstrated how the writers use different techniques, images and symbols to approach the real, and to transcend the historical condition of the past, integrating it into the present context of fiction. The imagined construction of the specific historical setting (pre-Revolutionary Russia) is intertwined with the present narrative, making its interpretation challenging. Conrad's construction of the drama of a historical past of the nation through his vision of the Revolution as a destructive force, and the opposition of the main characters, indicates the instability of the situation of the time, and the porous and ambiguous image of the nation, which shows a multifaceted image of Russia. The writer's pre-Revolutionary setting is, in Barthes's words, that "unformulated signified" (1997: 122) which, although it remains disengaged from the main narrative, is still present. Conrad's pessimistic view of the nation is embedded in the symbolic nature of the main narrative, which reinvents the Russian historical past and reestablishes a proximity between history and text.

The historical condition of the time is detached from the main stories, being only rarely reinforced by specific references to pre-Revolutionary life in Russia, like Stolypin's assassination in Fitzgerald's novel (1998: 49). Yet the representation of the characters, as well as that of the setting, constructs the allusion to early 20th-century Russia through an imagined, symbolic system of representation. Lisa's peasant image of an invisible, unheard, woman with unspoken thoughts as if covered with a black shawl represents the collective identity of the people she belongs to, and reveals commonality. She stands as a signifier to construct the image of the simple Russian woman at the turn of the 20th century and to endow the narrative with Barthes' "*realism effect*". Her image represents the Russian *narod,* which is simple and dependent. In other words, here we can distinguish between the historical expression, or ways of expressing the real, the past, and the interpretation of the literary text which the constructive nature of the representation suggests.

Overall, the writers approach *the real* by placing their imaginary characters in a historical context of pre-Revolutionary Russia. Conrad, Fitzgerald and West acknowledge the Other through exposure of the insecurity of the time, and the profound alienation and ambiguity of the setting of pre-Revolutionary Russia, to elaborate the points of metaphorical connection between history and fiction. Although their representations differ, producing multiple interpretations, the story of the Russian past in terms of the representation of Russian identity and the writers'

attempts to evoke the time authentically seem similar – an idea which holds all the three narratives together. This gives the imaginary characters a context, and allows them to be read against the Russian historical background. Although the latter is also imagined through western eyes, the constructive representation strives to present the imagined as real. The writers refer to certain historical instances, such as the autocratic regime and the social order, crime and anarchy, cruelty and duality, or Stolypin's assassination (*Spring* 1998: 49) to articulate the symbolic. In other words, the unrepresentable, the unspeakable nature of history in the novels remains on the one hand absent and on the other as the pervasive issue in the representation.

8 RUSSIA DISPLACED

> Townes they plant none, nor other standing buildings. But have walking houses, which the latines call Veii, built upon wheeles like a shepherds cottage. These they drawe with them whithersoever they goe, driving their cattell with them.
>
> Giles Fletcher, "The description of the countrey of Russia, with the bredth, length, and names of the Shires", 1588.

This chapter seeks to examine how the writers of the three English novels under discussion, through different means of representation, construct Russia as a displaced nation, located in-between, and deprived of its certain space and meaning. The writers' constructions demonstrate a stereotypical placement of the nation as an ambiguous Other, emphasizing the contradictory nature of the imageme of Russianness and the binaries which lie at the very core of its literary production. This stereotypical reporting brings the idea of displacement as the text's strategy to characterize the nation and to serve as a tool for articulation of its "typical" patterns. In addition, it constructs oppositional pairs, intensifying difference. As a result, the Russia of the novels comes to represent a colonized space perceived as the "unhomely", while the Western space is portrayed as that of the colonizer, creating a symbolic opposition. That is to say, the writers place their Russian characters in dispossession of their homeland, while demonstrating the English characters' attachment to their home. The relationship of the characters towards their own selves and the external world show how their identities, either in the form of physical exile (like Nikolai's in *The Birds Fall Down* and Razumov's in *Under Western Eyes*), or mental dislocation (like Frank's in *The Beginning of Spring*), are shaped in the search for their belonging, their home location.

Moreover, this chapter will also attempt to reestablish the idea of home and away, which during the last century has been re-rooted and re-routed in fiction written in English (George 1996: 1), and which is redefined in particular in Conrad's novel. Being, like their author, away from home and in search of the self, Conrad's protagonists do not find a resolution. When placed in context with Russia, the stereotypical view of home as a fixed, stable, unchangeable entity is destroyed by bringing to light a more fluid, more ambiguous perception "in-between", Bhabha's Third Space (Bhabha 1998). This serves as an ideological trope of the English nation's imperialistic narrative on Russia, in which a colonized space is perceived by the subject as a not-quite-at-home place, while the new space remains unfamiliar. Through such alienation and difference, the home location is distanced not

only geographically but also metaphorically, and the subject automatically becomes the Other, a hybrid creature, a person in the making.

This highlights a paradox in the perception of Russia, and Moscow in particular, in Fitzgerald's novel as both a provincial domicile and as unhomely. Imagined as a subordinate nation, located on the borderline, Russia in the novels constitutes a place of savagery, a point to which one may be a perpetual stranger although seeking to identify it as a home place. Lyotard refers to such point as "nodal" – a place where a person is located and through which various kinds of messages pass (qtd. in Kaplan 1996: 16). As this place is a frontier, it is ambivalent, because it allows both communication and separation. Such indeterminacy is in favour of notions of exile and nomadism, which this chapter will identify as being inevitable attributes of displaced Russian identity. Whether constructed as a welcoming domicile, or described as a not-quite-at-home oppressed community, representation of the displaced Russian nation in the novels functions as a powerful trope to signify cultural, racial, national difference, and to emphasize the equivocal nature of a stereotype construction. Accordingly, this chapter seeks to examine how Russia, with its profound estrangement, alienation and ambiguity, exists in this paradoxical realm.

The term *displacement*, or dislocation can be defined as a consequence of willing or unwilling movement from a known to an unknown location (Ashcroft *et al.* 2000: 71). The ideas of separation and distance, home and away, the Other and the Self are intrinsically embedded in the concept. One word to describe the experience of dislocation is "unhomely", Freud's term *unheimlich* or *unheimlichkeit* – literally "unhousedness" or "not-at-home-ness" – which is also sometimes translated as "uncanny" or "uncanniness" (2000: 71). Bhabha also speaks of the relocation of the home and the world – that is, the condition of displacement when the borders between home and world become confused (1994: 9). In such a position, a displaced identity undergoes deconstruction, alienation and change – a condition predicated on difference. It is through the latter that alienation and otherness is constructed, because being imagined as the Other means being identified as different, which, in turn, predetermines displacement.

In *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900), Freud identifies displacement as one of the aspects of the dream-work which serves to disguise the dream's true meaning (sexual), or the unconscious message of the dream. Along with condensation, which refers to the condition in which the evident content of a dream is reduced, compared with the full dream thoughts that can be derived from it, those of Freud, concept of displacement represents a serpentine path. By means of disguise and distortion, it carries the symbolic meaning of a dream. What makes his assump-

tion relevant to the present study is the idea of transition: dream-thoughts are transformed to manifest content, and abstract words come to correspond to concrete words which precede and encourage the audio-visual staging of the dream (1997: 193-196). This process presupposes the alteration of meaning within the content – an idea similar to postcolonial interpretations of the concept of displacement in that a displaced identity also undergoes a transformation, a movement which results not only in the alteration of space, but also in the modification of identity's meaning (hybridity).

Although the exposition of displacement in contemporary postcolonial theories differs from the Freudian, his ideas of transition and change are still pertinent. In the works of Homi Bhabha (1994), Edward Said (2003), Caren Kaplan (1996), Nadia Lovell (1998), Wendy Everett and Peter Wagstaff (2004), Trinh T. Minh-ha (1994) and Madan Sarup (1996), displacement signifies a departure from the original position with relocation to a new place, and therefore can be regarded as a starting point for rethinking problems of identity. Postcolonial studies raise questions of diaspora, national identity and cultural difference in relation to displacement, which this work regards as being central to the problems of represening Russianness. The emergence of such terms is closely linked to a colonial discourse which constructs the categories and ideas relating to power, producing a symbolic representation. Therefore, it is not enough to think of displacement only in terms of individuals' migration and crossing borders. So intricate and omnipresent is the trope of displacement that it has come to be seen as a metaphor for a variety of notions concerned with the alienated, the different, the hybrid. By examining these issues in connection with Russia, this chapter will explore how the nation has symbolically come into being as nomadic, homeless and displaced.

As this study mentioned earlier, problems of power are intrinsically linked with ideas of exclusion and inclusion which lie at the very core of the relations between Russia and the West, and the English in particular. Bhabha maintains that the phenomenon of displacement is typical of fictions that negotiate powers of cultural difference because it is in writing, which he calls "an apparatus of power", that the ambivalence of the nation is exploited, and where the privileged position of the English nation has been established (1994: 9; 1990: 292). As Herzen wrote, "The English are as whimsical in their relationships with foreigners as they are in everything else . . . they hardly disguise their sense of their own superiority" (1982: 450). This emphasizes the elite status of the English, simultaneously creating the patterns of opposition and resistance directed to and from the English Other. Although Herzen suggests the English nation's xenophobic experience is oriented towards all non-English, in Jimmie Cain's opinion "a virulent prejudice against Slavs principally directed at Russia" is predominant in the Eng-

lish novel (2006: 106).[91] This idea is constructed not only through representing the nation as feminine, subordinate, savage, etc., but also through locating the characters and the Russia on the borderline between two identities, the Russian and the European, which alludes to Fletcher's vision of the nation as division (discussed further), tests its limits, and generates its reading as fluid, malleable, optional. Thus, the construction of Russianness in relation to Englishness in the three novels under discussion poses more questions about displaced, relocated, disturbed Russian identity.

The early records of the Russian nation as nomadic and savage can be traced as early as the 16th century, when the English scholar, writer, ambassador and explorer Giles Fletcher, who travelled to Muscovia in 1588, produced a detailed account of the country in his *Of the Russe Commonwealth* (1591) (Masefield 1910: 18).[92] Coming from the other part of the world and being of Protestant upbringing, Fletcher approached the country through analytical reflection, defining the opposition and mapping the Russian space with its profound ambiguity and savagery. As the epigraph to this chapter suggests, the description of the Muscovites as a nomadic people without stable homes and personal affiliation is one of the aspects involved in Fletcher's representation of Russia to establish the idea of the nation as fluid, roaming and historically displaced. According to Palmer, Fletcher saw the very origin of the country as a division of the whole into its parts (2004: 139), which this study regards as a sign of difference within the nation and a vital prerequisite for the origin of a symbolic displacement as a phenomenon stereotypically attached to the nation. In addition, the Englishman regarded the Russians as a savage people, descended from the ancient Scythians, and his representation became the standard account of the Russian people in English writing (Hadfield 2001: 127). The three 20th century English novels that are the subject of the present study are case in point, demonstrating the perception of Russia as unhomely.

The idea of home is inextricably linked with the processes of exclusion and inclusion which the narrative of power imposes on narrative structure. In the novels,

---

[91] In Bram Stoker's *Dracula* (1897), a novel published at the time when anti-Russian sentiments were running high in England because of the Eastern Question, there is a clear struggle between an acceptable self that is English and a detestable other that is Slavic, or as Jimmie Cain argues, Russian, with antithetical qualities of duplicity, disease and corruption (2006: 103, 118, 119).

[92] Giles Fletcher the elder (1549?-1611) was an ambassador, Member of Parliament, and a poet. He was sent by Elizabeth to Scotland and Germany before travelling to Russia in 1588. His personal ambition and interest in Russia made its way into his writing, which became a lasting influence and a classic version of academic fame (Palmer 2004: 153).

the psychological and ideological orientation of the narratives is as if directed against their subjects, placing them outside their narrative. Conrad's novel is a remarkable instance of a narrative which is preoccupied with this phenomenon. The protagonist and the narrator go through a dissolution of autonomy in the course of the narrative. Both of them attempt to stake out a Western territory of rational, carefully bounded selfhood through the expulsion of the Russian, irrational other (Erdinast-Vulcan 1999: 18). In the case of Razumov that other is Haldin; in the case of the narrator the other is Razumov himself, now in opposition to the old teacher of languages. Nick De Marco argues that the narrator usurps Razumov's place as protagonist and Conrad's place as narrator because the Teacher of Languages is a masked version of Conrad himself whose attempt at "scrupulous impartiality"[93] does in fact create its opposite (1991: 41-42).

The English narratives in the novels occupy spaces and define their margins in which "our" and "their" territory is strictly segregated. Privileging the imaginary borders and creating the locality, or the privacy of the space of the English, involves the automatic exclusion of the space of the Other. The meaning of locality becomes metaphorically appropriated through representational space. "The confused immensity of the Eastern borders" (*UWE* 2003: 226) into which the Russians were born suggests vague margins and an ambiguous location which convert the country into a displaced entity. However, rather than viewing the locality as simply situated within specific margins, endowed with a certain national landscape and content, Nadia Lovell (1998) suggests treating it as a movement through space and time. The local, according to her, is dubious and allows deterritorialisation, which initiates the dynamics and dialectics of the relationship between the concepts of belonging and locality. In this sense, locality can be recreated as a particular place through the memory of past experiences which characterizes displaced communities (1998: 4, 10). This suggests that, while the English space is privatized and hegemonized, excluding the Other (Russia), the Russian space is transformed and mobilized, constituting a colonial space distinguished by its ambiguity, hybridity and strangeness. In other words, "the local" is conditioned into being and invoked into existence through the necessity of creating an "other" which is as different from ourselves as possible and is therefore, often transformed into a highly artificial construct (Lovell 1998: 4). This process, as argued earlier, has been historically constructed through English national xenophobic narratives and intertextual practices of representation. The novels under discussion can be regarded as traditional modern postcolonial representations in

---

[93] In his Author's Note to the novel, Conrad writes: "My greatest anxiety was in being able to strike and sustain the note of scrupulous impartiality" (2003: v).

which the English narrative establishes the locality, a space of home and outside, suggesting a conventional binary opposition between Russia and the West.

In the novels, the Russian space for the Russian characters, as well as the English for the English characters, becomes that void which creates a kind of sense of place, associated with its landscape, past experiences and the spiritual (for example, for Russians, they are the Russian soul, Russia as mother figure, a Holy land) which no other space can provide. As Bhabha expresses it, the domestic space is the space for normalizing and pastoralizing (1994: 11). Their place (the one of the English and the other of the Russians) determines their identity, and establishes a relationship between the two. It is when the characters experience dislocation that their identities undergo a transformation, and "uncolonized 'space'" is converted into a "colonized 'place'" (Ashcroft *et al*. 2000: 71). Therefore, not only does displacement connote the occupation of the space of the Other and change, but in wider political and historical representation, it can be also associated with colonization and the power imposed upon the displaced subject. The latter is distinguished by its dissimilar identity, which generates an opposition in relation to the colonizer.

The interplay between, and the questioning of the identity of the spaces of the Other and those of the Self show the extent of blurring around these issues in an era of dislocation when identities are no longer stable and centered (Nyman 2000: 177). Jopi Nyman maintains that this relocation and fluctuation results in one identity's space being located within the other and creating hybrid communities (2000: 177). A typical example in question is "La Petite Russie" – Little Russia – in Geneva, which demonstrates both the hybridity of the big city and the displacement of the Russian community. The interpretation of the novels at the point of the characters' departure from their home space and their relocation in a new one suggests Bhabha's Third Space, a level at which "the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew" (Bhabha 1994: 37). According to Nyman, this space can be experienced as exile and unhomeliness, and generates "a sense of ambivalence that can be considered as the sense of the unhomely, being-not-quite-at-home, *unheimlich*" (2000: 180). In addition, this space becomes a connective bridge between two cultures, two nations. It is a space which Bhabha also refers to as "culture's in-between" in which subjects are constituted through "cultural hybridization" and in which cultural difference is articulated through "baffling alikeness" and "banal divergence" (1998: 30). Although displacement has always been regarded as a loss of one's identity, the characters retain their collective Russian identity by locating it within their displacement. As a result, situated on the borderline, the nation is not only represented as hybrid in

relation to both cultures but is also stereotypically constructed as a frontier civilization which becomes a place of savagery (Ashcroft *et al.* 2000: 104). Russia, too, as this chapter will show, represents such a locality.

As the new settlers form a specific attachment to the new space, tensions arise that are central to their continuous preoccupation with issues of identity (Ashcroft *et al.* 76). In all three novels, the displaced characters are incapable of identifying themselves as belonging to their home place. Razumov's spiritual attachment to Russia and his physical belonging to the West, where he is sent to spy on the exiled revolutionaries, demonstrates the idea. Being deeply involved in all practices considered Russian, and identifying himself with the Russian landscape, Razumov cannot find his salvation in Geneva because its national space poses a great contrast to Russia, and so cannot be part of Razumov's identity. Although at the end of the novel the crippled Razumov seems to find his symbolic community of Little Russia in Geneva, the illusion of reinventing, reconstructing his imaginary self is short-lived: he returns to Russia to die. At the very crucial moment of his life when he finds himself self-divided in the dilemma of returning to Russia or not, and in desperate search for his identity, Razumov identifies himself with "the whole of Russia levelled with snow" (*UWE* 2003: 199). This domestic space is represented as a great cold blank landscape, imaginary and distant, located outside the borders of Razumov's present position. This place seems as if to be not quite familiar and hospitable towards the protagonist. Razumov's mental belonging to the confused immensity of its borders, constantly observed by the Western eyes of the English teacher (2003: 226), and his inability to physically situate himself within it, suggests the idea of Russia being for him a not-quite-home place either. As a result, the notion of home for him transforms itself into the condition of unhomeliness.

Razumov's self-divided nature and his ambiguous judgment towards the end of the novel become problematic in terms of the modern politics of exile and probably Conrad's personal perception of home. Rosemary Marangoly George, who maintains that questions of home in twentieth-century fiction must be read as homesickness, argues that Conrad's narrative is that of empire: what he presents as an alien land can be read against the idealization of England as Home (1996: 66). On the other hand, being himself an émigré writer, Conrad never perceived England as his home, which maybe explains his great exploration of resonant silences in many of his novels (1996: 65, 68). In *Under Western Eyes*, "the desolate silences of the wandering people", to whom Razumov also belongs, appear at a time of displacement and relocation, when the clash of different cultures becomes particularly acute (Bhabha 1990: 316). A similar idea is expressed by Kristeva, who argues that a displaced person exists between two languages, and that there-

fore their realm is silence (*Strangers* 1991: 15). In "La Petite Russie", where Razumov tries to find his new home, the Russians are haunted by the secret of these silences. "The free, independent and democratic city of Geneva" is opposed to "La Petite Russie", where "the shadow of autocracy" prevails and with which the protagonist's journey of life is accidentally and fatefully intertwined (*UWE* 2003: 71). This tension suggests that, Razumov's "Little Russia" as a home place, situated within a metropolitan European city, is provisional, and the search for a location where his self is "at home" is never completed. This partially explains why he, like many other Russians, is a character who is in deep conflict with himself (2003: 20), posing eternal questions of self-belonging. The idea of Razumov's Russia as a home place in the novel is as imaginary as the whole issue of Russian identity.

The idea of Russia being a not-quite-at-home place can be regarded as a force signalling racial displacement and disorientation, and suggests a discrepancy between what was constructed in the culture-internal discourse of the nation as "whiteness" and the savage "blackness" of imperial discourse about Russia. The Russians occupy the territory symbolically mapped as black. The "strongly lighted map of Russia" in Conrad's novel (*UWE* 2003: 216) implies a country shrouded in darkness and in need of more light. As Frances B. Singh puts it, Russia could be considered European and yet is still perceived as barbaric and nonwhite (2005: 194-195). This threatens the homogeneity of the Russian, and reinforces its auto-image as a dislocated nation. Conrad's admission of white into a nonwhite area is brilliantly explored in his *Heart of Darkness,* where he places his Russian Harlequin in the imagined African space. In Marlow's words, the displaced, replaced border-crossing figure is "the Russian" because he was born there, or "the Harlequin" (2005: 184). His clothing is a hand-stitched patchwork of colours and materials, and his facial physiognomy is taken as a symbol of Conrad's attitude toward the nameless folk of Russia (2005: 195). Because he has no special connection to his homeland, he is comfortable in Africa, which suggests that there is not much difference between a Russian and an African, and that their spaces are compatible. To draw such a conclusion is to displace Russia.

In Rebecca West, the Russian nation is constructed as a hereditary hybrid, located between the polarities of East and West. As Nikolai expresses it, Russians are as if "pulled two ways" because they are "a northern people, but a southern people too" (*Birds* 1978: 242). Although this has been one of the historically attested characteristics of Russia, the writer seems to have reinforced it by making hybridity central to the novel. The drifting of Russia between civility and barbarism, sophistication and ignorance, creates what Bhabha calls "a difference 'within', a subject that inhabits the rim of an 'in-between' reality" (1994: 13). Although the

Russian count Nikolai is represented as "a man of state" who is "more Russian than mere Russian human beings can be" (*Birds* 1978: 264, 301), his appearance is in great contrast to his noble origin. His white hair and beard are "streaked with the barbaric gold" (1978: 21) to associate him with the Scythians and the peasantry,[94] and his eyes do not speak "directly" (1978: 184) to suggest the concealed meanings and silences veiled behind a colonized Oriental Other. A distinct demarcation of Eastern Europe and Asia, and a weird mixture of civilized and barbaric worlds are embedded in his appearance. As Figes maintains, "in every Russian aristocrat, however European he may have become, there was a discreet and instinctive empathy with the customs and beliefs, the habits and the rhythms of Russian peasant life" (2002: 45). In other words, Nikolai's character problematizes the issues of acquiring an identity, and raises the idea of the Russian nation being hybrid, creating a difference "within" the nation and occupying the position "in-between".

The idea of displacement in West's novel is reinforced through some other characters' hybridization as well. Kamensky, who seems to be Nikolai's trustworthy subordinate, appears to be "the same as this scoundrel Gorin" (*Birds* 1978: 352); that is Gorin and Kamensky are "one and the same man, and this is a Russian" (1978: 421). Laura, who possesses half-English, half-Russian ancestry, is divided between two personalities, one of which is "a truly Russian girl" (1978: 211) who has the power to resist all misfortune, while the other is an Englishwoman who is too pragmatic to go beyond extreme sentiments. As her mother says, "she's half-English, and so doesn't care much about drama" (1978: 25). Laura's father, Edward Rowan, is a character of a similar kind. His dual self brings its complexity to the perception of the relation between Russian and English identities, and completes the series of twofold representations.

Like Fitzgerald's protagonist, Edward Rowan, although an Englishman, is mingled with everything Russian: he has a Russian wife, a half-Russian daughter, a Russian lover, and he has lived in Russia for some period of his life but has poor

---

[94] A persistent attachment of beards to Russians as a sign of "true" peasant and Oriental origin has been a recurring stereotypical construction in English writing on Russia. The Scythians, with whom the Russians have often been associated in English writing, wore beards, and were associated with gold (Grousset 1970: 7). In 1906, Annette M. B. Meakin wrote that the earliest records of ancient Slav customs indicate that the Slavs wore beards to approximate themselves with their Creator (1971: 84). During Peter the Great's reign, and after his return from Europe in 1698, Russian noblemen were condemned to shave their long beards to change their appearance towards a more European one (Figes 2002: 43). Traditionally seen as both a sign of holiness and barbarism, the Russian beard in English writing has become a sacred attribute of Russian identity. Conrad's "bearded Russian faces" (*UWE* 2003: 79), or West's "meager beard and moustache" (*Birds* 1978: 95) support this idea.

knowledge of the Russian language. Because of this mixture, the coldness of his English character with his formal ways of behaviour co-exists with "the same fires that burn within … Russians" (*Birds* 1978: 71). Nikolai identifies him as a "Russian without Russian faults, an Englishman without English faults –" even suspecting him of having some Russian blood far back in his ancestry (1978: 72). Moreover, Rowan's duality is reinforced by his fake perfection, which threatens his image as a positive hero, and displaces him from the position of devoted father and faithful husband. While Nikolai is completely confident of Mr Rowan being a good son-in-law of Protestant upbringing and an ideal match for his daughter, he, in turn, is fully involved in a love affair with Susie. At the end of the novel, having discharged the duties originally intended for him as Laura's father and Tania's husband, Edward Rowan returns to England with Laura's two brothers. The separation of the English-Russian family in which the women (Tania and Laura) return to Russia and the men to England signifies the conventional placement of Russia as a Mother figure, which accumulates female identities better than male (see our earlier discussion). Yet, knowing that Laura and her mother will return to the turbulent pre-Revolutionary country where they will not find a better life, in contrast to England, for which the male part of the family depart, shows what Nyman finds central to the perception of Englishness: it has a tendency "to characterize itself as masculine, as common sense, and it also likes to attach itself to the notion of home" (2005: 44). Therefore Russia is considered to be a not-quite-at-home place in contrast to England, thus blurring the whole conception of home.

Edward Rowan's image can be paralleled by Fitzgerald's Englishman, through whom the writer constructs the idea of the Russian nation as hybrid. Frank Reid, who has been speaking Russian every day with his workers and clients at the printing house as well as with his servants at home, who has been eating Russian food and wearing Russian clothes for decades, who is Russian and is "used to everything Russian", as one of his servants says (*Spring* 1998: 124), has still retained his English identity. Because of this confused border location, Frank is unable to find a place where he wholly belongs. The shop signs make him "feel homesick" (1998: 23), and he realizes that the chances of having to leave Russia are fifty-fifty (1998: 47) – a perspective which he accepts dispassionately, and which suggests that Russia is a not-quite-home place for him. His awareness of displacement in Russia is evoked throughout the story, emphasizing the distance between the two cultures, and intensifying the sense of Russia being the Other in relation to his identity, and consequently, to the English. Therefore, as a Russian, Frank is dispossessed of his home, and experiences the condition of unhomeliness, which brings that ambivalence in his identity and excludes the space of the Other, while as an Englishman, he feels himself attached to English identity,

evoking England as his home. As a result, his displacement can be read not only on the level of geographic transformation, but also as a mental dislocation.

Moreover, Frank's unfixed position in relation to both cultures, the Russian and the European, supports the earlier argument that the Russian people is represented as nomadic. Partially Russian, Frank is always ready to migrate, because for a Russian there is no idea of home as a stable concept. Although his Russianness makes him a norm-bound insider, he is condemned to perpetual dislocation and forced into exile. Frank's representation as a character who seems to be, in Chaadayev's words, "camping" in Russia, constructs him as a rootless wanderer (1969: 34). In this sense, he is similar to Selwyn, a stereotypical Russian character in the novel, who considers himself a stranger and a pilgrim who ought always to be ready to move on (*Spring* 1998: 47). What Peter Chaadayev wrote in 1836 might be true of all the Russian characters in the novels with their fluid identities:

> We all resemble travelers. Nobody has a definite sphere of existence; we have no proper habits; there are no rules, there is no home life, there is nothing to which we could be attached, nothing that would awaken our sympathy or affection – nothing durable, nothing lasting; everything flows, everything passes, leaving no traces either outside or within you. In our own houses, we seem to be camping, in our families we look like strangers, in our cities we look like nomads, even more than the nomads who tend their herds on our steppes, for they are more attached to their waste-lands than we to our cities (1969: 34-35).

Figes regards Chaadayev's sensational *Philosophical Letters* as being more a work of history than of philosophy, suggesting that the nation's historical displacement and dispossession was rooted fundamentally in the people's identity (2002: 132). This assumption questions the idea of the Third Space as culture in-between, and implies that this condition allows a translation, a deterritorialisation which is no longer here and there, but within here, or within there, or elsewhere. In other words, in the case of Russian identity, to form a Third Space does not necessarily involve setting geographical borders between cultures, but a symbolic frontier within Russia itself, which establishes the position in-between and generates hybridity and nomadism. The latter, in particular, has become a feature attached to Russian identity through the centuries by both writers in English and in Russian, starting with the 16th century Giles Fletcher's account to 20th century Russian writers like Gorky:

> The instinct of the nomad seems to survive in the Russian peasant, he regards the labour of the tiller of the soil as a curse of God, and is sick with "the desire for new places". He almost lacks the fighting desire to establish himself on a chosen spot and influence his surroundings in his own inter-

> ests, or at any rate has it very weakly developed; and, if he does decide to do this, a laborious and fruitless struggle awaits him (1977: 12).

The vision of the Russians as nomadic and peasants, and of Russia as provincial in relation to Europe, as the previous chapter argues, suggests the idea of Russians living in a displaced milieu, exiled from the centre of the world and placed in a void where they dwell not only like aliens to others but also "like strangers" (in Chaadayev's words) to themselves. Within that void, they are involved in a perpetual circulation and movement that results in the absence of fixity and attachment. Being historically inherent, this idea of the nomadic is constructed in all the three narratives under discussion. Razumov's conscious worries about belonging and his "true" home suggest the vision of him as a wanderer, a man without "a corner of the earth" (*UWE* 2003: 19). Nikolai's exile to France, Kamensky's and Laura's journeys between Russia and France (in *Birds*), Selwyn's indeterminate position, and Frank's ambiguous placement between Russian and English identities, in addition to his journeying to and from the railway station in search of his children, and his inability to find them in the place where they were supposedly waiting, – all these small details constitute a large part of the rambling Russian selves which undermine stability and a point of termination.

As pointed out earlier, displacement not only generates individual hybridity, but also produces hybrid communities. In all the three novels under discussion, Europe represents a metropolis which in twentieth-century representation signifies the site of cultural contact and migration (Nyman 2005: 255). It is in the modernist metropolis that new identities are formed rather than in rural and colonized spaces. Russia, with its provincial relation to Europe, represents a colonized place of the Other, where the homogeneous nation of the Russian people seems to be located. Neither Fitzgerald, Conrad nor West provides a representation of Russia as a hybrid community at the turn of the century. On the contrary, it is the West which functions as the nest of multiculturalism which accommodates Razumov, Nikolai, and many other similar Russians in Geneva or in Paris. The novels perform what Nyman observes as being the difference between the spaces of colonizer and colonized: all European spaces possess their silenced history of migration and function as spaces where the reconstruction of identity is possible (2005: 256). Russia, with its secluded, uncivilized space, is Othered through the prevailing ideological emphasis on the consistency of its nation, and the impossibility of reconstructing and creating new identities.

This idea is constructed through Fitzgerald's Englishman in Russia being separated from his English community, which at that time constituted a substantial part of Russian society. As Annette M.B. Meakin wrote in her contemporary travel observations on Russia (1906), English families could be found in every

manufacturing locality of the Empire; in cotton, linen, or cloth factories there were employed an English spinner, an English weaver, an English carder, or an English engineer. There were English schools for English children, to which Russian children were not admitted. According to Meakin, many of the Englishmen who were most bitter then against the Russian people, and Russia generally, were the children or grandchildren of men who made their money in Russia (1971: 68-69). This suggests that at the beginning of the 20th century the English colony occupied its own space within the Russian Other to which Frank Reid was not welcomed. This is to emphasize his russified version of an Englishman, to make him a more hybrid character on the one hand, while on the other to intensify the perception of Russia as what Conrad called "the mightiest homogeneous mass of mankind" (*UWE* 2003: 198).

Although feeling his Englishness, Frank's identity is patterned through his co-existence in the community of Russian brotherhood, where strong kin ties seem to hold all Russian people together. Through referring to a horse driver as "brother" (*Spring* 1998: 14), Frank not only demonstrates what Conrad calls, in relation to the same idea, "the very brotherhood of souls" (*UWE* 2003: 112), or West refers to the same idea as "a mystical fusion" (1928: 79), but also his class parity and solidarity, which suggests his affirmation and acceptance of the Russian nation as a part of himself.[95] In other words, Frank's hybrid character seems to be imagined through being temporarily placed in a non-hybrid, homogeneous society, deprived of contact and mobility, where all dwellers are brothers to each other. Frank's secular existence in such a place is shifty and unfixed, and ostensibly allows a return of the protagonist to the place of his family origin, questioning the idea of Frank's home and making him a displaced character.

The idea of displacement as estrangement and alienation can be easily understood as geographical dislocation or temporal dislocation: forced from home, divorced from the past, or, as Kaplan refers to it, "a drastic amputation from the social body or community" (1996: 106). Yet it becomes a more complicated phenomenon when it comes to its symbolic, or metaphorical significance. In all the three novels under discussion, the characters are displaced or alienated from their homes. However, the modes of their displacement are different, and therefore their perception of the place of their home, as well as their relation to their Selves and the outside world, varies a great deal. Frank Reid (in *Spring*), born and raised

---

[95] In her "The Strange Necessity" essay, Rebecca West uses the term "mystical fusion" for the first time when she critically analyzes the overused definition of the Russian brotherhood, expressed by many Russian novelists in their references to the Russian people's unity (1928: 79).

in Moscow, voluntarily settles himself within the Russian borders, Razumov (in *UWE*) consciously moves to Geneva to direct his spying activity towards the revolutionaries, and the Russian count Nikolai (in *Birds*) is banished from his home country on unsubstantial charges. Being uprooted and displaced from their home country, they, in Bhabha's words, "abandon the metaphor of a *heimlich* national culture" (1990: 316), retaining at the same time their dislocated national identity.

In their case, displacement signifies not only geographical disposition, but also a metaphorical change which varies in its content and meaning. What mainly separates Frank's position from Nikolai's is his status in the politics of displacement. Although both are uprooted from their homeland, Frank's position suggests an immigrant version of the dislocated subject, while Nikolai is the exile/expatriate. According to Kaplan, the main difference between the two is in the respective material and romantic goals they aim at (1996: 110). Frank, driven by his material gains, intends to assimilate himself into Russian society, to become russified, and therefore does not offer a romantic alternative to exile. Although he frequently alludes to his original identity, Frank is not passionately concerned with retaining it. Nikolai, in turn, may be seen to be displaced for spiritual, political, or aesthetic survival alone. His exile is endowed, in Said's words, with "a touch of solitude and spirituality" (2003: 181). Perceiving that he belongs to Russia, he can experience the new space only in contrast to his original. For him France is "the country of anarchy and atheism, the enemy of Holy Russia, willing host of all its exiles" to whom, "by the most horrible irony", he relates himself (*Birds* 1978: 54). Thus, the modes of displacement are in each case very dependent on the subject position, which reflects a state of alienation and oppression through the relation between identity and location.

In this relation Julia Kristeva, for example, observes a mediator which is the displaced subject's/foreigner's, or, as this study implies, Russian's other Self. In her significant work *Strangers to Ourselves* (1991), she maintains that a foreigner has a mask – "a second impassive personality, an anesthetized skin he wraps himself in, providing a hiding place where he enjoys scorning his tyrant's hysterical weaknesses" (1991: 6). This idea is central to the problem of the displaced Russian, who becomes a slave of his own Self, distanced and detached not only from others but also from him/herself. He/she is dispossessed of both a place of belonging as well as his own self-belonging, or, to express it in Kristeva's words, "settled within himself, the foreigner has no self" (1991: 8). In other words, the personality of the Russian falls apart, doubled, hybridized and becomes a victim of displacement. Razumov, Frank, Laura, Kamensky, Nikolai, who all experience different modes of exile and relation to their new "home", all undergo a similar

process of longing for affiliation, during which they become self-divided, making themselves other for themselves. This, which Kristeva calls the "psychotic ghost" (1991: 13), haunts every exile in whatever state of being it might be, because, being born into exile and condemned to being unhomely, the Russian characters in the novels go through an expatriation of their own selves without appropriation of the other. Reading their identities as "nomadic", "decentered", and "contrapuntal", in Said's terms in relation to exile (2003: 186), seems to be a repetitive practice employed by 20th century writers in English.

Although displacement is associated with tragic loss, homelessness, and both metaphorical and literal banishment, it may also produce, in Kaplan's opinion, critical consciousness and understanding (1996: 118). In this regard, from the modernist position, displacement can be viewed as a certain change, a possibility for new critical insights into the concept. For Laura, it is the train ride conversation which makes it possible for her for the first time to observe and analyze the practice of politics and the intrigue involved in human relations. The heroine's psychological maturity is represented through her mental exile from her childhood and her family ties. Because she detested being treated like a child (Rollyson 1998b: 204), West, it seems, associates her heroine with herself and Laura's displacement with her adultery. Abandoning physically and spiritually the universe of her parenthood, Laura starts perceiving the world as a catastrophic realm with no chance for survival. She realizes that social structures may be threatened, or even collapse, and the public may interfere with the private in a country where revolutionary passion and instability are at their extreme. It is then, at the crucial moment of her life associated with her exile and dispossession, that she quotes the words from the Bible, "There shall be no more sea" (*Birds* 1978: 350), meaning that a new heaven, a new earth, or a glorious new Jerusalem will not be for her (Norton 2000: 89). Thus Laura's displacement, which coincides with her great deprivation from her homeland, loss of belief and the tragic loss of her significant relations (her grandfather is dead, her grandmother is ill, her mother is emotionally destroyed, and her father is a traitor) is also a time of conscious apprehension of reality and mature growth.

This enlightenment also afflicts Nikolai, who, although an Orthodox Christian believes in God, passionately defends the Tsar and is fanatically preoccupied with the perfection of the Russian system (*Birds* 1978: 261), starts admitting that Russia is covered with Judases (1978: 111). At the moment of his would-be realization, he tries to find the only source of contentment in being alone with those whom, as he believes, he can trust. Ironically, he is represented as if childishly immature because of his incomprehension that one of those Russian Judases (Kamensky) has been under his supervision for a long time, and is actually the

cause of all his troubles. Moreover, Nikolai's exile can be regarded as martyrdom for the Tsar in whom he believes, and whose activity, whatever he has done, "is a part of his intercessory function", which cannot be a sin (1978: 109). In his search for positive insights, Nikolai tries to relate his banishment to his past memories and traditions, because the crimes of Tsardom are forced on him by his birth into a family belonging to the minor nobility (1978: 213). This suggests that the novel is questioning the issue of past memories, traditions and original belonging in relation to exile rather than simply geographical disposition. The turbulent, pre-Revolutionary country, with its instability, turmoil and autocracy, represents what Bhabha calls the "disjunctions of political existence" to which the unhomely moment relates the traumatic ambivalences of a personal, psychic history (1994: 11). Therefore Nikolai's displacement should be read through Russia and its political representation, which become the perfect basis for the condition of unhomely, dislocated subjects.

Being uprooted from their homeland, the displaced characters in the novels experience exile in the new space as a perpetual transience, a condition of transit between the past and the present. It threatens stability and destabilizes identity, generating irrevocable absence or, as Said calls it, "a perilous territory of not-belonging" where in a primitive time people were banished, and where in the modern era displaced persons loiter (2003: 177). However, from a modernist perspective, being located in such a territory might have a positive effect in viewing the condition of the unhomely. Laura, Nikolai, Kamensky, Frank Reid, Edward Rowan and Razumov appropriate the knowledge of two different worlds and their associated spaces, exploring both hosts and migrants. The awareness of Russian, English, French, or Swiss spaces reestablishes their perception of exile and identifies their position as travellers who can observe, explore and then interpret reality in their language. However tragic exile can be, it is, according to Said, always imbued with plurality of vision; it is aware of at least two cultures (2003: 186). Thus, when located in the in-between territory, the displaced characters recognize the duality of their perception and are able to observe things at a distance: turning their faces towards their original location, although not a home any more, they experience it as a vanished space, a lost paradise which is physically unattainable but spiritually adjacent; when looking into their prospective host country, they simply find no connection. Such duality and ambivalence in representing the characters demonstrate the polarities of the imageme and emphasize the clash of characteristics through which the nation is perceived.

The construction of the idea of displacement in the novels generates the production of new cultural meaning in which Russia herself as a location, a space, can be read as fluid and in transit. In other words, it is represented not only as a cause of

displacement, but also as its consequence. The experience of travel, journey and exclusion is more vividly embedded in West's setting of the novel located on the train. The earlier chapters of this study have already discussed the symbolic meaning of the train as a sign of apocalyptic change, chaotic time and oppression, yet it is also important in the context of displacement. Imbued with things Russian (Russian characters, Russian conversation), the train ride seems to demonstrate Russia in transition, with no time and space, or, as Bhabha expresses it in his reference to in-between spaces, the train represents "a stillness of time and a strangeness of framing" (1994: 13). Travel is the very antithesis of the idea of being at home, and the Russian characters located within the space of the train are as if condemned to a perpetual wandering and an eternal exile. Like many other Russians, they live "in a labyrinth of suspicion", not being quite sure whether they are in Russia or abroad (*Birds* 1978: 421). The metaphorical significance of the train journey in relation to Russia suggests that both the train and the Russians possess similar features, which assign them to the same categories of movement and change. A symbolic link between a displaced person and a train is vividly imbedded in Kristeva's analysis of the foreigner, and is relevant here:

> Not belonging to any place, any time, any love. A lost origin, the impossibility to take root, a rummaging memory, the present in abeyance. The space of the foreigner is a moving train, a plane in flight, the very transition that precludes stopping. As to landmarks, there are none. His time? The time of a resurrection that remembers death and what happened before, but misses the glory of being beyond: merely the feeling of a reprieve, of having gotten away (1991: 7-8).

The likening of Russia to a train is striking in terms of Saussure's theory of language. Although his example refers to all signifying practices, and not to trains in particular, it has an additional literal application to the present argument. Saussure parallels a train and its identity with the meanings of language, claiming that neither the former nor the latter has its own fixity. According to him, the train carries a difference within, since it has a different engine, carriages, and passengers each day, and therefore its identity is its position in a structure of differences that is purely relational (Barry 1995: 43). A similar reading can be suggested for the Russia situated within the train, which seems to be carrying its diaspora and its transformation. This is to demonstrate Russians in transit: although experiencing a time of gathering (Nikolai, Laura, Kamensky and Chubinov are all the members of the Russian train diaspora), they are still condemned to a perpetual dislocation with no home attachment and fixity. Similar to Conrad's La Petite Russie in Geneva, the Russian diaspora on the train represents Bhabha's Third Space, a cultural in-between which alludes to the unhomely. In other words, the construction of Russian identity is instilled with the characteristics of displacement; it is not

about home, but about exile; it is not of the whole but of the fragments; it is not of the norm but of deviation and difference.

To conclude this chapter it is necessary to point out that questions of the representation of the nation are intrinsically intertwined with the idea of displacement, dispossession and exile. Through practicing exclusion, national narratives create polarities between self and Other, and occupy spaces. It is in this dialectic that Said observes the interplay between nationalism and exile when he argues that, while nationalism asserts the notions of belonging, home, place, a people, heritage, culture, and customs, exile performs its opposite (2003: 176). In other words, exile is everything that nationalism lacks, and therefore, they must be two sides of the same coin, which naturally cannot exist without each other. In the three novels under scrutiny, this idea is demonstrated through the construction of Russia as Other which is excluded from the English territory (space), and condemned to eternal exile.

This chapter has examined how and by what means such a perception of Russia is embedded in the novels. It has demonstrated how, through different means of representation, the writers construct Russia as a displaced, decentered and fluid nation, located in-between, and therefore dispossessed of its certain meaning, space and time. Such a representation emphasizes the contradictory nature of the imageme of Russianness, and demonstrates its oppositional polarities. The idea of displacement is used by the writers as the strategy to characterize the nation and to articulate its "typical" characteristics such as hybridity and nomadism. The texts construct cultural difference through binary patterning, which contrasts Russianness with Englishness, symbolically formulating a confrontation.

As a result, the Russia of the novels represents a colonized place related to Bhabha's Third Space and can be experienced as exile itself with a sense of the unhomely. This place is silenced and still, because the new language for displaced people can be, according to Kristeva, compared to a resurrection (1991: 15), and their state of being to "the polymorphic mutism" (1991: 16) in which they live, full of resonances and reasoning linked to their past memories. This silenced space accommodates different modes of displacement, in which displaced people are situated either in the form of physical displacement or mental dislocation, as in the case with some characters, and in which a quest for self-belonging and affiliation is predetermined. In this condition, the interplay between the concepts of belonging and locality is initiated, allowing deterritorialisation and the recreation of the latter (locality) into a new symbolic sphere which can be treated as movement through space and time. This process of transformation, as this chapter has demonstrated, suggests the reading of Russia in the novels as nomadic.

Because of its fluid identity, such a place is imagined as not-quite-at-home, which reinforces the difference between the spaces of the colonizer and the colonized, placing the former in a symbolic relation to the idea of home while condemning the latter to a perpetual search for it. Therefore, the Russian characters in the novels go through disidentification, a dislocation which results in their being represented as orphaned, deprived of both their parentage and their home. All three stories are as if unfolding "under western eyes", suggesting the passivity of the object (the Russians) and the authority of its master (the English). Moreover, in this context, De Marco also observes the "strangeness" of the story, the feeling of having nothing in common with these characters from the point of view of a narrator – an idea which is particularly striking in Conrad's novel, in which the Teacher of Languages is the only Westerner in the story under the eyes of whom the whole narrative, and Russia itself, are simply incomprehensible (1991: 29). This symbolic alienation reinforces the image of Russia as exile which a nationalistic English narrative of power imposes on it.

Yet this construction would have been one-sided if there had not been the contribution of both Russia's auto-image as well as the writers' personal perceptions and experiences. As this chapter has observed, the image of Russia as nomadic and displaced was also formulated by some Russian nationals, such as Chaadayev and Gorky. The association of their nation with travel, and the vision of the Russians as a people dispossessed of their fixed location, articulate the phenomenon of displacement within the domain of Russian national narrative as well. Such ideas support my earlier argument that the duality of the imageme of the national character is revealed through the interplay between the hetero-and the auto-images. Showing how the national community of Russia is represented by Russian national writers as well as the three Anglophone writers as a liminal state of individuals with hybrid displaced identities helps this study to move beyond merely English national stereotypes.

Conrad's, West's and Fitzgerald's visions of Russia at the turn of the century are a milieu of uncertainty, of characters in transition, and in-between spaces as the frontier. Although this observation is partially grounded in the previous practices of representation and a series of fixed stereotypical attachments associated with the idea of Russianness, these novels would have been nothing without the personal tie of each of the three writers. Fitzgerald's perception of her parents' home as a cold and insecure entity, her unhappy marriage and drifting from job to job in support of her three children, her financial worries and uncertainty make their way into her novel. She was never in Russia, but her great gift for what Peter Wolfe calls "imagining herself in other people's shoes" (2004: 3) allowed her to visit Russia through her writing. In this sense, she can be paralleled with West,

who, lacking the experience of home as a place of privacy and security,[96] and believing in belonging to an empire which seemed to be like her "exotic extended family" (Rollyson 1998b: 9) exercised her experience into an imaginative perception of the Russian nation as a mass deprived of home and a place of belonging.

The Beginning of Spring and *The Birds Fall Down* can be associated with travel and travel writing, often represented through a sequence of movements (departure, journey and return), and a metaphorical construction of home. Into this category, Conrad's novel fits neatly as well because, as Said argues, he thought of himself as an exile from Poland, and nearly all his work (as well as his life) carries the unmistakable mark of the sensitive émigré's obsession with his own fate and with his hopeless attempts to make satisfying contact with new surroundings (2003: 179). Like many other émigré writers who have lived in double exile – far from their native land and far from their mother tongue – Conrad writes from memory, directing his look towards long-gone reality, and supposedly excels in reanimating the ashes of the country of his origin (Minh-ha 1994: 10). This analysis finds its focus in his solitary heroes, such as Razumov, Mrs Haldin, Nostromo, and Marlow, who all suffer from isolation and indifference. Although constantly under supervision, these images are endowed with profound isolation and loneliness – a state of being supposedly experienced by Conrad himself. In other words, Conrad's, West's and Fitzgerald's representations perform both a repetitive practice of previous English writing on Russia, and also the writers' personal experience, as well as their vision of the nation through western eyes.

---

[96] Rebecca West's father, Mr Fairfield, abandoned his wife and daughters, leaving them in straitened circumstances. He died in a Liverpool boarding house when Rebecca was about ten years old. Her father's rejection of the family left a mark that could never be erased and which is deeply embedded in West's dark view of the universe that her writing projects (Winegarten 1984: 225-226). This was one of the reasons why she chose to replace Cicily Fairfield (a name that in itself seems almost too good an example of English gentility) by Rebecca West, adding to it a new imaginative identity (Hynes 1975: x).

9 CONCLUSION

> Russia, compassion hardly to be borne … the railway trains chuffing between them with wood sparks crackling from their funnels, the wolves desolate on the steppes, the savage bell-clang of Kiev's great gate, dead Anna Karenina under the wheels, the manic crashing barbaric march of the Pathetic Symphony, hopeless homosexual dead Tchaikovsky, the exiled and the assassinated, the boots, the knouts, salt-eaten skin, the graves dug in the ice.
>
> Anthony Burgess, *Honey for the Bears,* 1963.

This study has examined a number of stereotypical representations of Russianness and their meaning in three twentieth-century Anglophone writers' novels as part of an intertextual dialogue with earlier texts in English. The analysis has focused on representation as a repetitive literary production seeking to demonstrate a relation between past and present practices of representation. It has aimed at exploring how Russianness has been constructed and developed in the English text, and how this conventional construction has produced the image of the Other in these writers' narratives. The study has also analysed some national characteristics of Russia, distinguished by their binaristic and ambivalent features, and has employed the idea of the imageme in connection with these binaries.

Three English socio-political novels, *The Beginning of Spring* (1988), *The Birds Fall Down* (1966) and *Under Western Eyes* (1911), all set in pre-Revolutionary Russia, were taken for discussion to explore the problem. A combination of constructionist and intentional approaches was applied to demonstrate that national characteristics are achieved through a subjectively constructed and intentionally manipulated course of representation. They are highly dependent upon context, and deploy a number of discursive features, each of which relies on the tendency of the entire narrative to represent the given nation as northern or southern, strong or weak, central or peripheral. In addition, these approaches were applied to examine how through constant repetitions and references to familiar imagery these national characteristics become commonplaces. Such speculations found their focus in the examination of the three novels in relation to each other and against some other texts dealing with Russianness, establishing strong intertextual relationships between them and facilitating the comprehension a cache of stereotypical images relating to Russia.

The overall results reveal an ambivalent perception of national characteristics of Russia, suggesting that binaries and antagonistic tropes were attributed to it by the writers in English. The Russia of the novels is seen as barbaric and uncivilized, or as enlightened and Holy, occupying the space between eastern and western cultural domains, and represented as either a sheltered Mother land or a not-quite-at-home place. All these paradoxical ambivalences, constructed within an English discourse, constitute part of a complex and multifaceted imageme of Russia, and have been an underlying feature as a whole within national twentieth-century English literature. The three novels this study has examined have become a part of this literary canon where Russia, as a polarity-bound phenomenon, occupies its traditional place under Other eyes.

The opening sections of the present study were devoted to representation, which was treated through intertexuality, stereotyping and constructedness. Bakhtin, Kristeva, Hall, Barthes and Bhabha were cited in an attempt to analyze how these ideas worked, independently and in relation to each other, and when the representation was established. They also played a substantial part in the discussion of the relation between the world and the text in which the debate about the relation of the "real" to the imaginary was initiated. Representation is a cultural construct which conveys its meaning through symbols and signs. The latter in turn create an image which is interpreted according to cultural norms and beliefs. In other words, the meaning given and taken in the practice of representation is determined by culture and the time in which they are set.

Such meaning, as this study showed, is socially and culturally determined, and therefore possesses an ideological resolution, imposed by the dominant narrative (the English) over its dominated Other (the Russian). In all the three novels under scrutiny, this practice is repetitive, establishing intertextuality between the three literary performances, and their proximity to many other previously written texts which represent Russia. Conrad, West and Fitzgerald use different devices and symbolic images to construct the perverted, chaotic world of pre-Revolutionary Russia, evoking the same stereotypical image of the otherness of that nation that was depicted by earlier English writers. Chancellor's first encounter with the Muscovites in 1553, Shakespeare's evocations of the nation in *Love's Labour's Lost*, John Fletcher's 17th-century perception of the relationship between the New World (England) and the Old World (Muscovy), Defoe's account of 18th-century Muscovy and Woolf's depiction of the Muscovite princess find their resonance in 20th-century representations of the nation. In all these works, Russia either appears as blackened and slave-like, metaphorically reducing the nation, or through a disguised feminine identity and barbarism to demonstrate cultural difference, feminine qualities and savagery in relation to the masculine English.

In the works studied, these characteristics are repetitive and are maintained through the stereotypical darkening of the Russian characters' skin, their bearded shapeless faces, slave-like identities and the feminized image of Mother Russia. In most cases, the Russians are portrayed through their Asiatic outlook and thinking (Nikolai, Kamensky, Chubinov, Crane, Razumov), and are committed to act as a barbaric people, that is to say, through anarchy and irrational behaviour (Haldin). The technique of darkening as a method of representing the Russian characters in the novels connotes ambiguity and exclusion. It reveals something of the fantasy of a master. It is also endowed with a symbolic meaning from the position of a servant who becomes excluded, disengaged and goes unrecognized, a device which reinforces our perception of the nation as alien and different. In addition, the indeterminate placement of the nation identified in the records of the first travellers and early writers on Russia is incorporated in the characters' images through their hybrid identities (Laura, Frank Reid, Edward Rowan) and twofold personalities (Razumov, Kamensky, Crane). This interplay between past and present practices of representation suggests that West's, Fitzgerald's and Conrad's novels can be regarded as textual reproductions which, although possessing certain modifications, can still be considered stereotypical constructions of the image of Russia.

The difference between an unchanging Russian other and a benign English self in the novels is represented through assigning some reserved characteristics to Russian identity. The Russia of the novels occupies the space of a dominated, submissive, resigned Orient, conventionally silenced by western writers. West's motley, discordant Russian language, quite incomprehensible to the Englishman Edward Rowan; her main heroine, Laura, destined to submit and remain unheard; and Conrad's and Fitzgerald's wordless Russian characters, such as Razumov and Selwyn Crane, are cases in point. The writers occasionally silence their voices to demonstrate their estrangement and outlandishness, and to emphasize the articulation or the voice of the English.

However, although the three texts are regarded as part of the English literary canon of texts featuring Russia, their analysis has been elaborated with respect to the writers' personalities and the impulses behind their interest in Russia. Conrad's and West's socio-political views, with their expression of anti-communist ideas and disbelief in the Revolution as well as their unfixed identities and nomadic existence fundamentally affected their Russian novels. They both had a skill for prediction, and were probably ahead of time, which is why their writing did not receive appropriate appraisal during their lifetime: Conrad was almost unknown to the Slavic reader, and West was not part of the canon of English 20th-century writers. In addition, West's complex political philosophy and Conrad's

Conrad's Slavic-English political affiliations, imposed on him by his nationality, makes it impossible to regard their writing as simply imperialistic narrative.

This study has also identified the complexity of the imageme of Russia revealed through the interplay of hetero-and auto-images of the nation. As a result, apart from the intertextual links found between some English writers in the past and the three works under scrutiny, this study has also established a link between the representations of Russia in the three novels and some 19th century Russian writers' works. Chekhov's play *The Cherry Orchard* was taken as one of the examples and discussed in connection with Fitzgerald's *The Beginning of Spring* to show a stereotypical image of Russia as provincial, and to demonstrate how and by what means the English writer draws on the Russian writer's work. The results establish the idea of Russia being imagined as an insular milieu with a provincial relationship to European culture. Although all three writers explore this idea, Fitzgerald's representation seems to have been more explicit than Conrad's and West's. In *The Beginning of Spring*, Moscow, although a capital, is constructed as a small provincial village to emphasize its simplicity and to equate it with the whole of Russia. As in Chekhov's play, where the orchard is associated with a place which is somewhere near the city, but still distant from civilization, in the English writer's novel Moscow is assimilated to a provincial place. This allusion performs not only a stereotypical construction and quotation, but also acts to create the nation as a symbolic formation.

The works of Said (1978), Anderson (1983), Cheyette (1993), Kiberd (1995) and Porter (2001) played a crucial role in defining the ideas of imagination, fabrication and construction in the process of nation-building in general, and their applications to the creating of the image of Russia in particular. The results show that the construction of the nation occurs through a fabrication of images in which a substantial part is devoted to imagination and fantasy as driving forces for creation. In this process, the image is visualized in order to be identified as something different rather than familiar. Thus the visibility of the Other through which we acquire the image-building is, in Bhabha's words (1994: 81), "at once a point of identity". This is in a way the process of the fabrication of the new identity which has been assigned to Russia, as well as many other countries such as Ireland, China, Scotland and Turkey. It operates in order to deliberately define the positions of strong and weak, advanced and backward. Yet, as the results of this study imply, racial constructions are ambivalent because they constitute an Other which is two-edged: it is different and universal at the same time. Thus Russia is situated in an imaginary space whose representation can never be compatible but rather inconsistent.

In order to show this, the idea of the Russian soul as a hallmark of Russian holiness and supernaturalness has been investigated. The findings demonstrate that the symbolic representation of the Russian soul in these three novels pictures the nation as eastern-minded, senseless and simple. The Russian characters are represented as unsophisticated, and are distinguished by their spirituality and lack of reason. Some of them are shown as brute beasts, exposing their emotions to extreme states (Kuriatin, Haldin, Ziemianitch). Moreover, the Russian soul is characterized by a resignation or passivity often paralleled by the monotonousness, featurelessness and inertia of the Russian landscape. In such a location, Russia is resigned to isolation, and the Russian character, with its cynicism, emotion, femininity and simplicity, is destined to submit to the rational, masculine, sophisticated English. Even when represented as Holy, which can be regarded as an attempt to approximate Russia to England, the former still remains the antithesis, endowed with the collectivistic and nationalistic spirits of its identity.

In addition, this study has also revealed that an immense spirituality through which the image of Russia is constructed alludes to the eastern stereotype of emotion predominating over reason. As Conrad's narrator assumes at the end of the novel, "I received without comment in my character of a mute witness of things Russian, unrolling their Eastern logic under my Western eyes" (*UWE* 2003: 248). The shifting Russian identity is turned to spiritual, eastern categories in the novels, portraying the Russian characters as a people with anti-Western logic, non-European bloodlines and an oriental way of thinking. Appreciating eastern values of life, turning their minds to God for repentance, they are still prone to despotism and ferocity. Russia itself, as the eastern country, is characterized by its static forms and passiveness in opposition to the dynamic and progressive West. All this situates the nation in the position of an Orient in relation to the English, and emphasizes its extrinsic qualities.

As the sun rises in the East, Russia is also a land of otherworldly phenomena, "the land of Baba Yaga and sputniks" (Burgess 1973: 156). It seems that the semantic strength of the nation can be found within its borders, and Russia is represented as a welcoming land which attracts visitors seeking their salvation. This is clearly incorporated in to Fitzgerald's and West's novels' conclusions when, at the end of the stories, Nellie (in *The Beginning of Spring*) and Laura (in *The Birds Fall Down*) return to Mother Russia, a dénouement which symbolically elides all differences. Both texts, which conclude on an optimistic note, indicate the continuity of the Russian nation demonstrating a renewal, a recreation which is needed to reconstruct the human spirit, and to reinforce the immortality of Russia.

Despite the observation that Russia constitutes a place of salvation and a Holy land, a repository of all virtues, it is also connected with notions of the unhomely, with dislocation and exile, which have become crucial issues for rethinking problems of identity in 20th century colonial representation. Represented as a colonized place, the Russia of the novels brings to light a perception of in-betweenness, which sets a strong opposition to the stable, determined and home-bound English identity. The Russian characters in the novels suffer either from physical exile or mental dislocation in their perpetual search for their home location and belonging. The contradictory vision of Russia on the one hand as a maternal and provincial home place (in Fitzgerald's novel), and as an unhomely location on the other (in Conrad and West), emphasizes the frontier position of Russia and its ambiguous placement in representations in 20th century English writing. This situates the nation in the hybrid position of an in-between and extends Bhabha's concept of the Third Space into the field of intertextuality and post-Said studies of Orientalism. In such a condition, Russia undergoes displacement – a physical and spiritual change in that it is situated on the borderline and becomes ambiguous in relation to both cultures, eastern and western.

The phenomenon of the unhomely represents not only a concept, but also a symbol through which the writers construct Russia and Russian identity. By making their characters experience different spaces: the Russian and the English, or the Russian and the Swiss, or by placing a substantial part of the events in a moving train (in West's novel), Conrad, Fitzgerald and West explore ambivalence and change, and continue a long-established tradition of representing the Russian nation as a displaced people. In other words, the examination of the concept of displacement in this study suggests its role as a metaphor and a nationalistic trope for the writers in English to construct Russia as the type of the alien land in relation to the English. In this imagined hierarchy, the former is always fluid and optional, while the latter is fixed and absolute.

This bewildering, contradictory image of Russia, with the sense of order and control over it that such a representation suggests, creates a new identity, and a subject for further investigation. Consequently, the research area of this study can be broadened by exploring more works in English, or written by English writers about Russia. More work needs to be done outside the setting of pre-Revolutionary Russia. Therefore, investigating modern representations of Russia placed in a different context may extend earlier findings. Moreover, a study wider than this, related to Greenfeld's ideas about Russia as the opposite of the West in terms of its superiority and extraordinariness may give the nation a different perspective (Greenfeld 2003: 226-227). Although this work has also taken on board ideas of Russia as mother and Holy land, a place for salvation of the world, never-

theless the entire study could be extended by having a closer insight into how English fiction writers explore the power of the nation.

The concept of representation of the nation as an imagined construction based on stereotypes and previously established images is crucial to modern understanding of both the national community and personal identity. This study has attempted to explore different readings of those polarities and contrasts which may lie behind the imageme of the nation. Those polarities, articulated through literature, demonstrate traditional values and emphasize the rhetoric of imagined colonial power in a post-colonial world. The imaginative manipulations of one nation within the space of another introduce cultural differences and contribute to the concept of displacement. The displaced nation comes to signify a subordinate, and is, thus, defined by its superior counterpart through a constant evaluation of the master's own qualities as supreme. As a result, such ideas as "pure Englishness" as opposed to "true Russianness", with regard to the latter being diminished and Othered, is projected through consistent ideological tropes of representation.

A dominant narrative, through different forms of representation, metaphorically constructs a symbolic community of the Other. The study suggests that, although this community is distinguished by its symbolic expressions such as national traditions, ceremonies and language, through which it is shown to have been historically bound to the same territory, it may also be articulated through various metaphorical forms of narrative. Those forms express national difference producing symbolic contradictions and cultural conflicts, the meaning of which is always ambivalent, never fixed, and at times paradoxical.

This suggests that representations of the nation and national identity in a post-Said world are endowed with new kinds of interpretations where the real coincides with the imaginary, generating new frames of reference both real and imaginary. National narratives reinvent the past, establishing consistent references to certain stereotypical conventions, enabling them to coexist at the same time with the imaginary scenes of the present narrative. In such a combination, the nation appears as both generic and individual, distinct not only by its language and territory, but also by possession of many other additional properties. They are the means to introduce a possible way of defining the nation and to present the imaginary as real.

In general, the "discovery" of Russia in this work suggests that literary representation in the three novels works as a stereotypical construction to create an omnipresent, ambiguous and foreign image of the nation. Although it is now more than four hundred years have passed since the first English travellers discovered the land of Muscovia, the Western idea of the Russian nation is still enshrined in

myth. An enormous land of one-sixth of the globe's land surface, "viewed as disastrous" (Malia 1999: 414) by her European neighbours, still remains for the English an enigmatically boundless source for exploring its often contradictory images. Yet, bearing in mind Conrad's, Fitzgerald's and West's exploitation of the pressing sense of isolation, subordination and difference that this study regards as merely the appropriation of past constructions of "truth", represented through the concerns of the present, a literary representation of the "troubled" Russian identity still has free space for the more imaginative redefinitions of a writer.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

Conrad, Joseph (2003/1911). "Author's Note". *Under Western Eyes*. Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, INC. v-vii.

Fitzgerald, Penelope (1998/1988). *The Beginning of Spring*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin.

West, Rebecca (1978/1966). "Foreword". *The Birds Fall Down*. London: Pan Books Ltd. 7-8.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abrams, M. H. (1971). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Alekseyev, M. P. (1998). "Роберт Браунинг (1812-1889) и Его Русские Отношения". [Robert Browning and His Russian Relationships]. In *Образ России: Россия и Русские в Восприятии Запада и Востока. [The Image of Russia: Russia and the Russians in the Western and Eastern Imagination]*. Eds. Bagno V. E. *et al.* St. Petersburg: The Russian Academy of Science. 245-270.

Allen, Graham (2000). *Intertextuality.* London and New York: Routledge.

Anderson, Benedict (2003/1983). *Imagined Communities*. Revised Edition. London & New York: Verso.

Ankersmit, F. R. (2003). "An Appeal From the New to the Old Historicists". *History & Theory* 42:2, 253-270.

Archer, J. M. (2001). *Old Worlds*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths & Helen Tiffin (2000). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts.* London and New York: Routledge.

Auerbach, Erich (1953). *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* Translated by Willard Trask. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Baehr, Stephen L. (1999). The Machine in Chekhov's Garden: Progress and Pastoral in *The Cherry Orchard*. *Slavic and East European Journal* 43:1, 99-120.

Bahrani, Zainab (2003). *The Graven Image: Representation in Babylonia and Assyria*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (2002). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Balibar, Etienne & Immanuel Wallerstein (1991/1988). *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities.* London, New York: Verso.

Barthes, Roland (1972/1957). *Mythologies.* Translated by Annette Lavers. London: Jonathan Cape.

Barthes, Roland (1997/1967). "The Discourse of History". In *The Postmodern History Reader*. Ed. Keith Jenkins. London and New York: Routledge. 120-123.

Barthes, Roland (1981/1973). "Theory of the Text". In *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader.* Ed. Robert Young. Boston/London/Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 31-47.

Barry, Peter (1995). *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Beeching, Jack (1985). Introduction. In *Voyages and Discoveries: The Principal Navigations Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation.* Richard Hakluyt. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. 9-30.

Bennett, Andrew & Nicholas Royle (1995). *An Introduction to Literature, Criticism, and Theory.* London: Prentice Hall.

Bernstein, Stephen (1994). "Conrad and Rousseau: A Note on *Under Western Eyes"*. *Journal of Modern Literature* 19:1, 161-163.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1990). "DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation". In *Nation and Narration.* Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London and New York: Routledge. 291-322.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1998/1993). "Culture in between". In *Multicultural States: Rethinking Difference and Identity.* Ed. David Bennett. London: Routledge. 29-36.

Billington, James H. (1970). *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture.* New York: Vintage Books.

Bird, Robert (2003). "Russian Writing/Writing Russia". In *Russia and Western Civilization: Cultural and Historical Encounters*. Ed. Russell Bova. New York, London: M.E. Sharpe. 145-176.

Blunt, Alison & Cheryl McEwan (2002). Introduction. In *Postcolonial Geographies*. Eds. Alison Blunt & Cheryl McEwan. London and New York: Continuum. 1-10.

Bolger, Dermot (2005). *The Family on Paradise Pier*. London: Harper Collins Publishers.

Bonnett, Alastair (2004). *The Idea of the West: Culture, Politics and History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boswell, James (1966/1904). *Life of Johnson*. London: Oxford University Press.

Brecht, Bertolt (1964/1938). "The Popular and the Realistic". In *Brecht on Theatre.* Ed. and Translated John Willett. New York: Hill and Wang and London: Eyre Methuen. 107-115.

Briggs, Julia (2006). *Reading Virginia Woolf*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brody, Erwin C. (1972). *The Demetrius Legend and Its Literary Treatment in the Age of the Baroque.* Rutherford: Farleigh Dickinson University Press.

Brooker, Peter (1992). *Modernism/Postmodernism*. London and New York: Longman.

Browning, Gary (2000). "Peasant Dreams in *Anna Karenina"*. *Slavic and East European Journal* 44:4, 525-536.

Browning, Robert (1994/1878). "Ivan Ivanovitch". *The Poems of Robert Browning,* 590-596. Ware: Wordsworth Poetry Library.

Burgess, Anthony (1973/1963). *Honey for the Bears*. London: Penguin Books.

Butler, Samuel (2001/1872). *Erewhon*. London: Electric Book Co.

Byron, Lord George Gordon (1966/1904). *Poetical Works*. London: Oxford University Press.

Cain, Jimmie E. Jr. (2006). *Bram Stoker and Russophobia: Evidence of the British Fear of Russia in Dracula and The Lady of the Shroud.* Jefferson, North Carolina, and London: McFarland & Company Publishers.

Calder, Angus (1976). *Russia Discovered: Nineteenth-Century Fiction From Pushkin to Chekhov.* New York: Barnes and Noble Books (A division of Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.).

Cannadine, David (2001). *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carabine, Keith (1996). Introduction. *The Life and the Art: A Study of Conrad's Under Western Eyes*. Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA: Rodopi. xi-xxx.

Cavender, Mary W. (2007). *Nests of the Gentry*. Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware Press.

Certeau, Michel de (1986). *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*. *Theory and History of Literature.* Volume 17. Translated by Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Chaadayev, Peter Yakovlevich (1969/1836). *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*. Translation and Introduction by Mary-Barbara Zeldin. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. 34-35.

Chaadayev, Peter Yakovlevich (1991/1836). *Philosophical Works of Peter Chaadayev.* Volume 56. Eds. Raymond T. McNally & Richard Tempest. Translated by Raymond T. McNally. Dordrecht and London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Chambers, Ian (1995). Migrancy, Culture, Identity. In *The Postmodern History Reader*. Ed. Keith Jenkins. London and New York: Prentice Hall.

Cheesman, Tom (2001). "The Turkish German Self: Displacing German-German Conflict in Orientalist Street Ballads". In *Imagined States.* Eds. Del Giudice Luisa & Gerald Porter. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press. 136-163.

Chekhov, Anton (1997/1904). *The Cherry Orchard*. In *The Plays of Anton Chekhov*. Translated by Paul Schmidt. New York: Harper Collins Publishers. 331-387.

Cheyette, Bryan (1993). *Constructions of "the Jew" in English Literature and Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Christensen, Peter (2006). "The Azev Affair and *The Birds Fall Down*: A True Story on a Parallel Universe?" In *Rebecca West Today: Contemporary Critical Approaches.* Ed. Bernard Schweizer. Newark: University of Delaware Press. 80-96.

Clayton, Douglas (2002). "Penelope Fitzgerald". In *Modern British Women Writers: An A-to-Z Guide*. Eds. Vicky K. Janik and Del Ivan Janik. Westport, Connecticut and London: Greenwood Press. 123-129.

Conrad, Joseph (2008/1905). "Autocracy and War". In *Notes on Life and Letters (Webster's French Thesaurus Edition)*. Ed. Philip M. Parker. San Diego: Icon Classics. 79-103.

Cross, Anthony G. (1985). *The Russian Theme in English Literature: From the Sixteenth Century to 1980. An Introductory Survey and a Bibliography*. Oxford: Willem A. Meeuws.

Davison Peter (1987/1945). "A Note on the Text". *Animal Farm*. George Orwell. London: Penguin Books. v-viii.

Defoe, Daniel (1953/1719). *Robinson Crusoe*. London and Glasgow: Collins.

De Marco, Nick (1991). *"Liberty" and "bread": The Problem of Perception in Conrad: A Critical Study of Under Western Eyes.* Chieti: Marino Solfanelli Editore.

Del Giudice, Luisa & Gerald Porter (eds) (2001). *Imagined States: Nationalism, Utopia, and Longing in Oral Cultures.* Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.

Douglas, Norman (1947/1917). *South Wind.* London: Secker and Warburg.

Dreiser, Theodore (1928). *Dreiser Looks at Russia*. London: Constable.

Dunmore, Helen (2001). *The Siege*. London: Viking.

Dunmore, Helen (2006). *The House of Orphans.* London: Penguin Books.

Durant, Will (1935). *The Story of Civilization: Our Oriental Heritage*. Volume 1. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Eco, Umberto (1992). "Interpretation and History". In *Interpretation and Over-interpretation*. Ed. Stefan Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 23-44.

Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna (1999). *The Strange Short Fiction of Joseph Conrad: Writing, Culture, and Subjectivity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Etkind, Alexander (2003). "Whirling With the Other: Russian Populism and Religious Sects". *Russian Review* 62:4, 565-588.

Evdokimova, Svetlana (2000). "What's So Funny About Losing One's Estate, or Infantilism in *The Cherry Orchard"*. *Slavic and East European Journal* 44:4, 623-648.

Everett, Wendy & Peter Wagstaff (eds). (2004). *Cultures of Exile: Images of Displacement*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Fabian, Johannes (1983). *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Figes, Orlando (1997/1996). *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution 1891-1924.* London: Pimlico.

Figes, Orlando (2002). *Natasha's Dance*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Fitzgerald, Penelope (1999/1977). *The Golden Child*. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Fletcher, Giles (1966/1591). *Of the Russe Commonwealth*. Facsimile Edition with Variants and an Introduction by Richard Pipes. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Fletcher, Giles (2001/1588). "The Description of the Countrey of Russia, with the Bredth, Length, and Names of the Shires". In *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels: Travel & Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology*. Ed. Andrew Hadfield. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 127-138.

Fletcher, John (1840/1618). *The Loyal Subject.* In *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher with an Introduction by George Darley*. Volume 1. London: Edward Moxon, Dover Street. 313-344.

Folks, Jeffrey (2006). "The Dangerous Irrelevance of Recent Theory". *Modern Age* 48:2, 130-139.

Foster, Jeremy (2003). "'Land of Contrasts' or 'Home we have always known'?: the SAR&H and the Imaginary Geography of White South African Nationhood, 1910-1930". *Journal of Southern African Studies* 29:3, 657-680.

Foucault, M. (1972/1969). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan-Smith. London: Tavistock.

Frame, Robin (2005). "Exporting State and Nation: Being English in Medieval Ireland". In *Power and the Nation in European History.* Eds. Len Scales & Oliver Zimmer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freud, Sigmund (1997/1900). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Translated by A. A. Brill. Wordsworth Classics of World Literature.

Garrett, Leah (2001). "Trains and Train Travel in Modern Yiddish Literature". *Jewish Social Studies* 7: 2, 67-88.

George, Rosemary Marangoly (1996). *The Politics of Home: Postcolonial Relocations and Twentieth-century Fiction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glendinning, Victoria (1987). *Rebecca West: A Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Gogol, Nikolai (1923/1842). *Dead Souls*. Translated by Clifford Odets. New York: Modern Library.

Goldman, Emma (1923). *My Disillusionment in Russia*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company.

Gorky, Maxim (1977/1922). "On the Russian Peasantry". In *The Russian Peasant 1920 and 1984.* Ed. R. E. F. Smith. London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd. 11-27.

Greenfeld, Liah (2003/1993). *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Griffiths, Jay (2000/1999). *Pip Pip*. London: Harper Collins.

Grousset, René (1970/1939). *The Empire of the Steppes: A History of Central Asia*. Translated by Naomi Walford. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Gunes, Ali (2004). "From Logocentricism (Binary Opposition) to Deconstruction: Meaning, Culture and Gender Identity in Virginia Woolf's *Orlando"*. *Feminist Studies in English Literature* 12: 2, 55-80.

Haarmann, Harald (2000). "The Soul of Mother Russia: Russian Symbols and Pre-Russian Cultural Identity". *Revision* 23:1, 1-19.

Hadfield, Andrew (ed.). (2001). *Amazons, Savages, and Machiavels: Travel & Colonial Writing in English, 1550-1630: An Anthology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hakluyt, Richard (1910/1598-1600). *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nations, Made by Sea or Overland to the Remote and Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth at Any Time Within the Compasse of These 1600 Yeares.* Volume 1. Ed. Ernest Rhys. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.

Hakluyt, Richard (1985/1598-1600). *Voyages and Discoveries: The Principal Navigations Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Hall, Stuart (2003/1997). *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices.* London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Hauser, Arnold (1999/1951). *The Social History of Art: Naturalism, Impressionism, the Film Age.* London: Routledge.

Herberstein, Sigmund von (1969/1557). *Description of Moscow and Muscovy*. Ed. Bertold Picard. Translated by J. B. C. Grundy. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Herzen, Alexander (1982/1867). *My Past and Thoughts*. Translated by Constance Garnett. Berkeley and Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Higdon, David Leon (1987). "The End Is the Devil: The Conclusions to Conrad's *Under Western Eyes"*. *Studies in the Novel* 19: 2, 187-196.

Hornsby, Stephen J. (2004). *British Atlantic, American Frontier: Spaces of Power in Modern British America.* Hanover and London: University Press of New England.

Hubbs, Joanna (1988). *Mother Russia: The Feminine Myth in Russian Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Huneker, James (1990). "A Visit to Joseph Conrad". In *Joseph Conrad: Interviews and Recollections*. Ed. Martin Ray. Iowa: University of Iowa Press. 21-26.

Hutcheon, Linda (1985). "The Politics of Postmodern Parody". In *Intertextuality.* Ed. Plett Heinrich F. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Hutcheon, Linda (1989). "Historiographic Metafiction". In *Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction.* Eds. Patrick O'Donnell & Robert Con Davis. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 3-32.

Hynes, Samuel (1975). "A Critical Introduction". In *Rebecca West: A Celebration.* Rebecca West. Selected from her writings by her publishers with her help. London: Penguin Books. ii-xx.

Irwin, Robert (2006). *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientals and Their Enemies.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Ivanov, Vsevolod (1985/1922). "Бронепоезд No. 14-69". ["Armoured Train No. 14-69"]. *Избранные Произведения.* [*Selected Writings*]. Volume 2. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura.

Jenkins, Keith (ed.). (1997). *The Postmodern History Reader.* London, New York: Routledge.

Johnson, Anthony W. (2005). "Notes Towards a New Imagology". *The European English Messenger* 14: 1, 50-58.

Kaplan, Caren (1996). *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*. Durhman: Duke University Press.

Karl, Frederick R. & Laurence Davies. Eds. (1983/1908-1911). *The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad.* Volume 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kataev, Vladimir (2002/1979). *If Only We Could Know! An Interpretation of Chekhov.* Ed. and Translated by Harvey Pitcher. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.

Kaye, Peter (1999). *Dostoyevsky and English Modernism 1900-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaznina, O. (2000). "С. С. Котелянский и Аглийские Писатели". ["S. S. Koteliansky (1880-1955) and English Writers"]. In *Русские Евреи в Великобритании*. [*The Russian Jews in Great Britain*]. Ed. Mikhail Parhomovskii. Jerusalem. 161.

Kelly, Catriona & David Shepherd (1998). *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kiberd, Declan (1995). *Inventing Ireland*. London: Vintage.

Kipling, Rudyard (1978/1901). *Kim.* London: Pan Books.

[Korzenowski, Apollo] (1966). "Polska i Moskwa. Pamietnik zaczety*** 186…" ["Poland and Muscovy. A Memoir by*** begun in 186…"]; *Ojczyzna: Dzennik polityczny, literacki I naukowy* [*The Fatherland: A Political, Literary and Scientific Daily*]. Leipzig, 27, 3 June 1864. Translated and cited by Andrzej Busza in "Conrad's Polish Literary Background and Some Illustrations of the Influence of Polish Literature on His Work", *Antemurale* 10, 128.

Klimenko, Svetlana O. (2001). "Anton Chekhov and English Nostalgia". *Orbis Litterarum* 56: 2, 121-137.

Kozyreva, Maria, and Vera, Shamina (2005). "Russia Revisited". In *The Perception of H.G. Wells in Europe*. Eds. Patrick Parrinder, and John S. Parington. New York: Thoemmes Continuum. 48-62.

Kristeva, Julia (1980). *Desire in Language*. Ed. Leon Roudiez S. Translated by Thomas Gora. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, Julia (1984/1974). *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Translated by Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, Julia (1986). *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. Oxford and Cambridge USA: Blackwell.

Kristeva, Julia (1991/1988). *Strangers to Ourselves*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.

Laing, Kathryn (2002). Introduction to *The Sentinel*. Oxford: European Humanities Research Centre, University of Oxford. xiii-liii.

Leavis, Q. D. (1985). "The Russian Novel". In *Collected Essays*. *The American Novel and Reflections on the European Novel.* Volume 2. Ed. Singh G. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 234-255.

Leskov, Nikolai S. (1981/1881). *Левша.* [*The Left-Handed*]. In *Повести и Рассказы. [Stories and Tales]*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura.

Leerssen, Joep (1997). "The Allochronic Periphery: Towards a Grammar of Cross-Cultural Representation". In *Beyond Pug's Tour: National and Ethnic Stereotyping in Theory and Literary Practice.* Ed. Barfoot C. C. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi. 285-295.

Leerssen, Joep (2000). "The Rhetoric of National Character: A Programmatic Survey". *Poetics Today* 21: 2, 267-292.

Leerssen, Joep (2007). "Nation, Ethnie, People". In *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters.* Eds. Manfred Beller & Joep Leerssen. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi. 377-381.

Levin U. D. (1998). "Россия в Английской Эссеистике XVIII в." ["Russia in English Periodical Essays of the 18th Century"]. In *Образ России: Россия и Русские в Восприятии Запада и Востока. [The Image of Russia: Russia and the Russians in Western and Eastern Imagination]*. Eds. Bagno V. E. *et al.* St. Petersburg: The Russian Academy of Science. 5-28.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude (2004/1963). "The Structural Study of Myth". In *Social Research Methods: A Reader*. Clive Seale. Translated by Nicholas Mann. London and New York: Routledge. 335-340.

London, Jack (1976/1908). *The Iron Heel*. London: The Journeyman Press.

Long, Andrew (2003). The Secret Policeman's Couch: Informing, Confession, and Interpellation in Conrad's *Under Western Eyes*. *Studies in the Novel* 35: 4, 490-509.

Lopez, Ian F. Haney (2004). "The Social Construction of Race". In *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Eds. J. Rivkin and M. Ryan. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 964-972.

Lord, Geoffrey (1996). *Postmodernism and Notions of National Difference: A Comparison of Postmodern Fiction in Britain and America.* Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Lounsbery, Anne (2004). "'To Moscow, I Beg You!': Chekhov's Vision of the Russian Provinces". [Web document]. Vaasa: Vaasa University Library. [Cited on 25 Jan. 2007]. Available at: http://www.utoronto.ca/tsq/09/lounsbery09.shtml

Lounsbery, Anne (2005). "'No, This Is Not the Provinces!' Provincialism, Authenticity, and Russianness in Gogol's Day". *Russian Review* 64: 2, 259-280.

Lounsbery, Anne (2007). "Dostoevskii's Geography: Centers, Peripheries, and Networks in *Demons"*. *Slavic Review* 66: 2, 211-229.

Lovell, Nadia (ed.). (1998). Introduction. In *Locality and Belonging*. London and New York: Routledge. 1-24.

Lowe, Lisa (2004). "Heterogeneity, Hybridity, Multiplicity: Marking Asian American Differences". In *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Eds. J. Rivkin & M. Ryan. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 1031-1050.

Lukács, George (1963/1957). *The Meaning of Contemporary Realism*. Translated by John and Necke Mander. London: Merlin Press.

Lu, Jie (2001). "Mnemonic Representation of Posthistorical Experience in Contemporary Chinese Fictional Histories". *Journal of Contemporary China* 10:27, 253-273.

Malia, Martin (1999). *Russia Under Western Eyes: From the Bronze Horseman to the Lenin Mausoleum.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap of Harvard University Press.

Malik, Kenan (2001). "Why the Victorians Were Colour Blind". *New Statesman*. May 7, 2001. 48-49.

Mann, Thomas (2005/1924). *The Magic Mountain.* Translated by John E. Woods. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Marx, Karl (1958/1848). "Manifesto of the Communist Party". *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Works.* Volume 1. Moscow: Foreign Languages Press. 21-65.

Masefield, John (1910). Introduction. In *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nations, Made by Sea or Overland to the Remote and Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth at Any Time Within the Compasse of These 1600 Yeares.* Richard Halkuyt. Volume 1. Ed. Ernest Rhys. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd. 1-21.

May, Rachel (1994). *The Translator in the Text: On Reading Russian Literature in English*. Evanston: Northwest University Press.

McCullough, Bruce (1946). *Representative English Novelists: Defore to Conrad*. New York, London: Harper & Brothers.

Meakin, Annette M. B. (1971/1906). *Russia: Travels and Studies*. New York: Arno Press.

Meek, James (2005/1962). *The People's Act of Love.* Edinburgh and New York: Harper Collins Publishers Ltd.

Messud, Claire (2007). "Chekhov and Aspiring Writers". In *Chekhov the Immigrant: Translating a Cultural Icon.* Eds. Michael C. Finke & Julie de Sherbinin. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers. 169-175.

Miller, Elaine P. (2002). *The Vegetative Soul: From Philosophy of Nature to Subjectivity in the Feminine.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Milner-Gulland, Robin (1997). *The Russians: The People of Europe.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Milton, John (1929/1682). *A Brief History of Muscovia*. *And of Other Less-Known Countries Lying Eastward of Russia as Far as Cathay*. London: Blackmore Press.

Milton, John (1966/1667). *Paradise Lost*. London: Dent Everyman's Library.

Minh-ha, Trinh T. (1994). "Other Than Myself/My Other Self". In *Travellers' Tales: Narratives of Home and Displacement*. Eds. George Robertson et al. London: Routledge. 9-28.

Montrose, Louise (2004/1989). "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture". In *Literary Theory: An Anthology.* Eds. J. Rivkin & M. Ryan. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 584-591.

Moser, Thomas C. (1984). "An English Context for Conrad's Russian Characters: Sergey Stepniak and the Diary of Olive Garnett". *Journal of Modern Literature* 2: 1, 3-44.

Murray, Penelope (1996). *Plato on Poetry.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Naarden, Bruno, and Joep Leerssen (2007). "Russians". In *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters.* Eds. Manfred Beller & Joep Leerssen. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi. 226-229.

Nabokov, Vladimir (1981/1942). *Poems and Problems*. Translated by Vladimir Nabokov. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Neilson, Keith (1995). *Britain and the Last Tsar: British Policy and Russia, 1894-1917*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neumann, Iver B. (1997). Russia as Europe's Other: Barbarian at the Gate, Gatekeeper and Golden Gate to the Future. In *Cultural Politics and Political Culture in Postmodern Europe*. Ed. J. Peter Burgess. Postmodern Studies 24. Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA: Rodopi. 119-154.

Nikitin, Nikolai (1923). "Ночь". ["Night"]. In the almanac *Кругъ* [*Circle*]. Moscow: Moscow Press.

Noe, Mark D. (2001). "Fitzgerald's *The Beginning of Spring"*. *Explicator* 59: 4, 204-206.

Norton, Ann V. (2000). *Paradoxical Feminism: The Novels of Rebecca West.* Lanham-New York-Oxford: International Scholars Publications.

Nyman, Jopi (2005). *Imagining Englishness: Essays on the Representation of National Identity in Modern British Culture.* Joensuu: Joensuu yliopisto.

Nyman, Jopi (2000). *Under English Eyes: Constructions of Europe in Early Twentieth-Century British Fiction.* Amsterdam, Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Ong, Walter J. (1982). *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World.* London and New York: Routledge.

Orwell, George (1987/1945). *Animal Farm*. London: Penguin Books.

Palmer, Daryl W. (2004). *Writing Russia in the Age of Shakespeare.* Bodmin, Cornwall: MPG Books.

Peace, Richard (1983). *Chekhov: A Study of Four Major Plays.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Peters, John G. (2001). *Conrad and Impressionism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peterson, Dale E. (2000). *Up From Bondage: The Literatures of Russian and African American Soul.* Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Pettersson, Torsten (1982). *Consciousness and Time: A Study in the Philosophy and Narrative Technique of Joseph Conrad.* Volume 61. Issue 1. Turku: Åbo Akademi.

Phillips, Gary A. (1991). "Sign/Text/Différance". In *Intertextuality.* Ed. Heinrich Plett F. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter. 78-124.

Pil'niak, Boris (1966/1922). *Голый Год*. [*The Naked Year*]. Letchworth, Hertforshire: Bradda Books Ltd.

Pipes, Richard (1995/1974). *Russia Under the Old Regime*. London: Penguin Books.

Poe, Marshall T. (2000). *A People Born to Slavery: Russia in Early Modern European Ethnography, 1476-1748.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Porter, Gerald (2001). "'Who Talks of My Nation?' The Role of Wales, Scotland, and Ireland in Constructing 'Englishness'". In *Imagined States*. Eds. Luisa Del Giudice & Gerald Porter. Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press. 101-135.

Pousada, Alicia (1994). Joseph Conrad's Multilingualism: A Case Study of Language Planning in Literature. *English Studies* 75 : 4, 335-349.

Putman, Hilary (1988). *Representation and Reality*. Cambridge USA, London: A Bradford Book.

Raleigh, Donald J. (2000). Provincial Landscapes: Some Reflections on Doing Local History. In *Studia Slavica Finlandesia: Modernisation in the Russian Provinces*. Tomus XVII. Eds. Natalia Baschmakoff, Paul Fryer. Helsinki: Helsinki Publisher. 128-139.

Ray, Martin (2007). *Joseph Conrad. Memories and Impressions: An Annotated Bibliography.* Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi.

Reed, John (1979/1919). *Ten Days That Shook the World*. London: Penguin Books.

Reilly, Jim (1993). *Shadowtime: History and Representation in Hardy, Conrad and George Eliot.* London and New York: Routledge.

Rieselbach, Helen Funk (1985/1980). *Conrad's Rebels: The Psychology of Revolution in the Novels from Nostromo to Victory.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press.

Rollyson, Carl (1998a). "Rebecca West & the FBI". *New Criterion* 16: 6, 1-11.

Rollyson, Carl (1998b). *The Literary Legacy of Rebecca West*. San Francisco and London: International Scholars Publications.

Rollyson, Carl (2005). *Rebecca West and the God That Failed: Essays*. New York, Lincoln: iUniverse.

Rollyson, Carl (2006). "Rebecca West's Politics: A Biographical Perspective". Preface. In *Rebecca West Today: Contemporary Critical Approaches*. Ed. Bernard Schweizer. Newark: University of Delaware Press. 9-17.

Said, Edward W. (1978). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books.

Said, Edward (2003). *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Sarup, Madan (1996). *Identity, Culture, and the Postmodern World*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Saussure, de Ferdinand (2004). "Course in General Linguistics". In *Literary Theory: An Anthology.* Eds. J. Rivkin & M. Ryan. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 59-71.

Scott, Bonnie Kime (ed.) (2000). *Selected Letters of Rebecca West*. New Haven and London: Yale Univerity Press.

Shakespeare, William (1906/1595-1596). *Love's Labour's Lost*. Ed. Horace Howard Furness. Volume 14. 2d edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Shiel, Matthew P. (1998/1898). *The Yellow Danger*. England: Routledge/Thoemmes Press.

Sidney, Philip (2002/1581). "Astrophil and Stella". In *Selected Writings.* Ed. Richard Dutton. New York: Routledge. Sonnet 30. 29-101.

Singh, Frances B. (2005). "'Motley's the Only Wear': Hybridity, Homelands, and Conrad's Harlequin". In *Postcolonial Whiteness: A Critical Reader on Race and*

Empire. Ed. Alfred J. Lopez. New York: State University of New York Press. 183-200.

Skidelsky, Edward (1999). "A Nation Enslaved by Its Past". *New Statesman*. September 13. 52-53.

Smith, Helen (2007). "Opposing Orbits: Ford, Edward Garnett and the Battle for Conrad". In *Ford Madox Ford's Literary Contacts*. Ed. Paul Skinner. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi. 79-94.

Spiering, Menno (1997). "Englishness and Post-War Literature". In *Beyond Pug's Tour: National and Ethnic Stereotyping in Theory and Literary Practice*. Ed. C.C. Barfoot. Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi. 267-276.

Sumarokov, Alexander P. (1957/1763). "Другой Хор ко Превратному Свету". ["Another Chorus to a Perverted World"]. *Избранные Произведения*. [*Selected Works*]. Moscow and Leningrad: Sovetskii Pisatel. 279-281.

Tess, Lewis (2000). "Between Head and Heart: Penelope Fitzgerald's Novels". *New Criterion* 18: 7, 29-37.

Thompson, Ewa M. (2000). *Imperial Knowledge: Russian Literature and Colonialism.* Westport: Greenwood Press.

Tolz, Vera (2001). *Russia: Inventing the Nation*. London: Oxford University Press.

Turton, Glyn (1992). *Turgenev and the Context of English Literature 1850-1900*. London: Routledge.

Varlamov, Aleksei (2005). "Once There Were Peasants". *Russian Studies in Literature* 41: 3, 84-87.

Voitkovska, Ludmilla (2005). "Conrad in Russia: A Discipline in Absentia". *Conradiana* 37: 1-2, 147-164. Texas: Tech University Press.

West, Rebecca (1928). "The Strange Necessity". In *The Strange Necessity: Essays and Reviews*. London: Jonathan Cape Thirty Bedford Squire. 13-199. The Berg Collection of English and American Literature. The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations.

West, Rebecca (1929). "The Inconveniences of Power". In *Time and Tide*. June 21. Rebecca West papers 1894-1975. Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

West, Rebecca (1957). *Rebecca West: A Celebration*. London: Penguin Books.

Wexler, Alice (1992). "Emma Goldman and the Anxiety of Biography". In *The Challenge of Feminist Biography: Writing the Lives of Modern American Women.*

Eds. Saara Alpern, Joyce Antler, Elisabeth Israels Perry, and Ingrid Winther Scobie. Chicago: The University of Illinois Press. 34-50.

White, Hayden (1978). "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact". In *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding.* Eds. Robert H. Canary & Henry Kozicki. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 39-58.

White, Hayden (2005). "Introduction: Historical Fiction, Fictional History, and Historical Reality". *Rethinking History* 9: 2/3, 147-157.

Williams, Raymond (1973). *The Country and the City*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Robert C. (1997). *Russia Imagined: Art, Culture, and National Identity, 1840-1995.* New York: Peter Lang.

Winegarten, Renee (1984). Rebecca West. *American Scholar* 53: 2, 225-231.

Woolf, Virginia (1977-1984/1929). *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*. Volume 1. Ed. Anne Olivier Bell. London: The Hogarth Press. December 8. 108.

Woolf, Virginia (1998/1928). *Orlando*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Woolf, Virginia (2001/1915). *The Voyage Out*. Ed. Lorna Sage. With an Introduction and Notes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolfe, Peter (1971). *Rebecca West: Artist and Thinker*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Wolfe, Peter (2004). *Understanding Penelope Fitzgerald.* South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Wolff, Larry (1994). *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of Enlightenment.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Womersley, David (ed.). (2003/1750-1752). *The Rambler*. *Samuel Johnson: Selected Essays.* London: Penguin Classics. 1-208.

Wormald, Patrick (2005). "Germanic Power Structures: the Early English Experience". In *Power and the Nation in European History.* Eds. Len Scales & Oliver Zimmer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 105-124.

Yeats, W.B. (1967). *Collected Poems*. London: Macmillan.

Young, Alexey (1998). "Natural Death and the Work of Perfection". *Christian Bioethics* 4: 2, 168-182.

Zabel, Morton Dauwen (1966). Introduction to *Under Western Eyes*. In *Conrad: A Collection of Critical Essays.* Ed. Marvin Mudrick. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 111-144.