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ABSTRACT

During the era of Russia’s modernisation and industrialisation which spans from the death of Nicholas I to the Revolution of 1917, Russian thinkers saw Britain as a rival and a society to emulate. The concern with Britain found its way to the pages of Russia’s literary prose fiction in the form of English characters and images of England’s society. The dissertation gives an analytical study of the English in Russian literature, examining how they become the textual other in the quest to identify Russia’s national self between 1855 and 1917.

The dissertation argues that the promulgation of stereotypes of Englishness in Russia’s prose literature relies upon images that had been established by the travel narrative in the initial stages of Russia’s quest to define its national identity. Early attempts to define Russia’s selfhood through travellers’ perceptions of England between 1790 and the 1840s fostered an essentialised image of Englishness which the later writers cemented.

The theoretical investigation of identity creates a foundation upon which our assessment has been formed. It involves the exploration of Russian national identity as it is implied through the images of England and the English. Evoking the critical framework of Said and the theories of Orientalism and Occidentalism, this dissertation studies the Russian literary productions of England and the English, of religion in England, of ‘Englishness’ as a form of social respectability, and also of the British Empire and the exportation of English values abroad.
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For ease and clarity quotations from the original Russian texts are given in Cyrillic; the modernised orthography has been used throughout.

Titles and authors’ names are transliterated according to the simplified Library of Congress System. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are mine.
INTRODUCTION

"В Европе мы были приживальники и рабы, а в Азии явимся господами. В Европе мы были татарами, а в Азии и мы европейцы."  
(In Europe we were hangers-on and slaves, but we shall go to Asia as masters. In Europe we were Tartars, but in Asia we too are Europeans...)

The nature of Russia’s identity vis-à-vis Europe has been much debated since the eighteenth century. It has proved to be a recurrent theme of Russian literature, both non-fictional and artistic, throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. There was a lively engagement between Russian and foreign characters and cultures in nineteenth-century Russian literature. This suggests how important the issue of producing adequate articulation of Russia’s national identity had become. The second half of the century saw Russia begin the task of modernisation through a series of social reforms and industrialisation. Concurrently there is an increase in the numbers and varieties of English characters in Russian prose. Dominic Lieven asserted that by the middle of the nineteenth century Britain is Russia’s main rival in the struggle to colonise the world in terms of territorial expansion. It is therefore hardly surprising that Russian culture has consistently aimed to produce an image of Britain. It will be the task of this dissertation to produce an analysis of this image.

1 F. Dostoevskii, Dnevnik pisateleia, in F. Dostoevskii, Sobranie sochinenii v deviati tomakh, tom 9, (Moskva: Astrot’, 2004) p. 480
2 It is important to stress that the use of England and the English here is not to deny the influence of the other nations making up Great Britain. I use England because, as is common knowledge, the Russians have traditionally tended to see ‘Britain’ as ‘England’. It is sometimes unavoidable to use England and Britain as synonyms, as for example, when discussing the British Empire, but the Russian terms ‘Anglia’ and ‘anglichane’ correspond to England and the English. In the Russian imagination there is little or no distinction between the two.
The sources for ‘English’ characters in Russian texts are various. Trade contacts had been established in the sixteenth century, from which time the English had been fairly frequent visitors to Russia. There were also many professionals from Britain in the employ of the Russian court, and a thriving English community existed in St Petersburg. English, and also Scottish, culture had been familiar to the nobility from the mid-eighteenth century onwards. There had been a fashion for reading English literature, albeit in translation. Many examples of this literature were also French or German publications masquerading as English. It was also fashionable to read Voltaire’s publications, which were extremely flattering towards England. This literature – both historical and imaginative – inspired a certain idealistic reverence towards a romantic idea of England and the English which persisted through to the end of the eighteenth and into the nineteenth century. This period also saw the rise in popularity of the travelogue as England became a fairly prominent destination on Russia’s version of the European Grand Tour. This in turn facilitated the spread of narratives based on first-hand knowledge of England and its inhabitants. It is also the most influential period in the creation of stereotypes of what might be termed the English ‘other’ of the Russian ‘self’. The knowledge and imagery embedded in travel writing provided inspiration for the developing literary representation of the English in the prose fiction of the second half of the nineteenth century. The creation and re-articulation of this literary England and its impact on Russian national identity will be the focus of our attention in the coming pages.

6 E. Simmons, English Literature and Culture in Russia (1553-1840), (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1935), p. 82; See also, for example, E. Clarke, Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa, I (London, T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1810), p. 90
Of course, the ‘Russia’ to which most identity-oriented narratives refer is the small tier of the educated elite, a small yet influential minority. It is the construction of Russia by its intelligentsia with which I am concerned. One of the most expressive media for the process of comparing and contrasting the self with its other – belonging to a different culture – is that of artistic literature. As Russian writers turn towards England, which is often construed as a personification of the ‘West’, they ultimately aim to discover a sense of their own Russianness arising from this discussion. Literary representations of the ‘other’ are not so much ‘objective’, as thought provoking, engaging, and at times profound. The range of valid interpretations in artistic literature are varied, as the creative process is not bound to historical fact and is therefore prone to multiple scenarios and possibilities. Prose fiction is multi-voiced. It enables arguments and issues of ideology to be embodied in characters and dialogues and is capable of creating situations in which established characters participate to enact ideological issues. I focus primarily on short stories, but not to the exclusion of novels and some poetry. The short story is best suited to discussions of identity and features of disparate cultures. There is a limited scope within short fiction which tends to contain a single plot, a single event and dramatic turning point. The novel deals with epic material, creating a comprehensive, layered image, containing multiple plots all woven together: concerns about the issues of Russian identity clearly buttress many novels, but tend not to be in the work’s focus. Poetry is not overly suited to this type of analysis, as it is generally personal and lyrical, containing a single thread of thought. However, there are a few poems about England in the Russian literary canon which bear discussion within the topic of this dissertation. I have two specific questions in mind when approaching this subject. How is the image of England and the English constructed in Russian literature? In what ways does literary narrative
produce an image of 'Russianness' through the representation of the English? In order to answer these questions I propose to examine the literary depictions of England and the English in Russian prose between 1855 and 1917.

The timeframe for this study is reasonably long, spanning the death of Nicholas I and the Revolution of 1917. This era covers the majority of the ‘golden’ and ‘silver’ ages of Russian literature. These were the times of great artistic creativity in Russia, when many of Russia’s most significant literary works were produced. It also covers the era of Russian classical realism, in which the texts strove to create a believable and useable image of Russia’s national identity. This was also a critical juncture in Russia’s history. Russia had focussed on the West as its primary constituent ‘other’ and had a turbulent relationship towards this entity that became both a guide for Russia’s development and an object of derision and great resentment.7 Russia’s drive towards modernisation and industrialisation began after the ignominious defeat in the Crimean War highlighted its relative cultural and technological backwardness in comparison with the Western states. Russians suddenly saw themselves as increasingly isolated. Under these conditions, Russia’s claim to be a European power was precarious, which resulted in greater introspection concerning its place in the world.

The changing form of Russian fictional characters over the century from the idealists who become the so-called ‘superfluous men’, men of inertia, and then to the men of action who seek to liberate the country and modernise, shows the uncertainty

---

of Russian self-perception during the periods in question. More telling, perhaps, is the strong Russian preoccupation with the interaction between Western Europeans and Russian characters. Also, the fact that foreign characters appear in many major Russian short stories and novels, while Russians in Western prose are uncommon\(^8\) is suggestive of Russia’s insecurity over its identity and the never-ending quest to articulate its national identity. These attempts to discern ‘Russia’ unify many short stories and feature as prominent themes in novels of various styles produced until the collapse of Tsarist Russia. It is particularly telling that significantly more English characters appear in texts in this era than previously, and they are often afforded greater prominence than had hitherto been the case. These characters are allowed to speak and interact with Russian and other foreign characters, reinforcing existing, and establishing new, stereotypes. Through this, they make a more convincing contrast to Russianness.

Prior to this period, little vignettes sufficed to portray stereotypes of foreign cultures. Pushkin’s ‘Englishman’ in his ‘Pikovaia dama’ (‘The Queen of Spades’), for example, with just one word – ‘oh’ – serves to create an impression of the English as cold and aloof.\(^9\) This expression is not characteristic of Russian etiquette. When used, it aims to conjure up an image that is well known to the intended readership. It suggests a non-demonstrative disposition and an unwillingness to engage in conversation, even to ask questions of the interlocutor. This detached attitude would strike readers as haughty, reserved and distant. We will return in greater detail in later chapters of this dissertation to the demonstration of English standoffishness and indifference to the fates of others. Such little cameos as the one in ‘Pikovaia dama’


serve the function of creating a ‘type’ that is representative of the other culture. They provide a foretaste of why England was to become so relevant to Russian identity even before the examples of the English became more prevalent in the middle of the nineteenth century.

In this dissertation, national identity is understood, as Benedict Anderson puts it in his *Imagined Communities*, as an ‘imagined’ phenomenon. He states that “[c]ommunities may be distinguished … by the style in which they are imagined.” This is underpinned by the notion that the nation is a shared community of beliefs and ambitions that is distinct from other nations in its particularities of values, language, territory, national myths and symbols. It is a unity that has evolved through time around the work of political and intellectual elites. Modern notions of the nation evolved from the late eighteenth century. As recent scholarship has shown, the idea of the nation has coalesced around discursive representation, where the description and designation of a contrasting other serves to create cultural boundaries, within which the nation is defined.

Timothy Brennan also reminds of the role played by imaginative literature in the formation of national identity: “nations … are imaginary constructs that depend for their existence on apparatus of cultural fictions in which imaginative literature plays a decisive role.” Anderson agrees that the evolution and dissemination of the novel

---

11 Ibid, p. 4
13 Ibid, p. 5
and the newspaper had a profound impact on the concepts of nationalism and national identity. He concludes that “nationality ... or nation-ness as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind.” Literature, which incorporates non-fictional elements, in addition to artistic works, is of course highly influential in promulgating a nation’s sense of itself. It confirms existing, or creates new, stereotypes and images of the national self and the foreign other. Literature – broadly defined – shapes knowledge, perceptions and identities. It allows people to imaging the nation through creating boundaries which portray common experiences, thus separating the ‘self’ from the ‘other’. It draws upon various types of knowledge and diverse critical thoughts. It can be used to impose patterns of thought and imagination, which provide a means for both producing and disseminating the governing ideologies and ideas of the day. It offers a means of distraction from everyday life, whilst creating an imaginary, yet plausible, world for its readers. It also serves to arrange signposts of the self, in generating bonds between the readership, allowing for the mutual identification of its readers with characters and authors. The idea of Aleksandr Pushkin as Russia’s ‘national’ poet and the identification of his characters as Russian types is a manifestation of the attempt to create a common national sense of awareness.

The need for a constant writing, re-writing, reaffirmation and consolidation of this national self-perception through literature is evident in Homi Bhabha’s assertion of the nation as a ‘work in progress.’ Anthony Smith regards identity as a process. It does not require uniformity through the generations; rather it depends upon “a sense

---

16 B. Anderson, op. cit., p. 4
18 Ibid, pp. 76-77
19 H. Bhabha, op. cit, p. 1
of continuity. Both concepts are evident in Russian nineteenth and early twentieth-century literature. Russian culture's intensive preoccupation with its national identity clearly tends to suggest insecurity. In the absence of other public forums for discussion and debate, Russian literature and literary criticism of the nineteenth century assumed an especially influential role in the formation of national identity. They could deal directly with social and political issues and especially the question of what Russia was. Literature was difficult to censor because of the multiple meanings and varying interpretations of a text and thus became the main medium for public debate following the strengthening of censorship and curtailing of public discussions under Nicholas I. The Decembrist uprising of 1825 had threatened the autocratic regime with its ideas about nationalism and individual freedoms. The adoption of the policy of 'official nationalism' was designed to curb future revolutionary trends. This consisted of the three principles of Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationalism. It proposed an official state ideology around which ideas of Russianness could coalesce "to distinguish Russia from the countries of western [sic] Europe and to define the symbols which were intended to appeal to the population." It was designed to affirm and maintain the autocracy, which was supposedly indispensable to the Russian state. Its emphasis on Orthodoxy was to promote, as Riasanovsky puts it: "the official Church and its important role in Russia, but also the ultimate source of ethics and ideals that gave meaning to life and society." In reality, it promoted the Church as a form of social control, a concept which will be fully explored in Chapter Two. The third aspect, 'nationality', refers to the nature of the Russian people. However, it is the

---

21 S. Monas, op. cit., pp. 76-91
23 Ibid, p. 267
least clear concept of the three, and appears to be the least important notion in this trio. As a result of the contiguity of the Russian Empire and its resultant fluid boundaries, ideas of ethnic Russianness were confused with the empire as a whole. This makes it difficult to determine the meaning of 'nationality' in the Russian sense, as the Empire – which was 'Russia' – encompassed several different nationalities. The idea of what constituted the Russian 'people' became a focus of Russia's literature after the 1820s and discussions centred around the role of the peasant as the retainer of supposedly unspoilt, truly Russian virtues and customs. During the era between 1855 and 1917, Russian literature contains many representations of the peasantry, supposedly betrayed, 'enserfed' and 'impoverished' by foreign ideals.

Focussing on the peasantry as the supposed repository of unspoilt national virtues is a concept that is influenced by German Romanticism. This was of fundamental importance to nineteenth-century Russian thought. In particular, the valorisation of the peasantry is inspired by the work of Johann Gottfried von Herder. He believed in diversity as a fundamental characteristic of universal order and thus urged nations to take pride in their own languages and histories and the common heritage found on shared territories. He argued that the 'artificial' order and rationalism, especially of French culture, was corrupting the 'simple native essence' of the German people. He saw the peasant as the true preserver of native culture and virtues, untainted by foreign influences. This is a philosophy seen in some Russian literature of the mid to late nineteenth century which regards the peasantry as the site for Russian self-definition. The increased preoccupation with the Russian peasantry is accompanied by

---

25 G. Hosking, op. cit., pp. 267-268
26 See, for example Turgenev's 'Zapiski okhotnika' (A Hunter's Sketches).
a greater, more critical depiction of the foreign other than in earlier literature. England, in particular, was perceived as the model of Western European cultural and societal accomplishment as it was at the height of its prestige. Its values were those by which other European nations were assessed. This positioning of the English in Russian literature as the other through which a sense of self is determined can be understood in terms of Hegel's dialectic of identity. Hegel finds that the construction of identity is a process of reciprocity, that individual consciousness is not independent. In his *The Phenomenology of the Spirit*, he argues that "Self-consciousness exists in itself and for itself, in that, and by the fact that it exists for another self-consciousness; that is to say, it is only by being acknowledged or 'recognized.'"28 This process is one of inequality because there is always a dominant identity. It requires the negation of the 'other' consciousness to affirm that of the 'self', and to stimulate the self towards its own specific existence in the world as an independent being. The other is identified as an 'other' in terms of its difference from the self.29 In Lotman's conception of cultural reciprocity, the division of self and other is determined by a boundary. It is the clash of self and other at this boundary that is the site where nationalism occurs.30 We can see this conception at work where the norm-setting voice of the Russian self is representing the English as a contrast to its own cultural values in an affirmation of its own national identity. When judged in terms of the norm-setting gaze of the self, England becomes depicted as Russia's antithetical other. It is both romanticised and demonised, more so than other European countries, with which Russian culture was more familiar.

29 Ibid, p. 111-118
Homi K. Bhabha’s conceptualising of the stereotype is crucial to my analysis of the images of England in Russian literature. Bhabha discusses the creation and function of the stereotype in the representation. He defines it as akin to that of the fetish. “The fetish or stereotype gives access to an ‘identity’ which is predicated as much on mastery and pleasure as it is on anxiety and defence, for it is a form of multiple and contradictory belief in its recognition of difference and disavowal of it.” In his understanding, the stereotype is ambivalent. He argues that it is “a form of knowledge which vacillates between something that is already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated.” In my understanding, the stereotype of ‘another’ is the set of values which are applied, and reapplied, under the scrutiny the of object of the norm-setting gaze of the self.

What then is this norm-setting gaze? In postcolonial critical discourse, it is unilateral, determined by the interests and motives of the observer. This commanding viewpoint belongs to the occidental subject, who is continuously detached, and whose object is the native, non-Western ‘other’. For the observer, “the Orient is reduced to a living tableau of queerness” This manner of accounting for oneself and a foreign other – to be represented as inferior – was put to use by Russian writers in their own orientalising texts about the East but importantly also in their writing about the West. The subject in the texts I shall examine in this dissertation is the Russian observer whose focus is England. The norm-setting gaze in this instance is the Russian one, complete with its own values, history and preconceptions. There is a noteworthy difference from the Western norm-setting gaze in Orientalist writing. Namely, the Russian observer here has to justify its own position as the norm-setting subject as its

32 Ibid, p. 66
33 E. Said, op. cit., p. 103
own identity is less secure than that of the Occidental observer. Russia is at once both Western and non-Western, as will become clearer later in this discussion. The Russian literary construction of England and the English is an articulation of imperialist rivalry, at the heart of which is its desire to colonise overseas territories like the British. As Russia had been unsuccessful in this endeavour, the images of Englishness provide a mask to cover up Russia’s failure at invading and supplanting territories in continents far away from the metropolitan centre.

For this dissertation, I envisage a methodological framework which draws upon postcolonial critical thought. In particular, I shall refer to the theories of Edward Said and Homi Bhabha, and the concept of Occidentalism as discussed in Peter Barta’s ‘The Fisher of Men: Evgenii Zamyatin’s Occidentalism’ and Ian Buruma & Avishai Margalit’s Occidentalism: A Short History of Anti-Westernism. Post-colonial criticism has instigated a re-evaluation of the dynamics of power, identity and culture in the development and maintenance of the idea of the nation. Said specifically analyses nineteenth-century Orientalist discourse as a mode of Occidental domination. Orientalism is perceived as a hegemonic, exoticising discourse. This is as much a description of Western Europe in which the ‘Orient’ was produced, as a discussion of this phantasmal ‘Orient.’ As in Said’s framework on the modes of producing the Orient, the images of England in Russia’s discourses produce ‘Russianness’ as a cultural construct on which Russian notions of the ‘self’ are predicated. England thus becomes the repository of Russia’s desire and derision. In the tradition of the Western nations’ appropriation of the differences between Western and non-Western others, the Russian observer appropriates England. The knowledge and images of England

---

34 Ibid, pp. 56-60
are created as a stereotype which channels awareness into Russian consciousness.\textsuperscript{35} This concept corresponds to a tradition of exotic ‘othering’ in nineteenth-century Western thought. It serves to define the boundaries of the ‘self’ as embodying a ‘reasonable norm,’ from an ‘other’ which symbolises the variations found in human nature; in corporeal, mental, spiritual, sexual, and historical difference.\textsuperscript{36} This type of characterisation depends on stereotypes which are common in Orientalism.

For post-Petrine Russia, in a position of cultural dependence on Europe, the concepts of Occidentalism are particularly relevant. Buruma and Margalit argue that Occidentalism diminishes the West in a manner similar to how Orientalism dismisses non-Western people as less than full human beings. For them, Occidentalism is ‘at least as reductive; it simply turns the orientalist view upside down.’\textsuperscript{37} Occidentalism, as Barta puts it, “shares a morphology of domination similar to the one we can locate in mainstream Orientalism.”\textsuperscript{38} Occidentalism then is the discourse through which non-Western cultures distance themselves from the West and its culture.\textsuperscript{39} It paints a dehumanising picture of the West through stereotypes of its ‘machine culture’ and its reliance on scientific accomplishments over spirituality.

The arguments which inform the concept of Occidentalism and Said’s analyses in his \textit{Orientalism} and the later \textit{Culture and Imperialism} of nineteenth-century Western European discourses as modes of hegemonic domination lend themselves to my investigations into Russian literary depictions of the English. Said argues that the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item P. Barta, ‘\textit{The Fisher of Men}: Evgenii Zamyatin’s Occidentalism,’ (\textit{Essays in Poetics}, Vol. 23, 1998), p. 147
\item P. Barta, (1998), op. cit., p. 147
\item I. Buruma & A. Margalit, op. cit., pp. 3-7
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
concept of the ‘Orient’ evolved through its meaning for Western European thought. In the Western production of inferiority, it provided the alter ego necessary for the defining of Western national and cultural superiority in the imperial age.\textsuperscript{40} The colonising powers of the West, in particular Great Britain and France, had established identities brought about through the maritime and technical prowess that enabled them to colonise vast areas of the world. They also had sophisticated national literatures in which identity was propagated, creating and maintaining the difference between coloniser and colonised.\textsuperscript{41} The idea of Western supremacy developed into the concept of Eurocentrism, which places a higher value on European concerns and cultures, at the expense of other cultures.\textsuperscript{42} Imperialism is found to be an aesthetic, as well as a physical, form of domination, in which literature played a fundamental role in supporting Western notions of its superiority. This evolved in imperialist discourse as the monologic coloniser’s voice objectifying and speaking for the colonised cultures, which in turn resulted in widespread assumptions of European hegemony.\textsuperscript{43} This facilitated the justification of colonialism, as it was perceived by the European colonisers that their colonies were in need of enlightenment and ‘civilisation.’ This in turn led to the notion of this civilising mission as, as Kipling famously put, ‘the white man’s burden’:

\begin{quote}
The legal sources of imperialism are to be sought in the old mood of the Anglo-Saxon soul, in the ideal gentleman who was the standard type of culture and manners. The gentleman is not only the polite and polished man; he is more especially the man who knows how to command; the imperial man in a certain sense, who, having powers, makes it his duty and his right to use them for the common welfare. The ideas of authority-
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{40} E. Said, op. cit., pp. 1-4
\textsuperscript{41} B. Anderson, op. cit., pp. 67-83
\textsuperscript{42} E. Said, op. cit., pp. 31-110
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid, pp. 32-98
as-power and authority-as-duty are the heritage of an aristocratic tradition.44

Although also ruled by a white, Christian nation, the Russian Empire, as Ewa Thompson notes, does not fit comfortably into Said's conceptual framework of dividing the world into the binary oppositions of East and West.45 Michael Doyle regards the empire as a 'system of interaction between two political entities' where the metropolis, the ruling institution, exerts political control over the effective sovereignty of the other, the subordinate periphery.46 The relationship between the two is marked by differences of ethnicity, and often administrative, procedure.47 Whereas the European empires had vast lands and seas separating the European metropolis from their colonies, the Russian Empire had expanded contiguously. Migration had created mixed populations that shared historical and cultural traditions, resulting in fluid boundaries between Russia and its borderlands. Convention, rather than geographical divides, has historically separated the two, as there is no physical border between Asia and Europe. The most commonly accepted divide is the one provided by the Ural Mountains, although this has been widely debated.48 As a result of this blurring of boundaries, Russian ideas about both the coloniser and colonised differed from those of Western empires.

As Susan Layton and Ewa Thompson have shown, Russia has participated in the European imperial ideology of perceiving the Eastern and Southern cultures of the

47 Ibid, p. 45-46
Empire as in need of ‘civilising’. Russian literary productions in the nineteenth century showed Russia as a major player on the world scene and are as complicit with the features of an empire as the literatures of other major colonisers. For Said, in his examination of power in discourses of colonialism, “the poet makes the Orient speak and renders its mysteries plain to the ‘West’”. Similarly, as Ewa Thompson points out, the Russian self speaks for its colonies, especially for the peoples of the South East and the Caucasus regions. The lack of clear separation between coloniser and colonised, however, resulted in an ambiguity of Russian identity as a Eurasian Empire with a very complex, and often confused, set of ties with Europe’s great colonising nations.

The Russian relationship with the West is as ambiguous as its ties with the East and has played a great part in Russia’s split identity. The European imperialists did not consider Russia as a nation to be colonised, yet it was not regarded as an equal either. Discourses in Western Europe in the eighteenth century in particular regarded Russia as the dark side of Europe and often posited Russia as an ‘other’ to mainstream civilisation. Voltaire, for example, without ever having visited Russia, wrote of it as “somewhere between barbarism and civilisation” thus propagating this image in Western discourse. The Marquis de Custine in 1839 depicted Russia through images of barbarism and backwardness, and through the idea of Moscow as an orientalised capital, where “en un mot, à Moscou, on oublie l’Europe.” (In a word, in Moscow

---

50 V. Tolz, op. cit. pp. 62-65
51 See L. Wolff, Inventing Eastern Europe, (Stanford University Press: Stanford, California, 1994), pp. 4-16
52 Ibid, p. 203
one forgets about Europe.) The French travel writer, Jules Michelet, wrote of Russia as “Cette Asia bâtarde où deux tyrannies se combinent, et d’Orient, et d’Europe.”

(This bastardised Asia where two tyrannies combine – the Orient and Europe.) For many Westerners, Russia represented an exotic ‘other’ which acted, as much as the Eastern colonies, as a point of definition and affirmation of Western Europe’s cultural superiority.

As is well known, it is through constant images of, and comparisons with, the West that Russian writers aimed to define their own sense of self. Russian writers of the eighteenth to early twentieth century needed only to refer to the profound schism in the Christian faith to find a source of difference and selfhood defined through binary opposition. The adoption of the Eastern, Byzantine form of Christianity in 988 rather than Roman Catholicism led to the separation of Kievan Rus from Western, Catholic Europe and increased its isolation. This isolation markedly increased through the gradual incorporation of elements of Mongol-Tartar civilisation into Russian identity: “Russia became the Eastern flank of Christendom.” However, the concept of the West took on particular intensity in the eighteenth century. Since Peter the Great first introduced Western modes of dress and behaviour, and greater numbers of German, French, Dutch and British professionals and artisans into Russia, the country has constantly been defined in texts in comparison with Europe. As Liah Greenfeld argues in her *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, once Russia had set upon this path of emulating the West, it had no choice but to become a nation. It was this focus on the West as its main constituent other that helped define one of Russia’s key features,

55 L. Wolff, op. cit., p. 206
56 V. Tolz, op. cit., p. 4
57 N. Riasanovsky, op. cit., pp. 34-36
58 L. Greenfeld, (1992), op. cit., pp. 254-255
ressentiment, or envy of the West as a major facet of Russian national identity. Thus, writing from a position of perceived cultural inferiority regarding the West whose culture the Petrine, and post-Petrine, establishments aimed to copy, Russian discourse about identity has shown some interesting affinities with the views of the West’s colonies. Homi Bhabha’s model of the ‘hybrid subject’ shows this sort of adoption and integration of the coloniser’s culture and values, which is frequently at the expense of indigenous customs. In Russia, this was the voluntary practice of the autocrat, rather than forced by some external coloniser. Peter the Great believed that the West offered the key to modernisation and Russia’s future success. He thus overhauled Russian society and its political and technological life according to European models. This policy nevertheless had similar results to those in cultures colonised by the European empires. Homi Bhabha notes that the subordinates experience their differences from the coloniser by partially identifying with the dominant culture. This results in a fusion that is neither the native nor the colonising culture. Similarly, the subject of articulation in many Russian texts identifies with Europe, but is not entirely European. Figes writes that “the European Russian had a split identity … On one level he was conscious of acting out his life according to prescribed conventions of European life; yet on another plane his inner life was swayed by Russian customs and sensibilities.” Catherine the Great’s famous proclamation in her Nakaz of 1767 that “Россия есть европейская держава” (Russia is a European power) is suggestive of this split identity. The very fact of this
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declaration suggests that Russia was not, but aspired to be, a European power. The adoption of French, the language choice of sophisticated, aristocratic European society, saw the biggest separation between native and assumed cultures. Russia’s upper classes eschewed the native language in order to be considered European and thus separated themselves from both their native culture and the majority of the population. For Russia, then, particularly in the eighteenth century, the West represented less a group of separate countries with individual traditions, histories and languages, than a cultural entity that embodied sophistication and a pre-eminence which Russia strived to attain. European sensibilities of enlightened, sophisticated behaviour and manners were regarded as *de rigueur* amongst the nobility resulting in a split in Russian society and what some scholars have perceived as a weakening of Russia’s core ethnic identity in its cultural colonisation by the West.

Although it has a long tradition of adopting the fashions and modes of behaviour of its ‘others’, Russia’s thinkers show a profound ambivalence towards the West which has also informed notions of national identity. As is well known, Russia has vacillated between periods of acceptance of Western values, and rejection of them as harmful to indigenous traditions. This oscillation is manifest in literature from the late eighteenth century, in the works of authors like Fonvizin, where we can see the early satirising of the so-called *Zapadniks* who slavishly adopted Western fashions and styles, modes of behaviour and all aspects of Western life. It is a trend which continued until the middle of the nineteenth century, when the foreign other began to occupy a more

64 V. Tolz, op. cit., p.14
65 R. Polonsky, *English Literature and the Russian Aesthetic Renaissance*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 6. Of course, the term ‘Zapadnik’, or Westerniser, originated in the middle of the nineteenth century with the group of intellectuals who argued that Russia had a historic destiny entwined with the West.
prominent position in Russian literature. Pushkin’s Muromskii in ‘Барышня-крестьянка’ (‘Mistress Into Maid’) is a good example of the Anglomaniac in Russian literature. We shall examine this, and further examples of the Anglomaniac in Chapter Three. This slavish adoption of another’s way of life also shows an awareness of the individual cultures of the West, which, in addition to forming a part of the cultural entity of Europe, also conjured up distinct stereotypes and images in Russian thought and literature and distinct meanings for Russian identity.

So within this broad picture of the forces defining and threatening Russian identity formation from the eighteenth to early twentieth century, what were the stereotypes of England in Russia? How does England compare with Russia in this era? Why was England in particular such a sharply defined other for Russian thought? Like Russia, England has, for geographical, religious and cultural reasons never been truly European. It has developed somewhat independently from the other European nations, whilst maintaining the ‘prestige’ of being ‘Western.’ The island status of Britain that separated England from mainland Europe had allowed its independent development. It also created the need for the majority of its technical, military and sea-faring achievements. Unconnected to mainland Europe, the majority of travel was conducted by sea, necessitating a sophisticated navy for trade purposes, which also both required and facilitated scientific accomplishments. Capitalism and overseas expansion created the need for technology and machinery. This led the Industrial Revolution and made possible the capable handling of Britain’s vast overseas colonies in the nineteenth century, affirming the military and technological supremacy of the British Empire.

By the time the nineteenth century scramble for overseas territories and the construction of vast empires was over, Great Britain had become a formidable world power, annexing immense areas of land across the world and developing sophisticated technological and political prowess. The status of Great Britain as a world leader and powerful ruler of vast proportions of the world’s land mass led to the forging of a strong sense of nationhood. This had already been established by the early nineteenth century. It had developed into a strong English sense of English superiority. This was formulated in the literary representation of ‘John Bull’ as the ideal, well-educated upright English citizen. This character was seen to personify those qualities deemed necessary to be a ‘true’ Englishman. These were patriotism, manifest in a love of one’s nation and a belief in its supremacy and enlightenment, love of one’s Queen, and a strong Protestant morality which fostered self-discipline and a sense of honour, with decorous and appropriate behaviour. In the eighteenth century, Voltaire had cemented England’s reputation in Europe as the most enlightened, modern and liberal nation in the world. In doing so, he placed England as the cultural opposite to ‘barbarous’ Russia, a feature which was especially prevalent through the nineteenth century. Buruma comments upon the fact that Voltaire was responsible for initiating the Anglomania of eighteenth century Europe. He began a fashion which was to provide Russia with knowledge of England through European sensibilities of refined behaviour and cultural enlightenment. For the majority of Russians in the eighteenth century, English culture was an abstract concept, known predominantly through

---

68 Ibid, pp.183-216
69 V. Shestakov, Angliiskii natsional’ni kharakter i ego vospriiatie v Rossi, in Rossia i Zapad: Dialog illi stolknovenie kul’tur: sbornik statei, (Moskva: Rossiiskii Institut Kul’turologii, 2000), pp. 102-108
70 Queen Victoria here, but more in the sense of monarch, or figurehead
72 Ibid, pp.46-47
European images of enlightenment and English chauvinism. From early on in Anglo-Russian relations, the English were distinguished from other foreigners as being fundamentally different in character, culture and manner of living. It is important to note at this juncture that the role of the English in Russia was vastly different to that of the French and Germans. French and German cultures were significantly more familiar to eighteenth and nineteenth-century Russian society, whereas Englishness was imported through French and German examples and stereotypes. German culture in particular was more integrated into Russia by the nineteenth century; for example there were a considerable number of Russianised Germans in Russian society, the most famous of these, of course, was Catherine the Great herself. In comparison there are few Russianised English people; the majority of English people who worked in Russia returned home after their service was completed.

English, Scottish and Irish businessmen and tradesmen had been fairly frequent visitors to Russia, thus establishing early on in Russian thought the commercial prowess of the British. By the late eighteenth century, however, England was considered to be the example of high culture. Imitating Englishness was considered to

74 The English were singled out from other foreigners because of their different behaviour towards the beginning of the seventeenth century. Ibid, pp. 72-3
76 See J. Alexander, *Catherine the Great: Life and Legend*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), pp. 2-3. For examples of Russianised Germans, or Russians of German ancestry in nineteenth-century Russian literature see Pushkin’s *Germann in ‘Pikovaia dama’*, the son of a naturalised German, or Shtol’t’s, the half-German, half-Russian from Goncharov’s *Obломov*.
77 A noticeable exception to this is Mikhail Lermontov who was descended from George Learmonth, a Scottish mercenary who settled in Russia c1612. I am grateful to Professor Robert Reid for bringing this to my attention.
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be “the mark of a refined upbringing.” The nineteenth century English visitors, Erofeev notes, were largely either tradespeople or leisurely travellers, who conjured up the stereotypical images of English capitalists and of England as a wealthy nation with a high standard of living.

Through the early decades of the nineteenth century, following the defeat of Napoleon, Russia was compared and contrasted primarily with England, rather than other European countries in discussions concerning social reform and quality of life. In addition, Britain and Russia were empires of comparable size, both on the peripheries of Europe. Russia, of course was a vast Northern territory with contiguously attached colony-like lands. In contrast, Britain was a small island which controlled a huge but remote Empire overseas. Thus, they were entirely different in constitution, styles of life and also in the manner in which they were perceived. The British Empire was sophisticated in its capabilities as an efficient and powerful coloniser. The Russian Empire, in contrast, was often viewed with condescension by its colonies:

In Western colonialism, the metropolis boasted an accumulation of [power and knowledge] ... The Russian colonial rule was usually based on power alone, rather than on a combination of power and knowledge. The nations of the western and south-western rim of the Russian empire perceived themselves as civilizationally superior to the metropolis. Their psychology as conquered peoples was different from that of the colonial subjects of Britain. While the Indians might have regarded the British as adversaries, they reluctantly acknowledged their civilizational competence.
The powerful European states also perceived the vast Russian Empire as a threat to the stability of peace by the early nineteenth century. The diplomatic conflicts caused by Russia's encroachment into Turkey and Western suspicions of Russia's potential to threaten their spheres of influence in the East were eventually to lead to the Crimean War. The subsequent period denotes a perceptible shift in Russian culture from mimicry of the West to modernisation and internal reform. The exposure of Russian society's weaknesses, its economic, political and cultural backwardness vis-à-vis the West compromised Russia's authority as a European power. The former notions of Russian national identity which stemmed from collective loyalty to the tsar shifted to the idealisation of the Russian peasant and to a greater awareness of the Empire as a vast territory encompassing disparate peoples. The sense of estrangement from Europe. Russia's intelligentsia now began thinking of this distinctness as a main feature of its identity and its Euro-Asianism as its strength. As the concepts of Russia's identity began to focus on the peasantry as the untainted representatives of the true Russia, notions of Russia's identity as a masculinised 'otechestvo', a concept propagated by Peter the Great as a statement of Russia's European identity, are supplanted by the more feminised 'rodina,' which implies Russia's more Eastern heritage. There was a celebration of Russia's semi-Asiatic roots, its Tartar heritage and its separateness from Europe. This is the essential element of Eurasianism which denotes a Euro-Asia led by Russia. In Orientalism, the East is assigned 'feminine' characteristics of passivity, irrationality and sensuality. The West is masculinised in contrast by its reason, activity and domination. This distinction is presented in Orientalism as a mark of Western superiority. From the
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viewpoint of Occidentalism, the scientific, rational nature of the West is perceived as emotionally sterile. Thus the concept of greater spirituality is attributable to Russia as a form of anti-Western logic. We can see in the nineteenth and early twentieth century literary representations of the English that Russian writers perceived themselves to be more spiritual and irrational than the perceived sterile, hypocritical English.

Both nations believed their defining strength to be their religiosity. Russian Orthodoxy was sustained by notions of *sobornost*, which relies upon collective identity subsuming the individual. “As [Khomiakov] used the word, *sobornost*’ meant unity in multiplicity, an organic union of believers in love and freedom, and pertained to the church as an idea, not as an institution.”86 It is perceived as the most spiritual, fraternal and spontaneous religion.87 Many Russian writers contrasted this to the individualism of the English church which was used more to teach moral codes of behaviour than as a spiritual guide.88 For the nineteenth century Russian self, the Anglican Church becomes an instrument of hypocrisy and the corruption of society’s morals in the pursuit of materialistic gains.89 This theme is prevalent in Russian nineteenth-century literary representations of the English underpinning the truly religious substance of Russian national identity.

Moving on from the historical depictions of the two nations, how are the English portrayed in Russian literature? In what ways does Tsarist Russia between 1855 and
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1917 produce the images of England in its artistic literature? The thesis I wish to pursue involves what I have already characterised as the portrayal of a split Russian identity as both a European and non-European nation via the portrayal of Englishness as both an admired and a reviled example of modern nationalism. As we have seen, images of England came to Russia initially through European channels, in translations and imitations of English literature, in European thought and the manifestations of Anglomania. Post-colonial theory shows how certain social realities of another civilisation are made the objects of scrutiny and often ridicule. I have selected the main examples of Russia’s prose which appropriate certain aspects of England’s social reality and create a stereotype of the English through which it is possible to discern Russia’s perception of its own national identity. As the image of England is being constructed, authors are drawing from, and cementing, the existing stereotypes and images of Englishness. I argue that a fundamental step in creating the stereotype of Englishness occurred from the last decade of the eighteenth century to the late 1840s of the European Revolutions. I have taken the salient points of difference between English and Russian societies from which these stereotypes of England emerged and have structured this dissertation around them. I attempt, when possible, to abide by the chronology of the selected stories and novels I discuss. This, however, is a study in literary thematology and as such I have structured chapters around specific themes. As a result, it is sometimes impossible to adhere strictly to the order in which the texts were written, for reasons of coherence. In addition, some texts will receive greater, more in-depth, analysis than others, or will appear in more than one chapter, as they offer greater scope for discussion.
Firstly, in Chapter One I explore the images of England in travel narratives from 1790 to the late 1840s. Up until the nineteenth century, Russian literary production was severely limited. As Russia in the nineteenth century matures into one of the leading literatures in the world, it also undergoes an ideological shift from its foundations in the eighteenth century. The eighteenth century was the 'Golden Age' of universal concerns. It gradually gave way to Russian nationalism, in the beginning of the nineteenth century for which the construction of 'Englishness' became an extremely important part by the last decades of the century. Thus the travel narratives from Karamzin's *Pis'ma russkogo puteshestvennika*\(^90\) (*Letters of a Russian Traveller*) in the 1790s bridged the gap between the two distinct periods of the age. This timeframe spans the beginning decades of Russian nationalism, to the time when Russia's own literary output took centre stage, rather than predominantly relying upon foreign publications. These writings provide a crucial background for the discussion of the stereotypes of England and for Russia's national self-perception. Although the timeframe is extensive and precedes that of the literary period I wish to study, it is a key epoch in the history of Russia's emerging national identity. It is also the era in which England became a destination on Russia's 'Grand Tour'. During this time the core stock of knowledge about England for Russian consciousness is accumulated. It is from this well of information that the nineteenth-century classic realist writers and their successors draw. This knowledge passes into the Russian imagination unquestioned and largely unchallenged. There is no concept of the ideological underpinnings of this artistic knowledge; it is accepted as unemotional and objective. I study the development of the travel narrative in Russia and its role in the dissemination of the concept of Russia's unique national identity as a background to

\(^{90}\) Hereafter referred to as Karamzin's *Pis'ma*
understanding the narratives themselves. Many of the points raised in these travel narratives as providing a contrast between Russian and English societies appear in later literary depictions. The main points of divergence between the two cultures that are raised in travel reminiscences and are then discussed in Russia’s prose fiction, and the ones on which I concentrate are those of religion and social respectability and deportment. The technological achievements and the spread of English culture to the vast British Empire are also areas which garner a great deal of literary interest. I do not focus on the political differences between Russia and England as these fall outside the scope of this dissertation. Instead, I examine the societal differences between the two cultures as shown in fictional representations.

The principal focus of Chapter One then is Karamzin’s *Pis’ma* as the work from which Russian belles-lettres begin to investigate notions of Russia’s distinction from Europe. In addition, this is the text in which many of the principal stereotypes of England take root in Russian thought. I then compare Karamzin’s impressions with those of other principal travel writers. Although many of these, such as Makarov and Grech, have not had the longevity of Karamzin’s work in Russian thought, they nonetheless garnered a considerable readership in their day as a result of their publication in popular periodicals.

Chapter Two investigates the question of religion in England. Russia’s Orthodox culture was, as I see it, the principal point of division between Russia and England and a point of fundamental and unbridgeable difference between the two. Orthodox culture permeated the entirety of Russian life from the law to the minutiae of day-to-day existence. Even for individuals who are not strictly devout members of the
Orthodox Church, for example Leo Tolstoi, the fundamental principles of Orthodox culture remain a facet of national identity. Even Khomiakov, one of the main advocates of Orthodoxy despised the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church, but expounded the virtue of the faith and the legitimacy and universality of the Church.\textsuperscript{91}

The notion of the Russian 'soul' is of fundamental importance to Russia's national identity well into the late nineteenth century, and this serves to separate Russia from the West as it is the basis of Russian uniqueness. Notions of Russian spirituality vis-à-vis England, and other Western nations, are predicated upon the concept of the Russian soul. It is a mystical concept; it is opposed to authority and reason, it has no formal attributes of spirituality and is specifically Russian. It is in direct contrast to the Western notions of individuality and convention.\textsuperscript{92}

As in Russia, religion in England occupied an important place in its national consciousness as it also provided a distinction between England and Europe. However it was far less intrusive into daily affairs than Orthodox culture and played a significantly lesser role in English social thought. For these reasons I have examined the development of religion in Russia and England in detail in addition to the roles it played in each society as background to the literary images of the English clergy and religion in England.

I follow this with an examination of 'Englishness' as developed in images of English society at home and 'Englishness' in Russia. Chapter Three is thus split into three sections. I first analyse the depiction of the so-called Anglomaniacs in Russian society. The figure of the Anglomaniac is a manifestation of Russian dissatisfaction with itself, as it is underpinned by the desire to imitate another's culture. It alludes to


the favourable reception of Russified aspects of 'Englishness' amongst Russia's
cultured elite whereas the images of English society, with which I follow this
analysis, are predominantly negative. The next section of this chapter concentrates on
the literary image of English society. This is based around the behaviour and
deportment of the English gentleman in society, the fixations with proper appearance
and social conformity. Finally, I examine Russian prose’s portrayal of English women
in a variety of roles from Pushkin to Zamiatin to understand how the image of the
Englishwomen compares to that of the Englishman.

The image of the ‘ubiquitous Englishman’ is a prevalent one in nineteenth century
prose, both in Russia and other European countries. The impressions of dissatisfaction
with modernity also abound in images of the British Empire as it is entering the
twentieth century. Chapter Four examines the literary depictions of British
achievements in the workplace and society. This includes images such as those of the
Crystal Palace which gave Britain the opportunity to showcase its cultural and
technological achievements. I then focus on the depictions of ‘Englishness’ as it is
exported to Britain’s colonies and the conclusions that can be drawn regarding
Russia’s own empire-building status from these. This will lead me into an overall
conclusion about the imaging of England and the English in Russian prose. Before I
turn to an analysis of England and the English in Russian prose, I shall firstly survey
the relevant scholarship which addresses the issues discussed in this dissertation. This
will establish a context for this dissertation within the existing canon.
LITERATURE REVIEW

This dissertation is an attempt to define how images of England and the English in Russian prose became the textual other against which Russia constructs a sense of self between 1855 and 1917. In order to discern a context for my study, this literature review will examine extant scholarship pertaining to the issues of Russian national identity and how it is constructed in nineteenth-century literature. Related concerns are the role of literature and empire in Russia and also national identity in the travel narrative in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Russia. Finally, this review will analyse works pertaining to Anglo-Russian cultural contacts. I shall indicate the areas of Anglo-Russian cultural relations which have received scholarly attention. The image of England in Russian prose is a subject which has been largely neglected to date. It is hoped that this dissertation will redress that balance.

The investigation assumes an understanding of national identity which is based on modernist notions of nationalism. Post-Petrine Russian national identity is predicated upon Russia's comparison with the West.1 The issue of the West in Russian culture is one that has been subject to a wide variety of interpretations in scholarship about Russia. Particularly influential for my study is Greenfeld's conception of Russian nationalism, which she finds was based upon evaluation and re-assessment of the West in Russian thought. She argues in her Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity2 that this culminates in ressentiment, or hatred and envy of the West. Although the West was still the model for Russian national identity, Russia would define itself as
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the opposite. Objects and ideas considered as virtues in the West would be defined as bad in Russia and vice versa.

In her *Russia: Inventing the Nation*, Vera Tolz argues that the focus on the West proved to be both the impetus for, and the undermining of, Russia's self-fashioning as it resulted in the weakening of its core ethnicity. This, she argues led to the preoccupation with state building and the ensuing failure of nation building in Russia. Tolz surveys the main ideas and interpretations of the nation by Russia's intellectuals and historians, arguing that there were two main errors in thought: the intellectuals' inability to distinguish between the Russian nation and the multiethnic Tsarist Empire, and the tendency to exclude various groups from the nation. She argues further that their concept of the nation was uniquely Russian.³ Tolz concludes that the failure of Russia's intellectuals to build a civic society or nation is partially as a result of their continued usage of nineteenth-century thinkers and ideologies. She analyses the views and the main concepts of principal Russian thinkers such as Khomiakov and Kireevsky. She focuses little on the religious aspect of their ideas, which seems to be a small oversight, as notions of Russia's spirituality were at the core of Russia's supposed uniqueness from Europe.

Tolz acknowledges that Russia is not fully integrated into European thought and that it was considered backward by European standards.⁴ Western European dialogues engaged in practices of painting Russia as the less sophisticated, and 'barbaric' half of
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Europe. Russia therefore is in a precarious position in between identifying with the West, and also with the East. Bassin asserts that Russia is understood as ‘located’ between East and West. This location has created a profound ambivalence, what he terms a ‘veritable geo-schizophrenia,’ in Russian self-consciousness. Bassin argues that in the nineteenth century, Russia’s view of Asia changed from one of territorial aggrandizement to one of self-sacrificing enlightener.

In Russian discourses about Asia, post-Petrine Russia had a fully-formed imperial identity and acted like a European imperialist towards its colonies in the Caucasus and the southern border areas. The body of scholarship which addresses the textual imperialism practiced by Russia’s intellectuals is of significant influence for this dissertation as these works adopt methodologies similar to my own. Literary works have played a key role in Russia’s quest to define its identity and its place in regards to both East and West. Said’s construction of the Orient has traditionally been used to analyse cultural aspects of Orientalism. Hokansen, in her ‘Literary Imperialism, Narodnost’ and Pushkin’s Invention of the Caucasus’, argues that “Russia’s foremost similarity to the nations of Europe was in its status as an empire and the creation of a literature of empire which can be called ‘national’ in terms of the European experience of the time.” Susan Layton similarly stresses the use Russia made of the Caucasus and Georgia, its ‘Orient’, as a source for discovering its national identity. Using Said’s conception of Orientalism, Susan Layton addresses issues of colonialism in the nineteenth-century Russian literary ‘creation’ and construction of the Caucasus.
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She argues that the Caucasus is primarily drawn into a dialectic which creates the problem of Russia’s identity as a European-style coloniser when Russians “could not believe in the alterity of the orient as readily as a European might”\(^9\) because Russia’s Orient was an organic part of Russian history. She argues that “only in semi-Asian Russia did romantic constitutions of Empire provide therapy for a profoundly ambivalent consciousness of national difference from Europe. … while the British Raj retained prominence as the colonial model to equal or even surpass.”\(^{10}\) Ewa Thompson similarly explores Russia’s empire-building projects through literary representations of the repressed other. Her work uncovers the literary cult of the Russian Empire as a major colonialist power during the nineteenth century, examining the cultural ramifications of Russian imperialist expansion. Similarly, Ewa Thompson examines Russian literature and imperialism in her *Imperial Knowledge*. She uses a framework based upon Said’s *Orientalism* to look at the ways in which Russian literature is as much an imperial literature as its European counterparts in the subjugation and domination of its colonised peoples. She argues that writers such as Tolstoi underpin Russia’s imperial exploits by imprinting the idea of Russian daily life as that of the Europeanised nobility. She also finds that since Pushkin there is little distinction between ethnic Russian identity and the empire in its literature. This confusion has played a great part in Russian self-perception. She argues that there is an inferiority complex towards the Western parts of the empire which consider themselves civilisationally superior to the centre. This is manifest in the belittling of the Poles and the Finns, and often in Russia’s suspicions of Europe.

\(^9\) S. Layton, op. cit., pp. 74-75
\(^{10}\) Ibid, p. 75
In his ‘Gumilev’s Africa in Context,’ Peter Barta examines Gumilev’s poems about Africa to situate them in the canon alongside other texts on Africa. He argues that they are an expression of Russia’s imperial ambitions and also a manifestation of its insecurity regarding its mission and general place in the world. Barta analyses Zamiatin’s ‘Lovets chelovekov’ (‘A Fisher of Men’) as an expression of what he terms Russia’s Occidentalism. He argues that Occidentalism, which Buruma and Margalit define as a form of ‘anti-Westernism,’ is an important strand of nineteenth century Russian national identity. This article is perhaps unique thus far in the Russian canon for discussing Russian identity as a form of Occidentalism and is influential on my own conception of Occidentalism.

Further exploration of the issues of Russian national identity vis-à-vis the West occurs in the nineteenth-century travelogue. The investigations into Russian identity in the travel narrative of this era have profound importance for my dissertation as they articulate the core images of England, and analogously, Russianness, which are then appropriated by later prose writers. There are two main volumes which analyse the development and usage of the travelogue in nineteenth century discourses. The first of these is Derek Offord’s *Journeys to a Graveyard: Perceptions of Europe in Classical Russian Travel Writing*. Offord concentrates on narratives about Western Europe and argues that his texts show the travelogue as a “vehicle for self-definition.” The texts he analyses, narratives on France, Spain, the German states, Switzerland, Italy and England are polemics written for a domestic audience about Europe and Russia’s place within it. They were written between 1697 and 1881 and cover periods of very
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significant social issues and concerns. He examines how Russian travellers engage with contemporary debates at home and pursue them on the road. He situates each text within the relevant historical, cultural and intellectual currents of the day, analysing the narrative within contemporary ideological discourses. He highlights how Russia’s texts about the West adopt similar strategies to the Orientalist texts Said describes, how they appropriate aspects of Western culture and speak for the observed country.

Where Offord focuses on the intellectual and social contexts of his texts, Sara Dickinson, in her *Breaking Ground* foregrounds the literariness of the travel writing genre. Her focus on travel writing as “a highly stylised literary genre” has proved greatly influential to my conception of the travel writing about England. She locates the role that travel writing from the late eighteenth to mid nineteenth century played in the development of Russian ‘national consciousness.’ She stresses that travellers’ explorations of cultural differences contributed to notions of ‘Russianness,’ that they frequently contrasted ‘Russians’ to Western Europeans. This was most commonly ‘the Germans’, or ‘the French’. She argues that in the nineteenth century “Western Europe no longer compels the Russian writer to genuflect before its cultural alters, but serves as a background for deliberations on Russian identity and national literary tradition.”

Dickinson illustrates the importance of Nikolai Karamzin’s work as providing the break from the emulation of the European model to instigating the trends of the ‘Russian.’ She links the individual narratives to their Western counterparts, or to
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earlier Russian adaptations, locating the texts within the European literary canon. She maps the development of the travelogue, as Russian travel writing in this era gradually detached from the literary traditions of the West and contributed more to an indigenous tradition, more focussed on the issues of identity and internal geography than imitation of earlier, Western models. Finally Dickinson confirms her assertion that travel writing was overshadowed by other literary genres and that the issues of identity, particularly Russia and the West, have been taken up in other genres. “In particular, writers turned primarily to fiction - and most often to domestic landscapes.... Here, as noted, they build upon a foundation laid in large measure by literary travel writing.”16 With the exception of Karamzin’s work, Dickinson focuses predominantly on narratives portraying France and there is little mention of the image of England in her discussion.

An analysis of the travellers to England in the 1770s and 1780s forms the final chapter of Anthony Cross’s By the Banks of the Thames: Russians in Eighteenth-Century Britain.17 Cross analyses the reminiscences of a small group of travellers on the ‘Grand Tour’ to Britain. He finds that there is a consistent impression of England as an enlightened and wealthy country.18 The opinions of these travellers are similar to those of the various craftsmen and professionals Cross discusses through the course of this volume. This is a historical survey into the types of careers held by Russians in eighteenth-century Britain. The majority of Russians in Britain were students at University or in apprenticeships, sent by the Russian government to acquire necessary skills to aid with Russia’s modernisation. The chapter entitled “Learn from the

16 Ibid, p. 236
17 A. Cross, By the Banks of the Thames: Russians in Eighteenth-Century Britain, (Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1980)
18 A. Cross, (1980), op. cit., pp. 248-251
British” covers those working in industry and technology, including instrument makers, weapon producers, painters, engravers and sculptors. Other areas include agriculture, shipbuilding, the Church and its chaplains, and the Embassy which was the meeting point for Russians living there. The sheer numbers of Russians in Britain and the types of careers held or trained for is indicative of Britain’s pre-eminence in all things practical and technical in the eighteenth century and the depths of Russia’s reliance on foreign imports.19

This volume covers a wide range of disparate careers; it establishes a firm historical basis for the representation of the English in Russia. Its partner volume By the Banks of the Neva investigates the careers which took British professionals to Russia. This gives greater scope for uncovering the foundations of stereotypes of Britain in Russia. By the Banks of the Neva has a chapter devoted to the British community in St Petersburg, showing it to be a thriving, vibrant society.20 The next chapters concern the workers of the Russia Company and the English Church in St Petersburg. Interestingly, the chaplains discussed here have a much better rapport with people than their later fictional counterparts and play a large role in the life of the society.21 Nevertheless they are portrayed as highly erudite, educated individuals and it is possible to understand where the reputation for learning in the Church of England, and the contrasting impression of Russia’s uneducated clergy originate. There are chapters on British doctors, naval officers and architects working in Russia, showing them to be successful and in the main highly respected. Finally there is a chapter on British travellers visiting Russia. In the main, the volume suggests that relationships between Britain and Russia at this time were amicable and mutually

19 A. Cross, (1980), op. cit., p. 2
20 A. Cross, (1997), op. cit., pp. 9-43
21 Ibid, pp. 90-201
beneficial. It is interesting to note how, as the concerns of the eighteenth century change, so do the careers of the subjects of these volumes. From weapons manufacturers, craftsmen and metal workers, in the second half of the century demand changes to clockmakers, architects and gardeners. Cross also makes several allusions to English materialism, referring to newspaper advertisements offering high quality English merchandise and job advertisements. In addition, he investigates the lives of English merchants in the English communities. Whereas Russian merchants in England were rare, there were several English merchants living rather well with their families in Russia, which fuelled the impressions that the English were wealthy.22 Unfortunately he does not pursue this line of enquiry any further than the odd reference to material goods or rich individuals. Cross also observes that the positive reactions towards the British can be seen as a part of the growing French-fostered European Anglophililia, rather than necessarily influenced by the English people themselves.23 Although the impression given by Cross's research is that the reactions to the British in Russia were positive, the case studies establish a real-life foundation for the images and stereotypes of the English in Russia.

Cross also analyses one of the main features of 'Englishness' to be widely discussed amongst those who had visited England or had English contacts, the issue of English patriotism. Russian views of English patriotism are the subject of two almost-identical essays, 'Russian Perceptions of England, and Russian National Awareness at the End of the Eighteenth and the Beginning of the Nineteenth Centuries'24 and "Them": Russians on Foreigners.25 The late eighteenth and early

22 Ibid, p. 5
23 Ibid, p. 3
24 A. Cross, (1993), op. cit., pp. 93-112
nineteenth centuries coincided with the burgeoning of Russian nationalism. Cross argues that whilst there was still a degree of admiration for England, Russians now viewed the English with ambivalence. However, he argues that the example of English patriotism, often manifested in an arrogant display of superiority, aggravated Russian interlocutors and simultaneously encouraged the development of Russian nationalism. Cross examines a series of contemporary articles and demonstrates how experiencing for themselves the English self-assuredness and the pride in the English language had prompted Russian intellectuals to evaluate their own culture.

Cross's argument is convincing and bridges the gap between the eighteenth-century amicability between Russia and Britain, and the nineteenth century mutual mistrust. Predtechenskiy investigates the phenomenon of Anglomania in the early nineteenth century. He argues that in some circles of Russian society, the English were regarded as the products of the finest upbringing and Englishness was the last word in European culture. In his essay, he concludes that Anglomania spread as a result of Russian intellectuals' admiration for England's philosophical and political works. The spread of treaties by Bentham and other English thinkers greatly furthered interest in England in late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Russia. He traces the influence of England's political thinkers on important Russian liberals of the early nineteenth century. He finds that English agricultural and farming techniques were popular in Russia in the early to mid nineteenth century and discusses their usage in

26 Ibid, pp. 84-87
29 Ibid, pp. 74-77
Russia. He concludes, somewhat unconvincingly, that Russian politics are too different to British for them to have a positive effect on the Russian system. Similarly, he argues, that traditional Russian farming methods have proven to be more effective in Russia than the more modern English ploughs, and Russia’s day-to-day traditions are too deeply ingrained and too different for this Anglomania to have much, if any lasting impact in Russia.

Erofeev’s *Tumannii Al’bion: Angliia i anglichane glazami Russkikh 1825 – 1853 gg.*, on the other hand, would suggest that Englishness has had a significant, and lasting impact on Russia. He argues that before this period, there was relatively little information about England in Russia, and much of what was circulating was from French and German sources. Erofeev’s investigation is situated in the reign of Nicholas I, when there is a serious deterioration in Anglo-Russian relations, and subsequently an increase in discussions about England. His chapters are titled after the main myths about England: ‘A Materialistic Civilisation’, ‘John Bull’ and ‘Perfidious Albion.’ He surveys a wide range of contemporary articles and books, examining the Russian preconceptions of ‘Englishness.’ He notes that between the ascent of Nicholas I and the Crimean War the image of England deteriorates. Rather than retell amusing anecdotes about English quirks in journals and newspapers, writers would make sweeping statements about English snobbishness. He argues convincingly that these are the images which remain in the Russian imagination to the point that by the 1880s the depiction of Englishness is solely negative. He finds that,
rather than being noted for its technological and industrial improvements, Russia saw England as a capitalist nation with an abundance of money.\textsuperscript{36} He makes a good case for the development of the stereotypes of Englishness from ambivalent images of a politically and technologically capable society whose inhabitants have a few specific quirks to “Perfidious Albion” on the eve of the Crimean War, although he largely ignores examples of prose literature and poetry in favour of journal and newspaper articles about England.

Shestakov in his ‘Angliiskii natsional’nii kharakter i ego vospriiatie v Rossii’ traces the origins and clichés which make up the so-called English ‘national character’ in the nineteenth century. He analyses German, American and other European sources to trace the development of the English ‘national character’ to the nineteenth century and argues that it has developed steadily since Shakespeare’s era.\textsuperscript{37} In the second section, he traces the history of Anglo-Russian literary and artistic contacts and travel writing on the English to the mid nineteenth century, discussing the impressions of Pushkin, Gertsen and Belinskii. The survey of European impressions of Englishness is reasonably comprehensive; however Shestakov does not explore fully how these stereotypes are introduced into Russian thought, if indeed they are to any great degree. He discusses mutual literary influences between England and Russia without attempting an analysis of the literary texts or stereotypes themselves. He merely concludes his essay with a comment to the effect that England has had a great impact on Russian artistic culture.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid, p. 300
\textsuperscript{37} V. Shestakov, (2000), op. cit., p. 72
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid, p. 115
As Shestakov observes, the imprint of Englishness on Russian culture is felt through the various English literary influences on Russian prose. Russian scholars Iurii Levin and M. Alekseev have written extensively on the reception of English literature in Russia during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.\(^{39}\) There is also a considerable body of scholarship devoted to the impact of English literature in Russia, including the influence of Dickens, and other writers on major nineteenth-century Russian authors.\(^{40}\) These works analyse the reception, and influence, of individual authors, different styles, character portrayals and ideologies.

Analyses of England and the English in Russian prose has been predominantly focussed on specific images which have captured the Russian imagination. The representation of the Crystal Palace is given a reasonable amount of scholarly attention as it is part of the wider culture of nineteenth century debates concerning Russia and the West.\(^{41}\) Works documenting the relationships of various authors and famous figures within England take precedence over interpretive scholarship.\(^{42}\) For example, Waddington’s *Turgenev and England*\(^{43}\) is a comprehensive study of


Turgenev's various English acquaintances and his visits to Britain, however there is only a limited introduction to the actual image of England in his prose. There is no comparative study of his Anglomaniacs, for example. A notable exception to this trend is Valentin Kiparsky's *English and American Characters in Russian Fiction*. This is a collection of short chapters detailing the appearances of different types of English and American characters in Russian belles-lettres from the eighteenth century to Brezhnev's era. Kiparsky analyses a wide range of stories, diaries and poems from a very extensive timeframe. There are some serious methodological flaws to his work. He gives little or no contextual background for these characters to suggest how and why these images have been produced. There also appears to be no continuity as to what type of stories are analysed. The volume serves better as a bibliography of English and American characters in Russian prose than an interpretive text, although there are several missing English characters.

This literature review has shown that there is a gap in current scholarship for a study of the image of 'Englishness' in nineteenth-century Russian prose. Where the majority of existing works on Russia and England provide invaluable background on the artistic product and the dissemination of the stereotype, there has been no comprehensive analysis of this issue to date. I hope that my dissertation will follow on from the existing work, and expand it in order to present an examination of the portrayal of the English in Russian literature.

---

44 V. Kiparsky, *English and American Characters in Russian Fiction*, op. cit.
From the middle of the eighteenth century the rise of nationhood replaced the idea of a universal European culture. Following this each individual society attempted to define itself as a distinct entity with its own traditions and culture. Russian letters began to show a discernible effort to conceive of 'Russianness' as an individual identity, whilst still attempting to define Russia as 'European'. This was primarily a result of the upsurge in popularity from the late eighteenth century of leisured travelling to Western Europe. This increased the potential for fashioning Russian self-identity through firsthand knowledge of European cultures. Occurring with this shift in national self-perception was an increased awareness of the separate cultures that made up the entity of the 'West'. Additionally, by the middle of the nineteenth century, there was a greater sense of separation in Europe between the Northern, industrialised states of France and England, and the less developed, more patriarchal Italy and Spain. The Northern states held greater fascination for, and were thus perceived as more threatening, by Russia.

As we have discussed, Russia had already been accustomed to Western mores for many decades by the late eighteenth century. This had had the effect of lessening, from the Russian perspective, the foreignness of European, particularly French and German, ways. England, however, was less familiar to Russia than these other

---

1 Sara Dickinson makes the distinction between 'leisured' travel such as travelling for health reasons, for pedagogical pursuits or pure tourism, and travelling for professional reasons. S. Dickinson, 'The Russian Tour of Europe Before Fonvizin', (Slavic and East European Journal, Vol. 45, No.1, 2000) pp. 1-29; see also S. Dickinson, 'Imagining Space and the Self: Russian Travel Writing and its Narrators 1762 – 1825,' (Phd Diss., Harvard University, 1995), esp. pp. 4-7
2 D. Lieven, op. cit., pp. 201-203
cultures. This ensured that it remained a distant and fairly exotic culture to the Russian nobility. England was not an especially popular destination for Russian visitors as it was both difficult to reach and expensive. It also held little of the allure of France as the home of Enlightenment and sophisticated culture. As the popularity of the Russian Grand Tour spread in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, however, the numbers of Russian visitors to, and subsequent accounts of, England increased. There is a body of travel writing about England in Russia which helps to reinforce Russia's cultural boundary and thus define the Russian 'nation' in its interaction with this cultural other. In the process the Russian writers are able to appropriate aspects of this foreign culture that act as inspiration for Russia's prose writers of subsequent generations.

Let us see how these Russian travellers described the English. How does this portrayal of the English serve as a foundation of England's later literary image in Russia? Sara Dickinson argues that literary travel narratives of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century provided the impetus for the development of Russia's fiction. In particular, she finds that the expression of a national identity, the discovery of a national culture and conceptions of place, both Russian and Western European, were among the primary achievements of the travel genre and constituted its chief legacy to prose fiction. The meeting of Russia's travellers with both internal and external others prompted a re-evaluation of Russianness. In confrontation with the 'others' within the narrative, the nation becomes a locus of multiple meanings which is constantly in progress. Bearing in mind Lotman's premise that the further we are from

---

3 S. Dickinson, (2006), op. cit., pp. 2-4
a culture the more empowered we feel to comment upon it, I propose that it is predominantly the group of Russian travel narratives about England which gave the stereotypes of the English great currency in Russian culture and informed the later generation of prose writers. From Karamzin's *Pis'ma* in the 1790s there is a discernable change in the style of representing English society in travel narratives. This persisted until the late 1840s when this style of travel narrative gradually went into decline to be overshadowed by prose fiction and forms of travel writing which were more overtly political in tone. I propose, therefore, to examine a selection of Russian travel narratives from this period to show how they depicted England and how this helped inspire later literary depictions of the English in Russia.

In order to situate these travel narratives in their literary context, I shall first discuss the concept of travel writing and its development in Russia. The idea of travelling for health and pedagogical purposes had become popular in Europe in the seventeenth and especially in the eighteenth centuries. The 'Grand Tour' in its eighteenth and nineteenth-century variant was a particular pastime of the English upper classes. It was perceived that a tour to acquaint oneself with the cultures and societies of the rest of Europe was the completion of a gentleman's education. As the English were separated from the rest of Europe, it was regarded as important for their gentlemen to travel and gain firsthand knowledge of European trends. France was known as the home of civilisation, Italy the home of antiquity and artistic culture and Germany, the home of philosophy. In Catherine's Russia, too, a tour of Europe, in

---


order to learn European behaviour and conventions, spanning several months and sometimes years, was seen as the climax of a Russian noble’s education. If the object of the Englishman’s tour was as much to show British superiority and civilisation as to acquaint oneself with the other cultures of Europe, the purpose of the Russian tour was as much to show the cosmopolitan sophistication and European verve of the Russian nobility.

In common with European trends, it became de rigueur for travellers to write their reminiscences of these trips, which were often published in contemporary periodicals. The most popular of the nineteenth-century journals for publishing travel notes were Vestnik evropy, (Herald of Europe) which ran between 1802 and 1830, Biblioteka dlja chteniia, (The Library for Reading) from 1834 to 1865, Otechestvennye zapiski, (Notes of the Fatherland) spanning between 1818 and 1884 and also Severnaia pchela, (Northern Bee) which was published from 1825 to 1864. Such journals were an ideal medium for publishing various types of articles which compared and contrasted Russia with other cultures. Once disseminated throughout Russian culture, the dominant images in such travel narratives gained meaning and had the power to define or depict a group or an individual, through powerful stereotypes within representations. Through such a travel narrative an ethnocentric perspective prevails, whereby the Russian observers become figures of cultural authority in their

---

representations of the ‘other’ in a manner acceptable for a domestic, Russian audience.

The last two decades of the eighteenth century witnessed a marked upsurge in travel writing in Russia. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, narratives about foreign and domestic, fictional and actual, journeys became a prevalent literary trend. As we noted earlier, they coincided with, and facilitated, the formation of Russian national identity vis-à-vis both Westerners and non-Europeans. Anthony Cross devotes a chapter in his By the Banks of the Thames to travellers’ perceptions of England in the 1760s and 1770s in the first real wave of Russians undertaking European travel. He finds that, in the main, visitors to England heaped praise upon the English, their institutions and culture:

One after another, diarists speak of the English as the nation they love above all others, stressing particularly the public spirit and institutions as well as ‘la liberté civile’. For several, ‘c’est sa constitution qui détermine son caractère, et c’est celui qui le porte à une bienveillance universelle, propre à rassurer tous les esprits.’

8 A. Cross, (1980), op. cit, p. 251

In such descriptions, the affirmation of England’s existing image in Russia appears to be sought. We can see examples of this in the words of Princess Dashkova. Prior to her travels she exclaimed “Отчего я не родилась англичанкой? Как обожаю я свободу и дух этой страны!” (Why wasn’t I born an Englishwoman? How I adore the freedom and spirit of that Nation!). Her subsequent notes from her travels are replete with references to England’s grandeur. In a particularly strong example, she writes to her friend:

In such descriptions, the affirmation of England’s existing image in Russia appears to be sought. We can see examples of this in the words of Princess Dashkova. Prior to her travels she exclaimed “Отчего я не родилась англичанкой? Как обожаю я свободу и дух этой страны!” (Why wasn’t I born an Englishwoman? How I adore the freedom and spirit of that Nation!). Her subsequent notes from her travels are replete with references to England’s grandeur. In a particularly strong example, she writes to her friend:

8 A. Cross, (1980), op. cit, p. 251
Other travellers echoed her perspective. For example, in view of Catherine’s penchant for the English garden, these early travellers also make much of the splendour of the gardens: “The gardens are beautiful, in taste completely distinct from all the others.”¹¹ In addition, there is high praise for English machinery and factories. “The tourist’s eyes were as likely to be attracted by factories and machinery as historical monuments … Zinov’ev … found another reason [for England’s wealth] in the English ability to ‘use wheels instead of people and thus become manufacturer for the whole world’”¹²

Since the time of Peter the Great, the English in the service of the state had come to be considered highly competent and English technological prowess had been revered. It appears that these travellers sought to view the proof of this. The very favourable impressions of England in early travel notes, many of which only existed in manuscripts, informed the opinions of educated Russian readers at a time when Anglomania was in vogue amongst the nobility. There is a reaction to this in the short satirical sketch, ‘Angliiskaia progulka’, in which the author is clearly mocking the

¹¹ Quoted in A. Cross, (1980), op. cit., p.249
excessive Anglomania of his contemporaries. Interest in England was both inspired by the French penchant for English culture, and was also in resistance to the characteristically excessive adoration of French manners in contemporary Russian society. However, the main stereotypes found in Russian literature come from later, less glowing representations of the English, and really begin with Nikolai Karamzin’s depictions of his stay in England from July to September 1790. Although he was by no means the first travel writer to tackle questions of Russia's identity and Europe, he is the first to discuss this question in the context of England. His Pis’ma is perhaps the most widely read and significant, first-hand account of England and the English in Russia. Its impact on its successors is apparent, and it is still known today for its influential impressions.

Karamzin, in his position as social documenter in the 1790s, the time of an emerging Russian national identity, is conscious of his responsibility to represent Western Europe for the specifically Russian reader. His account reflects a growing need to distinguish Russian norms from those of her Western European mentors. In his early letters from Europe he stipulates his intentions and tells the reader: “Вспомните, что я не Немец, и не могу писать для Немецкой Публики.”

---

14 Early Russian rejection of this excessive Francomania can be seen in Denis Fonvizin’s ‘Pis’ma iz Frantsii’, which is discussed in D. Offord, ‘Beware the Garden of Earthly Delights: Fonvizin and Dostoevskii on Life in France’, *(Stratonic and Eastern European Review*, Vol. 78, No. 4, 2000), pp. 625-643
16 In a radio interview given on 15/06/2002 on Radiostantsia ‘Ekho Moskvy’, broadcaster Aleksei Venediktov interviews Iurii Kobladze, director of International Renaissance-Kapital about his time in the UK and his impressions of the English. Kobladze remarks on Karamzin as of major influence in his perceptions of the English.
17 D. Offord, (2005), op. cit., p. 11
(Remember that I am not German and cannot write for the German public.) This reminds the reader that, whilst the individual European cultures, including Russian, were all European, they nevertheless also had their own specificities. The emphasis on 'Russian traveller' in his title also reinforces this point. It is assumed, therefore, that readers will have been familiar with Karamzin's viewpoint, and understood his remarks in accordance with their own sensibilities. His work, instead of a mainly denotative scientific guide about people and places encountered, is a literary work which inspired a change in the form of Russian travelogues.

The travel narratives to be discussed here are descriptions of real visits to, and stays in, England. They typically took the shape of the letters and diaries of travellers to England, and were often published in the journals of the day. They are types of what Andreas Schönle terms the 'literary travelogue.' This form encompasses various literary trends including the sentimental and romantic. It is written in a more colloquial style than earlier literature. This bridges the gap between the formal language of scholarly texts and the vernacular. Rather than simply imparting 'factual' descriptions of places, there are more personalised commentaries, digressions and observations. The genre now engages directly with the reader as the first person narrator adds an air of authority and immediacy to the narrative. Considerable attention is given to the feelings and sensibilities of the narrator in response to various sights and encounters with different people. This type of travelogue, then, is not merely for describing what is present in the places visited. It allows for an exploration of the identity of the self through its differences from the alien culture with which it is confronted. Places and customs that are the same as at home tend to be under-

20 Ibid, pp. 1-3
described in favour of those that are perceived as different or exotic. Early British and French explorers and travellers to the overseas colonies had the authority to describe and define the peoples and cultures of these distant lands. So, similarly, Karamzin and his early nineteenth-century successors travelling to England were in a comparable position of authority for creating an ‘England’ back home because of the relative lack of firsthand Russian accounts of the country and culture. In Karamzin’s narrative, and later works about England, we can see an increased preoccupation with middle class life, as opposed to that of the gentry. Previously Russian travellers’ notes tended to focus on the life of the landed classes. There is also a fascination with ‘byr’, or daily existence, which also became an important means of distinguishing Russia from Western Europe. 

Russia’s travel writers adopt similar strategies to those attributed to the ‘imperial observers’ in post-colonial theory. Their texts favour the point of view of the observer, effectively silencing the English, whose mores and customs they are describing. They render England mute; it becomes an object under the scrutiny of the norm-setting Russian gaze. Thus the role of such travel narratives is a key in the construction of Russia’s ‘England’ as a cultural other against which to define Russian national identity. As Russia is in the unique position of a quasi-European culture, however, the Russian travelogue of this era shows as much a representation of a phantasmal England as it does a sense of the Russian self.

Russian travel literature, and Karamzin’s Pis’ma in particular, has received considerable scholarly attention for its impact on later Russian literary genres and for his use of Western European literary influences. Karamzin consciously emulated the

---


22 Karamzin has been attributed with establishing a new literary language which was in keeping with the style of European sentimentalism. See, for example R. Anderson,’ Karamzin’s Concept of
style of Sterne’s *A Sentimental Journey Through France and Italy* in his own travel narrative. Sentimentalism as a literary movement sought to include feelings and affairs of the heart, and Sterne in Karamzin’s own words, was the “original painter of sensibility.” In answer to criticisms of his preoccupation with the minutiae of everyday life, Karamzin compares his work with the novels of Richardson and Fielding, acknowledging a literary inspiration for his narrative. Richardson’s brand of sentimentalism was preoccupied with the detailed inner worlds of the heroes, of ordinary people. The sentimental hero (man) was an independent individual, responsible for his own fate and behaviour. The trend also reflected an interest in other cultures as different cultures to the sentimental traveller were just as interesting as other individuals.

In his *Pis’ma*, Karamzin supplements his descriptions of places and people with discussions of literature, poetry and history, and various anecdotes in addition to his own thoughts and feelings. The series of letters allows him the freedom to present disparate themes and places, rather than necessarily structure them in logical progression. The author is therefore not restricted to chronological development; more in-depth attention can be given to aspects of the other culture which are the most interesting to the author. Nevertheless this does not detract from their significance in the formation of England’s literary image in Russia. Karamzin’s work, based upon his summer in England in 1790, is thus to be in central focus of this chapter for both its

---

23 A. Cross, op. cit. (1980), pp. 252-257
24 Ibid, p. 255
impressions of England, and the idea he presented of what it was to be Russian in the context of Europe. The ideas in Karamzin’s *Pis’ma* shall also be discussed along with the impressions of other visitors whose travelogues of the same era were published in widely-read journals. I have selected those accounts that give insights into the life in England of the narrator, along with his\(^{27}\) observations about English society.

In addition to the work of Karamzin, of particular interest are the works of writer and translator Petr Makarov who spent several months in England from 1803 to 1804\(^{28}\) and wrote a substantial number of letters home that were published some years later. Pavel Svin’in, a journalist and businessman, was an advocate of technology and served as the Russian consul in Philadelphia for a time. The diaries of his eight-month 1814-15 visit to England were published in the monthly, liberal *Syn otechestva*. I will also take into consideration the writings of the Slavophile thinker Aleksei Khomiakov, a well-known Anglophile who spent two weeks in London in 1848. In addition, I shall discuss the letters home of Petr Chaadaev from his trip in September 1823. He was also an Anglophile, whose Philosophical Letters started the debates between the Slavophiles and Westernisers, and lastly I shall discuss Nikolai Grech, an ardent supporter of the autocracy. He spent three months in England in 1839. Although none of these travelogues has had the longevity of Karamzin’s, they were significant enough to be published in journals of reasonable renown, had wide reading audiences and give an overall picture of Englishness as perceived by the Russian travellers which had an impact on later prose writers.

\(^{27}\) The accounts I will be discussing here are all written by men. The only travelogue of note I could find that was written by a woman is Princess Dashkova’s *Puteshestvie odnoi rossiiskoi znatnoi gospozhi po nekotorym Aglinskym provintsiam*, op. cit., pp. 105-44

\(^{28}\) There are no precise dates given for Makarov’s stay in England in his diaries. It merely tells us he spent several months in England.
Many of the ideas expressed in the images of England from Karamzin onwards, such as the number of beggars and the supposed Russian affinity with and affection for the lower classes of ‘the West’, had a great impact on the formation of concepts of Russia’s identity vis-à-vis the West. Russia, from early times, was seen as a poor relation to Western Europe. It was described as ‘rude and barbarous’ in England after the initial contacts between the two cultures had been established.29 This is noticeable from many western travel narratives including, notably those by Voltaire:

Les Mouscovites étaient moins civilisés que les Mexicains quand ils furent découverts par Cortès: nés tous esclaves de maîtres aussi barbares qu’eux, ils croupissaient dans l’ignorance, dans le besoin de tous les arts, et dans l’insensibilité de ces besoins, qui étouffait toute industrie.30 (The Muscovites were less civilised than the Mexicans were when they were discovered by Cortes. All born as slaves of masters as barbarian as they, they wallow in ignorance, in the need for all the arts, and in the insensibility of this need which affects all industry.)

This positioning of Russia as Europe’s ‘other’ fosters Russia’s sense of insecurity. The representation of the English both in the travel literature and later fiction follows in this pattern in its portrayal of supposedly excessive rationalism and sterility of English society. This is also noticeable in the promotion of Russia’s supposed spiritual superiority over what it perceives as the more sophisticated, and yet morally bankrupt English. This gave rise to later conceptions of a ‘Russian soul’, a quality which set the Russians apart from the perceived rational, materialist world with which they were confronted, and which provided opportunity for the claim of superiority.31 It allowed them to embrace the idea of Russia as distinct from Europe in a positive

29 See, for example, L. Berry & R. Crumney (eds), Rude and Barbarous Kingdom: Russia in the Accounts of Sixteenth Century English Voyagers, (Madison & London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968)
31 R. Williams, op. cit, pp. 573-588
light. Now Russia was not merely the land of primitive living conditions and poverty. The concept of Russia as European, yet distinct from Europe, became a prevalent theme in Russian secular literature in the nineteenth century, following its early articulation by Karamzin in his *Pis'ma*.

Iurii Lotman observes that Karamzin’s English ‘letters’ are different in style from those about the rest of his journey, and have obviously been edited at home.32 This belies the important premise in travel literature that it is a spontaneous record of actual events.33 Its altered style implies the importance Karamzin attached to revising the letters from England before publication in order for impressions to be appropriate for the reading public. In addition, his own viewpoint towards the West altered after his travels. In the *Pis'ma*, Karamzin is at pains to present himself as cosmopolitan, and a sympathetic observer. No matter what the situation, he never appears in a bad light. On his return home he became more nationalistic and his major project, *История государства российского* (*History of the Russian State*) was a considerable effort in the quest to articulate Russia’s identity.34 His previous, self-confessed Anglomania became heavily diluted:

Видеть Англию очень приятно; обычай народа, успехи просвещения и всех искусств достоинны примечания и занимают ум ваш. Но жить здесь для удовольствий обобщения есть искать цветов на песчаной долине ... Я в другой раз приехал бы с удовольствием в Англию, но выйду из нее без сожаления.35 (It is very pleasant to see England; the people’s customs, the successes of enlightenment and of all the arts are worthy of note and will occupy your mind. But to live here for the pleasure of communal life is to search for a flower in a sandy valley. ... I would happily return to England another time, but I leave without regret.)

33 S. Dickinson, (2006), op. cit., p. 15
34 V. Tolz, op. cit., pp. 75-76
35 N. Karamzin, op. cit., p. 499
Compare this to his much warmer attitude towards France: "Я оставил тебя, любезный Париж, оставил с сожалением и благодарностью! ... выехал из тебя не с пустою душою: в ней остался идеи и воспоминания ... Прости, любезный Париж! ..."36 (I have left you, dear Paris, left with regret and gratitude! ... I have departed from you, but not with a soul that is empty; ideas and memories have remained in it! ... Goodbye, dear Paris! ...) This substantiates, in addition, Cross’s claim that of all the cultures he came into contact with in Europe “Only England, or Englishmen, failed to meet Karamzin’s expectations.”37 Perhaps this is because his expectations of the English were far higher than of other cultures in the light of his self-professed love of English literature, and through the stereotyped view of England as a country of lords and ladies:

Было время, когда я, почти не видав англичан, восхитился ими и воображал Англию самою приятнейшею для сердца моего землею. Мне казалось, что быть храбрым есть ... быть англичанином, великодушным — тоже, ... романы, если не ошибаюсь, были главным основанием такого мнения.38 (There was a time when, having met almost no Englishmen, I revered them, and felt that England was the land closest to my heart ... It seemed to me that to be valiant was... to be an Englishman. To be magnanimous, also... Novels, if I am not mistaken, were the main basis for this opinion.)

Therefore, Karamzin’s initial view of the English was through preconceived ideas of honour and respectability; he saw England through the Russian interpretation of its literature, especially the impressions he received from Richardson and Fielding.39 Martynov argues that Karamzin was the “most enthusiastic and passionate protagonist

36 Ibid, p. 496
37 A. Cross, (1971), op. cit., p. 81
38 N. Karamzin, op. cit., p. 571
39 A. Cross, (1971), op. cit., p. 69
of English literature’ in the eighteenth century.”⁴⁰ Karamzin contrasts his preconceptions of a country “которая по характеру жителей и степени народного просвещения есть, конечно одно из первых государств Европы”⁴¹ (which, for the character of its inhabitants and the enlightenment of its people is, of course, one of the leading states of Europe) with the realities; he found himself alienated by the language barrier and by his failure to understand cultural nuances and traditions. So how does Karamzin contrast Russianness with Englishness?

There is a noticeable difference between English and Russian identities in the respect they accord to their national languages: this theme gives rise to later travel narratives and also some Russian fiction: “Все хорошо воспитанные англичане знают французский язык, но не хотят говорить им ... какая разница с нами! ... а в нашем так называемом хорошем обществе без французского языка будешь глух и нем.”⁴² (All well-bred English folk know French, but they do not wish to speak it ... How they differ from us! In our so-called high society you would be deaf and dumb without French.) Although he spoke English reasonably well, Karamzin’s narrator appears to feel like more of a cultural outsider in England than he did in other European countries. In the other countries he visited the narrator meets with famous people, often intellectuals, with whom he is perfectly comfortable conversing, including the writer, Christoph Martin Wieland, in Germany and the novelist, antiquarian and classicist, Abbé Jean-Jacques Barthélemy, in France. Karamzin makes a real effort to show his Russian traveller as a person of erudition and one conversant

⁴¹ N. Karamzin, op. cit., p. 502
⁴² Ibid, p. 517 (italics in original)
in European culture in meetings with these people. He relates Wieland’s remarks “Мне нравится ваша искренность; и я вижу еще первого русского такого, как вы. [...] Обыкновенно ваши единоземцы стараются подражать французам; а вы ...” (I like your sincerity, you are the first Russian of your type I have seen ...)

Usually your fellow countrymen try to imitate the French, but you ... [do not])

Significantly, in England, the Russian traveller does not appear to meet anyone of such renown, and is thus at a disadvantage as he is unable to show off his cultural sophistication. As the traveller feels estranged in unfamiliar surroundings, he employs defensive measures to reinforce his self-confidence. He often remarks upon the perceived cultural antics of English life that are incomprehensible and irritating to the foreigner. For example, he comments on how odd the ‘timetable’ of English life is to him: “Не скоро привыкнешь к здешнему образу жизни, к здешним поздним обедам ... Воздайте, что за стол садятся в семь часов! Хорошо кто спит до одиннадцати, но каково мне, привыкшему вставать в восемь?” (You do not quickly get used to the way of life here, to the late dinners ... Just imagine, they sit down to eat at seven o’clock! This is fine for one who sleeps until eleven, but what about me, who is used to getting up at eight?) Discussing these incidents emphasises the distance between Russian and English mores and reinforces England’s strangeness. When at the theatre, the traveller sits with a merchant family. “Меня посадили на лучшем месте и кормили пирогами, но нимало не думали занимать разговором ...” (They gave me the best seat and fed me pies, but did not think to engage me in conversation...) The English family politely offered the traveller the

43 Dickinson argues that Karamzin’s traveller is always “cool, cultivated, and everywhere ‘at home,’ he is careful never to show himself or his constituency at a disadvantage.” See S. Dickinson, (2006), op. cit., p. 110
44 N. Karamzin, op. cit., p. 176
46 Ibid, p. 525
finest seat and fed him, giving him the best they had, but clearly they were not particularly interested in him personally. The father chides the programme seller, arguing that the traveller is a foreigner and cannot refuse her attempt at getting him to spend money on her brochure. "... к нам вошла женщина с афишами и втолкнула мне в руки листочек, для того чтобы взять у меня 6 пенсов. Старший из семьи выпнул его у меня и бросил женщине говоря: «Ему не надобно; ты хочешь отнять у него деньги; это стыдно. Он иностранец и не умеет отговориться»."\(^{47}\)

(A woman selling programmes came up to us and thrust a printed sheet into my hands in order to take 6 pence off of me. The father of the family took it off me and threw it at the woman, saying: "He doesn’t need it; you just want to take his money. It is embarrassing. He is a foreigner and cannot refuse for himself.”) Although they were trying to help him, the episode suggests that their actions were perceived as condescending. The narrator certainly found it humiliating: "«Хорошо, — подумал я, — но для чего ты, господин британец, вырвал листок с такою грубостью?»"\(^{48}\)

(“Fine”, I thought, “but why did you rip the sheet away so rudely, Mr. Briton?”) This little episode certainly did little to reassure the Russian visitor that his civilisational status is viewed symmetrically.

Although polite and welcoming to a certain degree, the English are shown to keep the foreign traveller at arm’s length, which the narrator appears to find discomfiting. In order to reassert his superiority, the traveller sums up his feelings about the English. He compares them to Russians and finds them lacking in the more humane ‘essence’ which he claims is a Russian trait:

\(^{47}\) Ibid, pp. 525-526

\(^{48}\) Ibid, p. 526
... холодный характер их мне совсем не нравится. [...] Русское мое сердце любит изливаться в искренних, живых разговорах, любит игру глаза, скорые перемены лица, выразительное движение руки. Англичанин молчалив, равнодушен, говорит, как читает, не обнаруживая никогда быстрых душевых стремлений, которые потрясают электрически всю нашу физическую систему. Говорят, что он глубокомысленнее других; не для того ли, что кажется глубокомыслием? Не потому ли, что густая кровь движется в нем медленнее и дает ему вид задумчивого, часто без всяких мыслей? 49 (I do not like their cold character at all. [...] My Russian heart likes to pour itself out in sincere, lively conversations; it loves the play of the eyes, quick changes of facial expression, and expressive hand gestures. An Englishman is aloof, indifferent; he speaks as he reads, never feeling the quick passions of the soul, which electrify our whole physical being. It is said that he is more profound than others, but perhaps he only appears to be more profound? Is it not because thick blood moves around him slower and gives the look of being deep in thought even to one who is thoughtless?)

Karamzin emphasises this further when summing-up what he perceives of the English ‘character’ as chauvinistic and rude towards foreigners. “Вообще, английский народ считает нас, чужеземцев, каким-то несовершенными, жалкими людьми. «Не тронь его» – говорят здесь на улице, «это иностранец», что значит: «это бедный человек, или младенец.» 50 (In general the English think of us foreigners as poor, incomplete folk. “Don’t touch him”- they say on the street-“he’s a foreigner.” – that means: “he’s a poor person or an infant.”) Karamzin emulates criticisms levelled at the English by European writers, 51 including A. W. Schlegel, who wrote of the English that they used to be far more welcoming of foreigners than they had become by the late eighteenth century. 52 Placing Russians among ‘other’ Europeans who find fault with the English cleverly implies that Russia

49 Ibid, p. 572
50 Ibid, p. 498
51 Reuel Wilson discusses the work of V. Sipovsky in documenting sources from which Karamzin took many of his ideas and themes, suggesting that Karamzin employed both French and German models as inspiration for his writings. See R. Wilson, The Literary Travelogue: A Comparative Study with Special Relevance to Russian Literature from Fonvizin to Pushkin, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), pp. 58-59; see also T. Roboli, (1963), op. cit., pp. 42-73 for additional discussions about Karamzin’s literary influences.
is European too. Furthermore this device saves the trouble of inventing stereotypes and makes it possible to borrow them from the Germans and the French. The traveller assumes the familiarity of the Russian reader with such stereotypes: “Вы слухали о грубости здешнего народа в рассуждении иностранцев.”53 (You have heard of the rudeness of this people towards foreigners.)

Karamzin’s successors also emphasise this point, commenting upon the difficulties of acceptance in English society. The majority discuss the coldness of the reception they receive,54 and unfriendliness of the English in society: “Встречаясь с английанином на улице, вы заметите, разумеется, что он хлопотлив, деятельен ... необщительен и подчас даже очень груб.”55 (If you meet an Englishman on the street you notice that he is energetic, preoccupied, uncommunicative ... and sometimes also very rude.) Many travel writers highlight indifference towards foreigners, which they attribute to the arrogant superiority of an inflated sense of self. Viazemskii, in 1838, paints a harsher picture still, but his words have an air of wounded pride about them:

Присутствие иностранного путешественника заражает воздух ... присутствие иностранца в английском обществе ... производит в англичанах раздражение как присутствие разнородной и даже противородной стихии...56 (The presence of a foreign traveller contaminates the air ... the presence of a foreigner in English society irritates the English like the presence of diverse and even unnatural elements.)

53 Н. Карамзин, op. cit., p. 452
54 Shestakov discusses this point in his essay on the idea of the ‘English national character’, drawing examples from various travel writers including Karamzin, Makarov, Pogodin, and Herzen, see V. Shestakov, (2000) op. cit., pp. 94-99
However, in contrast to the cold reception given to foreigners in society, those who stay in lodgings, usually owned by lower middle class landlords, describe the warmth and friendliness of their hosts. Makarov writes: “Иностранец, ... хозяин свой имеет искреннего советника и охранителя...” (The foreigner ... has in his host a true confidant and protector.) These hosts are willing to converse with their visitors; they treat them almost like a part of the family, which contrasts markedly to the reception the Russian traveller finds in upper class society. Karamzin had earlier differentiated between the reaction to him by the upper classes, and the way in which he could relate to the servants. Where Karamzin writes in his _Pis’ma_ about his interaction with the working classes he shows the ease with which he can converse with them. “В восемь часов утра приносит мне чай ... и разговаривает со мною о филдинговых и ричардсоновых романах.” (At 8 a.m. [Jenny the maid] brings me tea ... and chats with me about the novels of Fielding and Richardson.) Here, where the traveller is chatting to the maid, and similar scenes, show early on Karamzin’s relatively comfortable attitude with the servants and their relaxed manner of interaction. This kind of company is natural, at ease and is presented as the antithesis of life with members of the higher classes: “служанка успела уже рассказать мне тайную историю своего сердца ...” (The maid has already managed to tell me her deepest secrets.) The traveller attempts to paint a picture of shared humanity, showing himself as able to empathise with his fellow human beings, irrespective of age or nationality. This fascination with the servant girls explores the culture of feeling at 

58 P. Makarov, op. cit., p. 131
59 N. Karamzin, op. cit., p. 441
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the heart of sentimentalism. There is also a sense of a Rousseau-esque craving for innocence and simplicity to this exchange. The traveller would have the reader believe that his Russian heart, which is apparently warmer than English hearts, has inspired great enough confidence in the maid to spill her secrets to him freely.

The ease with which Karamzin relates to the members of the lower classes is similar to how he interacts with fellow Russians in England. There are references to his Russian friends, suggesting that he was carefree when out and about with them:

"Трое русских, М*, Д* и я, в одиннадцать часов утра сели на ботик и поплыли в Гринич. День прекрасный — мы спокойны и веселы...

([We] three Russians, М*, Д* and I, walked down to the bank of the Thames at eleven o’clock in the morning, hired a small boat and sailed to Greenwich. It was a beautiful day - we were relaxed and cheerful...) Karamzin spent most of his time in London with Russian diplomats and émigrés, thus only sharing the most superficial experiences with educated aristocratic locals. This is also apparent in the offhand manner with which Karamzin depicts encounters with members of the upper-middle classes. These events are depicted as though the traveller was an observer, rather than a participant, as at an upper class dinner party: “Пригласили мне обедать богатый англичанин Вахтер, консул, ... Это, говорят, весело! По крайней мере не мне.”

(The wealthy Englishman Baxter, a consul, invited me to dinner ... this is considered a good time! But not by me ...) Karamzin does not consider the actual event worthy of much description. He appears disdainful of the style of the evening and the

---
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company he kept there. This is echoed a few years later in 1804, in the words of Makarov, who also describes an upper middle-class dinner party, painting scenes of a mechanically structured evening that fails to inspire him: "Английские собрания довольно скучны. Их обеды выдуманы, кажется, для испытания человеческого терпения."66 (English gatherings are rather dull. Their suppers are structured, it seems, in order to try one’s patience.)

The structured nature of English society and conformity is found in numerous descriptions in the travel literature of the early nineteenth century. It creates an impression of English society as regimented and somehow inhuman, an image that is often seen in later fictional depictions of England, in the writings of authors such as Goncharov, Bunin and Zamiatin. Everything appears to be enacted as per an unwritten script, leaving little room for spontaneity. Viazemskii paints a picture of this decorum at the table: "За обедом есть не как едят другие. ... резать, а не ломать свой ломоть хлеба."67 ([The Englishman] at dinner eats differently to others ... he cuts, rather than breaks his piece of bread.) A comic example of this is to be found in Mikhailov’s description in 1849 of the decorous way in which the English gentleman sits and has lunch in a restaurant, ignoring other diners completely "Никогда не улыбается, никогда не произносит ни слова."68 (Not smiling, not uttering a single word.) His observations are related in an amused tone, from the vantage point of norm-setting superiority. The narrator gazes at the spectacle of the English ‘other’ and positions himself in the centre of reasonable civilised manners. Other writers follow his example, presenting comical anecdotes about English foibles that are alien to the ‘reasonable norm’ of the Russian. Karamzin remarks on the tradition of announcing

66 P. Makarov, op. cit., p. 139
67 P. Viazemskii, op. cit. p. 181
68 M. Mikhailov, op. cit., p. 360
who is at the door by their knocking. "Кто придет, должен стучаться медной скобкою в медный замок: слуга — один раз, гость — два, хозяин — три раза."

(Everyone who comes to the door must knock on a brass knocker: servants once, guests twice, and the master three times.) Mikhailov writes: “Почтальон возвещает о себе двумя сильными, быстро следующими друг за другом ударами; постороннему гостю предписывается нежное. Хозяева дома выделывают молотком более сильную дробь, а слуга обязан ... стучать в дверь, как перун.”

(The postman announces himself with two strong, quick bangs, one after another. Strangers with soft ones. The master of the house knocks strongly with the door knocker, and the servant is required to bang like a thunderbolt.) This practice is ridiculed in their writing as an English idiosyncrasy, but it also serves to underpin the idea of the English spectacle of unbending conventionality and adherence to custom in English society.

Such rigid conformity is ascribed to the English preoccupation with the externals of wealth and prosperity, a feature that is common to the later literary representations of Englishmen. Hence Makarov’s sour comment: “Важные, глубокомысленные англичане столько привязаны к моде, что смеются над бедным иностранцем, если он покажется на их улицах в том наряде, в котором он приехал.”

(Important, profound Englishmen are so keen on fashion that they laugh at the poor foreigner if he goes out in the same outfit that he arrived in.) This shows that a great deal of importance is attached to superficial appearance. It is on the basis of this that people of all classes are judged. For Mikhailov the English home is symbolic of this preoccupation with external appearance. The English obsession with their houses

69 N. Karamzin, op. cit. p. 442
70 M. Mikhailov, op. cit., p. 359
71 P. Makarov, op. cit., p. 127
represents the incompatibility of Russian and English sensibilities. He devotes a large
collection of his travelogue to showing the English concern with appearance and riches,
the attention to minute details of decoration. He contrasts the English and Russian
perceptions of poverty and grandeur, describing how the English are concerned with
carpets as a symbol of wealth: “Говоря о русском бедняке, никому и в голову бы
не пришло сожалеть об отсутствии ковра в его угол [...] в каждой комнате
английского дома пол должен быть обит или покрыт ковром.”72 (Talking about a
poor Russian man, nobody would dream of complaining about the lack of carpet ... in
each room in an English house the floor must be covered with carpet.)

Makarov does, however, like many Russian travellers, concede that such wealth,
whose obsessive flaunting denotes a great level of social conformism, does
nevertheless provide some real luxuries. The positive aspects of the comforts afforded
by wealth are acknowledged and contrasted implicitly with the poorer, Russian ways.
For example, the clean, wide, even “как скатерть” (as a tablecloth) streets of England
are commented upon by Karamzin and his successors as marvellous, and on which
travelling is smooth, “катишься по дороге как по бархату, не зацепишься за
камышек.”73 (Travelling along the road is like on velvet. You are not struck by loose
pebbles.) The streets of London with their impressively stocked shops and continuous
lighting give an impression to Russian travellers of opulence and wealth, making
London seem beautiful to them. They have an almost magical, striking effect on some
Russian travellers, in their contrast not only with Russia but even with Continental
Europe. There are comments on the quality of English goods ranging from small

72 Ibid, p. 362
73 P. Viazemskii, op. cit., p. 181
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items to large, well-constructed carriages. English made objects had long been noted in Russian society, where amongst the rich, the demand for English goods was high.

In spite of that, however, the harsh realities of English life and capitalism are implicitly contrasted with the Russian way of life. Zabolotskii-Desiatovskii wrote in 1849 that most travellers who end up in London want to leave quickly, as there you have to pay for everything, and pay well. Some Russian travellers make much of the cost of life in England, with Makarov describing in detail the high cost of items, including such necessary supplies as coal for the fire. At the same time, many remark on the appealing style of living in England, and how it is possible to live well, and live cheaply. The persistent reaffirmation of this idea that it is quite inexpensive to live there implies the conventionality and ordinariness of the fact that comforts and material goods are available to large numbers of average individuals in England, unlike in Russia where the living conditions are a good deal worse. The bustling streets, however, are both attractive and off-putting for the Russian observer, as the pace of life seems too fast. Karamzin remarks “Какое множество! Какая деятельность!” (What crowds! What activity!) Herzen, later, in 1859, describes the Russian traveller in London as milling about looking lost in the busy streets.

Herzen’s bustling streets of London and the representation of the fast-paced business-like ethic of the English in Russian travel narratives contrast sharply with the world of Russia’s ‘superfluous men’. This was the Oblomov-type character discussed by Dobroliubov, an ineffectual and socially inept dreamer of gentry origin, who was

74 P. Svin’in, ‘Ezhednevnik zapiski v Londone’, in O. Kaznina & A. Nikolkin, op. cit., p. 146; Makarov, op. cit., p. 129
75 A. Cross, (1980), op. cit, p. 239-250
76 N. Erofeev, op. cit., p.37
78 N. Karamzin, op. cit, p. 505
79 See N. Erofeev, op. cit., p. 38
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educated on fashionable Western ideas and who was a manifestation of the Russian noble in the literature of the time.\textsuperscript{80}

To demonstrate the differences between the Russians and the English, Karamzin discusses English pragmatism as cold and practical: “В них действует более ум, нежели сердце ... делать добро, не зная для чего, есть дело нашего бедного безрассудного сердца.”\textsuperscript{81} (There is more reason than heart in their actions. To do good without knowing why is a feature of our poor, spontaneous heart.) Karamzin is contrasting Russians to the English, comparing what he perceives as the hard, calculating and practical nature of the English businessman to the poor, simple heart of the Russian people. “Русское мое сердце любит изливаться в искренних, живых разговорах, любит игру глаз, скорые перемены лица, выразительное движение руки. Англичанин молчалив, равнодушен ...”\textsuperscript{82} (My Russian heart loves to find expression in sincere, lively conversations, it loves the play of the eyes, the swift changes in facial expressions, the expressive movements of the hands. The Englishman is silent, indifferent ...) This image of the unsophisticated, yet free, Russian heart versus the practical matter-of-factness of the English is expounded further in later Russian literature. The anxieties and desires of the Russian self, regarding its relative lack of status and business acumen are implied in the criticism of the English coldness and the negative stereotyping of English capitalism.

\textsuperscript{81} N. Karamzin, op. cit, p. 587
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid, p. 590
Capitalism is further contrasted with the Russian way of life in implicit suggestions of English hypocrisy. The materially wealthy, decorous culture of the gentleman is contrasted with an impoverished, slovenly society. We see in Karamzin and his successors several instances of beggars on the English streets, demanding money in return for the slightest 'service': "Дай мне шиллинг за то, что я подал тебе руку, когда ты сходили с пакетбота." (Give me a shilling as I gave you my hand when you were alighting from the packet boat.) Begging, it seems, was such an obvious fact of English life that the English do not appear to notice it. It is repugnant to the foreigner - a part of capitalism, which strikes the Russian traveller as cold and inhuman. Karamzin writes of the English attitude towards the poor, showing that in England to be poor is somehow shameful:

Later authors, including Svin’in, in 1817, consider the sheer numbers of the poor in England, finding it a strange aspect to a rich and enlightened country. "В Англии, земле самой богатой и наполненной благотворительными заведениями и учреждениями для бедных – находитсё более чем в каком-либо Европейском государстве бродяг и нищих! ... Как сообразить сии противоположности!" (In England, the land of the richest charitable institutions and establishments for the poor... there are more tramps and poor people than in any other European country!)

---

83 Ibid, op. cit., p. 433
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85 P. Svin’in, op.cit., p. 146 (italics in original)
How can one understand these contradictions! The image of gentlemanly English behaviour is thus undermined by its antithesis, the excessive poverty and coarse behaviour of this stratum of English society. Russian concern with hypocrisy and unfairness in England implies cultural superiority whilst Russian culture may not have the super-sophistication of the English gentleman, it does not try to hide its ills behind a façade of propriety.

Our travellers gleefully participate in a form of Occidentalism, or anti-Westernism, highlighting the negative side of English culture to assert the supposed superiority of Russian mores. Their examples of England’s culture of excesses, its strict conformism giving way to extreme depravity and bawdiness recur in some later fictional descriptions of Englishness. The travellers discuss the social depravity caused by the English tendency to drink to excess. This is shown to permeate all strata of society. Karamzin’s narrator remarks at a fashionable dinner party: “и рюмка за рюмкой кла́рету ... мужчи́ны пьют ... снова пить.” (the men drink ...glass after glass of claret ... and then drink some more.) Grech devotes a considerable part of his travel narrative to investigating the drinking habits of the English. He remarks on the sheer numbers of beer-houses in London. “На каждой улице видите бесконечные вывески, на которых пребольшими золотыми буквами написано, что в этом доме продается портер и пиво такого-то завода.” (On every street you see endless signboards on which it is written in large gold letters that port and beer from such and such a factory is on sale here.) His traveller attributes to this phenomenon

86 P. Barta, (1998), op. cit. pp. 143-159; I. Buruma & A. Margalit, op. cit., p. 95
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88 N. Grech, Putev'ia pis'ma iz' Anglii, Germanii i Frantsii Nikolala Grecha, Chast' I, (Sankt Peterburg: tipografii N. Grecha, 1839) p. 86
the pastimes of "Буйство, драки и смертоубийства"\(^9\) (unruly conduct, fighting and murder). Karamzin also eschews the lower class entertainments of the English for their sheer crudeness:

Но если хотите, чтобы у вас помутнилось на душе, то загляните ввечеру в подземельные таверны или в ночные дома, где веселиться поднял лондонская чернь! – Такова судьба гражданских обществ: хорошо сверху, в середине, а вниз не заглядывай.\(^9\) (If you wish to experience revulsion, just have a look of an evening at one of the underground taverns or beer houses where London’s rabble finds its amusement. ... such is the fate of civil societies, good on the surface and in the middle, but do not look underneath.)

Additionally, almost all Russian travellers remark upon the commoditisation of sex and the sheer numbers of prostitutes in England. Karamzin writes: “На лондонских улицах ввечеру видел я более ужасов разврата ... между несчастными жертвами распутства здесь много двенадцатилетних девушек!”\(^9\) (I saw a lot of terrible depravities on London’s streets of an evening ... amongst the unfortunate victims of this debauchery are many twelve-year-old girls!) Makarov devotes a whole letter to his descriptions of the ‘priestesses of Venus’,\(^9\) the remarkably pretty, well-dressed ladies he meets at the theatre and on the streets of London. He then comments “теперь должно испортить всю картину ... гурии, которых я описывал, торгуют своими прелестями.”\(^9\) (Now I must spoil this picture ... the beauties I have described, sell their charms.) The impression is given that everything in England, including human life, is for sale. Buruma and Margalit argue that depictions of the sex trade, of the prostitute as a ‘soulless automaton’, are typical occidentalist images of

\(^{89}\) Ibid, p. 89
\(^{90}\) N. Karamzin, op. cit. p. 575 (italics in original)
\(^{91}\) Ibid, p. 576
\(^{92}\) P. Makarov, op. cit., pp. 133-137
\(^{93}\) Ibid, p. 135
capitalism and the Western 'machine civilisation.' Descriptions such as Makarov’s ‘Priestesses of Venus’ serve to show the exoticism of English life for the traveller and emphasise its difference from the supposedly normative Russian way of life.

Features of Russian Occidentalism are also prevalent in Karamzin’s and later depictions of the English landscape. England is so exotic to Karamzin that he claims that travelling through the rest of Europe has prepared him for its strangeness in some way, but not completely:

Что ежели бы я прямо из России приехал в Англию; не видав ни рейнской, ни сенских берегов; не быв ни в Германии, ни в Швеции, ни во Франции? – Думаю, что картина Англии еще поразила бы мои чувства; она была бы для меня новее.” (What if I had come directly from Russia to England, not having seen the Rhine, nor the Seine, not having been in Germany, in Switzerland nor in France? – I think that the picture of England would have surprised me even more, it would have been even stranger to me.)

England becomes a spectacle, an object of difference, more so than the more familiar cultures of France and Germany, thus it is of greater importance to him to define and classify ‘Englishness’. He is fulfilling the role of an authority figure, reporting home on the ‘other’. This feature of ‘reporting’ is common in both Orientalism and Occidentalism, where the foreign becomes the site of the self’s projections of its own fears and desires. We see a similar discourse to that used by the British traveller in defining their overseas colonies thus making England the norm versus “the aesthetic, observable and exotic ‘other’ phenomenon.”

94 I. Buruma and A. Margalit, op. cit., p. 19
95 N. Karamzin, op. cit., p. 433
96 P. Barta, (1998) op. cit. p. 147
97 I. Kleespies, ‘East, West, Home is Best: the Grand Tour in D.I Fonvizin’s Pis’ma iz Frantsii & N.M. Karamzin’s Pis’ma ruskogo puteshestvennika’ (Russian Literature 52, 2002) p. 267
Metaphorical depictions such as Karamzin’s “Англия есть кирпичное царство.”\(^98\) (England is a kingdom of bricks) further render England as an exotic spectacle to the Russian traveller. The image of little brick houses is reused by Karamzin’s successors to create a stereotypical image of the English town and countryside. Zagoskin remarks in 1839 that in London there are “бесчисленное множество кирпичных домов как две капли воды друг на друга похожих”\(^99\) (countless numbers of brick houses that are as alike as two drops of water.) Landscape in travel literature is often used metaphorically to give a sense of the scale of a place and as a projection of the traveller’s judgements.\(^100\) In Russian writings about their peripheral lands, as in British and French writing about the colonies, we can often see images of wild, savage and untamed landscapes, used as metaphors for the characterisation of the natives, implying a contrast with the more sophisticated and norm-setting coloniser. Occidentalist descriptions such as Karamzin’s and Zagoskin’s ascribe excessive rationalism and conformity to the landscape, implying the idea of mechanisation and soullessness.

London is shown to be more conformist and less exciting than Paris in the eyes of the Russian traveller. Makarov portrays the London landscape as rather dull in comparison to that of Paris: “Строение не хорошо. Нет таких зданий как в Париже и в Петербурге ... даже дворц Кроловской кажется снаружи коноплею.”\(^101\) (The building is not good ... There are no buildings like those in Paris and Petersburg.

---

\(^98\) Ibid, p. 430
\(^101\) P. Makarov, op. cit. p. 128
Even the Royal Palace seems like a stable from the outside.) The juxtaposing of Paris and Petersburg in the comparison with London of course underlines the notion of Russia's Europeanness. Grech furthers this notion by distinguishing London from the other capital cities with which he is familiar:

В известных мне столицах и больших городах Европы есть обыкновенно центр, главная часть, сердце города; так, например, в Париже все пространство от Тюльерийского Дворца до заставы de l’Etoile; в Берлине — от королевского Дворца до Фридриховой улицы; в Гамбурге Jungfernstieg с окрестностями; в Петербурге Первая Адмиралтейская Часть. В Лондоне этого нет: вы здесь не можете назвать одного квартала преимущественно пред другими...102 (In the European towns and cities which are familiar to me, there is the main part, the heart of the town. For instance in Paris it is the whole area between Tuileries Palace to the l’Etoile. In Berlin it is from the Queen’s Palace to Friedrich Street. In Hamburg it is Jungfernstieg and the surrounding area. London has none of this. You could not say one region has any advantage over another.)

In distancing England’s capital from those of France, Germany and Russia, he again is able to assume Russia’s Europeanness whilst making England strange in comparison with the Continental European countries. Karamzin, like some later travellers, emphasises this concept, as he is more at home in Paris than in London. He spends his time there with French people, rather than with other Russians, which suggests that he is more comfortable with the culture. In this way the French act as mediators. Russia’s connection with France, and thus with Europe, is cemented by the fact that the later travellers, like Karamzin, have a tendency to compare England and France, or more usually, London and Paris. Karamzin, almost with surprise, remarks that “Хотя лондон не имеет столько примечания достойных вещей, как Париж, однако ж есть что видеть.”103 (Although London has fewer memorable sites than

102 N. Grech, op. cit., p. 43
103 Ibid, p. 526
Paris, there is something to see.) Take also, for example, Makarov’s comparison of London with Paris: “Лондон превосходит величиною все города на свете, даже Париж. Но кто хочет наслаждаться жизнью, тому надобно жить в Париже. А не в Лондоне.”104 (London surpasses all cities in its greatness, even Paris. But he who wants to enjoy life should live in Paris, and not in London.) England is invariably portrayed as less hospitable, less easy-going than France; this rigidity also typifies the attitudes of the inhabitants towards the foreign traveller. In sum, travellers’ attempts to make England exotic in comparison to France confirm the status of Russia as European.

Karamzin is better disposed towards the French than the English because of their superior treatment of the poor. Mikhailov suggests a similar vein of thought when discussing the relationships between the English and French nobilities and their servants: “Тех добрых и гуманных отношений, какие существуют между прислугой и господами во Франции, ничего искать у англичан.”105 (Such pleasant and humane relationships as exist between servants and masters in France cannot be found in England.) This gives the impression of the English as inflexible and consistent in their adherence to social rules, customs and rigid social strata. Viazemskii describes this difference in character between the English and French: “Француз податливее и сговорчивее.”106 (The Frenchman is more compliant and compliant) He goes so far as to ascribe this to a general air of English superiority that culminates in “англичанин везде одевается, завтракает, ходит, и мыслит по-английски.”107 (The Englishman dresses, breakfasts, walks and thinks likes an

104 P. Makarov, op. cit., p. 128
105 M. Mikhailov, op. cit., p. 362
106 P. Viazemskii, op. cit., p. 181
107 Ibid, p. 181
Englishman wherever he is. This offers an early image of English chauvinism. This will reappear in later literature where the English are depicted in situations abroad by such authors as Goncharov and Tolstoi who depict the relationships of the English with foreigners as one-sided, and conducted totally according to English expectations. The English behaviour in such stories as *Fregat Pallada* and ‘Liutsem’, in particular, and also later in Zamiatin's ‘Ostrovitiane' is founded in the style of self-assuredness depicted in early travel literature. Here the English come across as arrogant and inflexible.

Mikhailov’s depiction of English rigidity in his discussion focuses on friendship. The English are once again posited against the French and the Russians. “Интимные отношения, которые так легко завязываются у нас и во Франции, теряют очень много ценности в сравнении с такого же рода отношениями в Англии.”¹⁰⁸ (Intimate friendships which are forged so easily by us and in France, lose a lot of value when compared with similar relationships in England) But reserve and conformity also make Russian thinkers contemplate the role of history. Khomiakov discusses the English respect for their history: “Англия меняется медленнее других земель.”¹⁰⁹ (England changes more slowly than other countries.) This is a notion that is also present in Chaadaev's writings. In his *Philosophical Letters*, Chaadaev writes of how the English revere their past and move forward taking into account the lessons of the past and building upon them for the future. This, he contrasts with the Russian tendency to move from epoch to epoch and from trend to trend, meaning that the Russians have little concept of the past, and that their history is just a series of

¹⁰⁸ M. Mikhailov, op. cit, p. 361
ideas.\textsuperscript{110} Viazemskii states this in his travel notes: “Русский, с легкой руки Петра I, легко поддается чужим обычаям.”\textsuperscript{111} (The Russian, with the help of Peter I, easily gives itself up to others’ customs.) Dostoevskii later expands upon this notion that the adoption of other cultures is the defining strength of Russian identity. He contrasts this flexibility to a bourgeois, utopian hell as personified by the England he portrays in his Zimnie zametki o letnikh vpechatleniiakh (Winter Notes on Summer Impressions); this perhaps is the most articulate elaboration on how completely alien England is for Russians.

Such depictions of English society in Russian travel literature provide real-life examples of Englishness. This becomes a means for defining Russia’s national identity which will inform literary productions. Travel writing shows an early attempt to discern Russian identity in the context of the West, where the Russian is seen as cosmopolitan and well versed in European culture and customs. The inability to depict English life, cultural mores and traditions in an entirely unfavourable light and the persistent contrasts between Russian and English living standards keep suggesting, however, the precariousness of the portrait of ‘European’ Russia. Combined with the negative portrayal of English self-assurance and its perceived emotional sterility, this suggests an early expression of the insecure, semi-European, semi-Asian identity which is noticeable in later prose.

\textsuperscript{110} P. Tchaadaev, Lettres Philosophiques, Addressées à une Dame, (Paris: Librairie des Cinq Continents, 1970), pp. 56-57
\textsuperscript{111} P. Viazemskii, op. cit., p. 181
CHAPTER TWO
THE FICTIONAL REPRESENTATION OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND

Karamzin’s description of the English Sunday is one of the earliest Russian accounts of religion in England. Karamzin’s matter-of-fact tone suggests that he is merely reporting on the events in question. The evocation of the image of Yorick, the archetypal sentimental character, makes this appear to be a typical, idyllic English scene. However, the descriptions of the occasion rather contradict this impression. The traveller will remark upon those aspects of the other culture which are unexpected or appear strange. For Karamzin, then, the scene is rather artificial in its orderliness. He comments upon the structured, regimented nature of this event, where the congregation is organised according to family status. He also assumes that the individuals’ prayers are coldly materialistic. They request, rather than love, peace or conservation of family, which would fit in with the sentimental tones of the description, the ‘preservation of what they already have.’

The fictional representation of religion in England expands upon Karamzin’s early observations, forming a significant part of the overall picture of ‘Englishness’ in

1 N. Karamzin, op. cit, pp. 567-568
Russian prose from 1855 to 1917. The image portrayed of religion in England helps to formulate Russian identity in contrasting Orthodoxy with English religiosity. This chapter will therefore investigate the development of religion in Russia and Britain and the relationship of church and state in the two countries. This will provide a background for examining the fictional representations of religion in England and how they help to construct an impression of a distinct portrait of Russian nationality.

Scholars tend to agree that religion played a large part in the early formation of national identity. Anthony Smith, in his National Identity, argues that "Religious communities are often closely related to ethnic identities ... most religious communities coincided with ethnic groups..." This is a useful insight into both English and Russian national identities. Traditional perceptions of Russia's history follow Smith's line of reasoning, finding that pre-Petrine Russia had a strong ethnic core that was united in its strong religious identity and adherence to the Orthodox Church. The adoption of Orthodoxy by the Kievan State in 988 was intended to facilitate state and nation formation by strengthening Prince Vladimir's hold over his vast and disparate territories. In addition it was intended to articulate a spiritual force for national identity, in replacing the diverse pagan beliefs with one faith, promoting the unity of these peoples under the one sovereign. The adoption of the fully developed Orthodox religion from Byzantium greatly assisted in this goal. The Kievan State had little tradition of scholarship and thus embraced Byzantine culture, learning and architecture in addition to the Orthodox religion. The various peoples and social groups began to observe the new faith and the Church was able to exercise
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2 A. Smith, op. cit., pp. 6-7
3 V. Tolz, op. cit, pp. 3-4; N. Riasanovsky, (1993), op. cit., pp. 120-123, 197-198
4 S. Franklin, "Identity and Religion", in S. Franklin & E. Widdis (eds), National Identity in Russian Culture: An Introduction, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 100
its influence in all areas of everyday life. It began to regulate, for example, dress, food and marriage, not only compelling obedience and observation of its rituals, but also spreading a lasting culture which proved an effective means of national and social control.\(^5\)

The Church had provided the impetus for uniting the people during Russia's occupation by the Mongols and Tartars and during the Time of Troubles at the beginning of the seventeenth century. It provided a constant entity with which the population could identify in times of social upheaval. The election of the Romanov dynasty was proclaimed by a charter issued by the *Zemskii Sobor*\(^6\) to have occurred expressing the wish of the Orthodox Christians of the Moscow state.\(^7\) Thus the Church conferred the role of religious protector on the tsar, ascribing to him an almost divine right to rule. This was used to bolster the legitimacy of the autocracy and the Church until autocracy's collapse in 1917. In this manner the tsars used the Church as a political tool, and they perceived the state as God's secular arm on earth.\(^8\) This meant that the boundaries of Church and state affairs tended to be blurred and religious concerns became subordinated to national interests and ambitions.\(^9\) As such, Russia's history and national myths are inextricably bound up with religious concerns. As Smith points out, "[m]embership of the [religious] community became fixed, largely because of fear of religious foes outside."\(^{10}\) Wars were fought in the name of defending the Church from perceived foreign infidels and heretics. The election of the

---

6 The Zemskii Sobor, or 'Assembly of the Land', was a council comprised of the boyars, the clergy and the service gentry. It met sporadically when the tsar needed to mobilise his supporters. For further information on the Zemskii sobor see N. Riasanovsky, (1993), op. cit., pp., 188-191; J. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe*, (London & New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 99-101
7 See V. Tolz, op. cit., p. 4
10 A. Smith, op. cit., pp. 6-7
Romanovs was under the threat of Polish, Catholic, intervention; thus the Russian lands backed the new tsar who saved Orthodoxy from the supposed threat of heresy. The myths of Moscow as the Third Rome and of ‘Holy Rus’, the land of the Christ-like tsar and his chosen people, and the defender of the ‘one true faith’ were forged during the time of Muscovite Rus when the Church was at the height of its power, and perpetuated by the Romanovs throughout their three hundred year reign. Such narratives are also imperative for creating a sense of national unity. These myths also bolstered a sense of superiority for Russians in the face of the Western states. The perpetuation of the myth of Holy Rus, protecting the original, true faith extolled the concepts of Russia’s humility and obedience, which were perceived as the main virtues of Orthodox Christianity. These traits were considered to be the opposite of contemporaneous Western forms of Christianity. The Western forms of Christianity had developed traditions of learning and discovery from the Romans and extolled the virtues of constant growth and development. They also thrived on the material wealth that ensued from these endeavours. The Orthodox Church thus proved to be an exclusive force which isolated Russia from the Catholic, and later Protestant, countries of Western Europe. Reinforcing its geopolitical marginality vis-à-vis Europe, this religious isolation forced Russia to the periphery of the continent in ideological terms, too. Russian national thought and character fused with Orthodox culture with its suspicion of foreign religions, its emphasis on and call to meekness, humility, obedience, poverty and its reliance on the Orthodox faith as the source of its

uniqueness. It also instilled tendencies towards self-depreciation and insecurity towards the West which are manifest in the Russian Church’s exalted claims to be the preserver of the ‘true’ faith in the face of Western ‘heretics’.

In subordinating the Church to the state, Peter did not weaken the notion of Orthodox Christianity as the main facet of Russia’s identity; if anything it was strengthened as it brought the Church under greater control of the autocrat’s machinations and bolstered the supposed legitimacy of the sovereign. The later tsars still relied upon the authority of the church to support the legitimacy of their rule. Orlando Figes writes that “in a largely peasant country like Russia, where most of the population was illiterate, the Church was an essential propaganda weapon and means of social control.” In addition to worship, it continued to be used to cement the image of the tsar as a God-like figure on Earth. The liturgy as the main expression of Orthodox belief was the principal form of catechisation in which the priests were expected to extol the virtues of the tsars and condemn any dissention. They were obliged to inform the authorities of any subversive elements in their parish, and to teach children obedience to the tsar and authorities in their lessons. The concepts of private contemplation and individualism which were instilled in the Western forms of Christianity were frowned upon in favour of communal worship. This afforded the authorities a greater means of control. In addition to this, strengthening Orthodoxy’s claims to be the true religion of the Russian people, from the earliest days of Russia’s conversion, Orthodox Christians were afforded the greatest legal freedoms in

15 N. Zernov, (1962), op. cit., 262-263
16 J. Brooks writes in his When Russia Learned to Read that in Russian literature, up until the middle decades of the nineteenth century the two main facets of Russian identity were loyalty to the Orthodox Church and to the tsar. J. Brooks, op. cit., p. 221
17 O. Figes, op. cit., p. 63
comparison to other faiths. Figes states: "To be Russian was to be Christian and a member of the Orthodox faith." There existed two main groups in the tsardom: Orthodox believers and non-Orthodox, or all others. The tsar - the defender of Orthodoxy as the state religion - in his capacity as ruler of non-Russian others, whilst providing for their spiritual needs, was not compelled to grant their religions the privileges reserved for the Orthodox Church. Freedom of conscience was not a policy followed by the tsarist regime. Besides, the Church branded those who opposed the Tsar’s rule as heretics. In turn the tsars’ law-enforcers punished those who opposed interpretations issued by the Church’s hierarchy.

The deep-seated and patriarchal nature of the Russian Orthodox Church is a significant feature which heightens its isolation from the rest of Christianity. Its primary appeal is aesthetic. It retains a strong emphasis on the external aspects of worship and its magical elements, the performing of the liturgy and participation by all in the service. As we said, its focus was on the community, rather than the individual. The reverence for icons and veneration of the saints is further evidence of the humility of Orthodoxy and is also a constant reaffirmation of the faith making it resistant to change and perpetuation of tradition. Isolation from the intellectual currents of Western Europe prevented the Renaissance or a Western-style Reformation movement from reaching Russia. As Chaadaev wrote, Russia had been cut off from the main branch of Christianity: "En un mot, les nouvelles destinées du genre humain ne s’accomplissoient pas pour nous. Chrétiens, le fruit du christianisme ne mûrisait pas pour nous." (In a word, the new destinies of the human race were
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not accomplished by us. Although we were Christians, the fruit of Christianity did not mature for us.) Russia lacked the traditions of social and intellectual exchanges and theological scholarship of the West that allowed the questioning of the Church and its politics and allowed for its reform.

The seventeenth-century schism of the Old Believers was, in a sense, the opposite of the Reformation in Europe whereby the dissidents broke with the United Catholic Church as a result of the Church’s resistance to changes to its theology and doctrines. The schism of the Old Believers was the result of an attempt by the Patriarch to institute changes in custom in line with the Greek Orthodox Church. He believed their practices to be more correct and traditional than those of the Russian Church. The dissenters split from the official church believing the reforms to be heretical and against the original faith, rather than a revival of the moral and spiritual vigour thereof. The ‘Old Believers’, although still technically of the Orthodox faith, were persecuted for heresy along with those of other sects and faiths. Thus the Church retained its earlier forms and did not develop, furthering its claims to be the protector of the original, true faith.

The preservation of the church forms of the ancestors was capitalised upon in the 1830s by Nicholas I’s Minister of Education, Sergei Uvarov. He formulated the so-called Doctrine of ‘Official Nationality’, Orthodoxy – Autocracy – National Identity, which we mentioned in the Introduction to this dissertation. This was an official project to construct a coherent Russian national identity with which to educate the
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24 For further information on the schism, see G. Michels, *At War With the Church: Religious Dissent in Seventeenth-Century Russia*, (Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), esp. pp. 3-18
people. The authorities aimed to bridge the ever-widening gap between the Westernised, increasing secularised, nobility and the Russian peasantry. It was also intended to reinforce the divine status of the autocrat. It was to underpin the traditional forms of Russian identity to overcome the threats posed by European revolutions and currents of social change. The 1825 Decembrist revolt had proved to the government that Western-style independent thought could prove dangerous to autocracy. With the proclamation of an official nationality, the autocracy sought to preserve the status quo. It was designed to focus upon, and preserve, the traditional means of Russian identity and the sources of its uniqueness. It also follows official policy, successfully attributing Russian national identity to Orthodoxy, excluding the non-Orthodox and thus non-Russian peoples of the Empire and confirming Orthodoxy's privileged status.

The notion of 'Official Nationality' was acceptable neither to the Slavophiles nor to the Westernisers. The concern of both of these factions was to define a true Russian identity and debate Russia's place vis-à-vis the West. Whereas the Westernisers down-played the significance of religion in Russia, the Slavophiles argued that Russia's identity was bound-up in the organic unity and equality inherent in Orthodoxy. They affirmed the superiority of Russia and of Orthodoxy and relentlessly attacked the Catholic Church of Rome for its excessive reason and rationalism, which were the antithesis of Orthodox thought. They looked to the peasant commune as the preserver of the pre-Petrine, traditional Orthodox way of life. They argued that Peter's Westernising reforms had diluted the faith in separating the Europeanised gentry from the majority of the people and the traditional way of life. Thus Orthodoxy was

26 N. Riasanovsky, (1993), op. cit., p. 324
increasingly seen by both parties as a religion of the uneducated, unenlightened peasantry.

Scholars have debated the true extent of religious feeling amongst the peasantry in the nineteenth century. This is partially as a result of the existence of Russia’s ‘dvoeverie’, the coexistence of Christianity with superstitious and pagan elements. It has been suggested that the peasants were not un-religious, merely that their religion was adapted from place-to-place according to the conditions of their lives. According to Orlando Figes the average peasants assumed the external requirements of Christianity: they participated in the liturgy and attended Church, but were in reality profoundly un-spiritual. Latimer attributes a lack of interest in religious matters amongst the peasantry to the lack of any theological knowledge of the village priests. Western Christianity was dependent on knowledge and discussion of the Gospels and Scripture. Debates about them and differing interpretations were encouraged in order to foster greater theological education and sophistication. In Russia, however, the lower Orthodox clergy were largely impoverished and uneducated and thus had no skills to assert the legitimacy of Orthodoxy. They were merely assured of its correctness and that non-Orthodox views were heretical.

In more recent scholarship, however, there have been attempts to review this picture and show the official church to be in accordance with, rather than separate

---

30 O. Figes, op. cit., pp. 66-67
31 R. Latimer, op. cit., p. 60
32 Ibid, p. 60
from, the popular church patronised by the peasantry and the workers in the cities.\textsuperscript{33} Vera Shevzov, for example, argues that the sheer numbers of unofficial chapels in the countryside affirm that religion was more than an obligation in peasant life.\textsuperscript{34} Scott Kenworthy argues that the majority of workers in the cities were deeply devoted to their religious duties and in the years until 1917 the Orthodox Church initiated programmes to reach out and re-educate society in the faith.\textsuperscript{35} The concept of Orthodoxy as a stalwart of Russian identity was prevalent in Russian society in all strata. A survey undertaken in 1937 shows the extent to which many Russians still saw themselves as Orthodox Christians, even despite the enforced atheism of the Soviet state.\textsuperscript{36} This suggests the depth to which Orthodox thought permeated the Russian sense of identity. Russian literature confirms that Orthodoxy was a part of life with a strong hold on society.\textsuperscript{37} By the mid-nineteenth century, debates about true Russian identity and Russia’s uniqueness, the contrasting of Orthodoxy to other religions find eloquent representation in Russian fiction.

Whereas Orthodoxy had separated from the other Christian faiths, Anglicanism occupies a middle position between Protestantism and Catholicism. The Orthodox, in fact, often saw the Church of England, as the closest in Europe to the Russian Church.\textsuperscript{38} It thus received a great deal of attention in nineteenth century Russia in discussions about the possible unification of the Christian Church. Khomiakov, in

\textsuperscript{33} G. Freeze, op. cit., pp. 95-98; S. Kenworthy, 'An Orthodox Social Gospel in Late-Imperial Russia', \textit{(Religion and Society in Central and Eastern Europe, Vol. I, 2006)}, pp. 1-29
\textsuperscript{34} V. Shevzov, 'Chapels and the Ecclesial World of Pre-revolutionary Russian Peasants', \textit{(Slavic Review, Vol. 55, No. 3, 1996)}, pp. 585-613
\textsuperscript{35} S. Kenworthy, op. cit., pp. 26-27
\textsuperscript{37} See, for example, Tolstoi's depictions of Orthodox church services in \textit{Voskresenie}, L. Tolstoi, \textit{Voskresenie}, (Moskva: Eksmo, 2005), pp. 135-136, N. Leskov, \textit{Melochi arkhiepiskop zhitni},
\textsuperscript{38} J. Muckle, \textit{Nikolai Leskov and the "Spirit of Protestantism,"} (Birmingham: Birmingham Slavonic Monographs, 1978), pp. 3-4
particular, found the Anglican faith similar, in principal, to Orthodoxy. He argued that the English as a people were closest to Russians for their religious feeling and the observance of the Sunday.\textsuperscript{39} Sure enough, the concept of the English Sabbath intrigued Karamzin, as we noted earlier. Khomiakov believed that the independence of the Church of England from the Roman Church had assisted England’s rise to be such a great and powerful nation. But in Khomiakov’s view, reflecting Karamzin’s opinion, the spirit of commercialism of the Church had corrupted it and overtaken its true religious substance. It is precisely because of his view that the Church of England is closest to the Orthodox in dogma that Khomiakov criticises so sharply the petty, mercenary nature of the Church of England:\textsuperscript{40}

Neither a tradition nor a doctrine, but a mere establishment, and therefore a moribund thing ... like a narrow isthmus of sand beaten by the powerful waves of two enemy oceans, the Anglican Church crumbles into Romanism and Dissent. In principal it belongs to Orthodoxy, but is kept outside by its petty historical provinciality.\textsuperscript{41}

The castigation of what Khomiakov perceives as the lack of spirituality in the Church of England is furthered in his poem, ‘Ostrov’ (‘The Island’), in which he prophesies that the lack of religious feeling in favour of blatant commercialism is to be England’s downfall:

Но за то, что ты лукава,  
Но за то, что ты горда,  
Что тебе мирская слава  
Выше Божьего Суда;  
Но за то, что Церковь Божью Святотатственной рукой  
Приковала ты к подножью  
Власти суетной, земной: ... \textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{39} A. Khomiakov, op. cit., p. 109  
\textsuperscript{40} W. Birkbeck, \textit{Russia and the English Church}, (London: Rivington, Percival & co., 1895), p. xxix  
\textsuperscript{41} A. Khomiakov, quoted in R. Hare, \textit{Pioneers of Russian Social Thought}, (London: Oxford University Press, 1951), p. 124  
(But for this that thou art wicked;
But, for this that thou art proud;
That thou settest worldly greatness
Higher than the throne of God
That with sacrilegious daring
Thou Christ's church has trampled down,
Chaining her unto the footstool
Of a fleeting earthly throne; -....) 43

Both Khomiakov's God and the earthly god of capitalism are placed on identical thrones; however, he accuses the English Church of making spirituality subservient to the mundane needs of commercialism and prestige. In his poem, Khomiakov expresses thoughts which are a forerunner of the ideas of Dostoevskii and Zamiatin regarding the Western Christian Churches, and the Church of England in particular. They all regard the Western Churches as spiritually bankrupt and materialist. Dostoevskii, in particular, like Khomiakov believes that the Western Churches will eventually get their comeuppances, when the 'true faith', Russian Orthodoxy, will outlast the 'fleeting' earthly fashion. It implies that whatever else the Russian Church may be, it at least is not hollow as its English counterpart.

Although the principals of the English Church may be construed as similar to those of the Orthodox faith, the actual practices of the Church of England differ greatly from Orthodoxy. Like the other Protestant faiths, and of course Orthodoxy, the Church of England is independent of the Pope. This affirms the Protestant idea of a community of all believers. This is not entirely dissimilar to the Orthodox principals of a community of worshippers. The Protestant concept of 'justification by faith' is closer to Orthodoxy than to the Catholic doctrines of salvation. 44 However, the Church of England stresses the individual's relationship to God and the importance of

---

43 Translation by W. Palmer, quoted in W. Birkbeck, op. cit., p. 224
44 J. Muckle, (1978), op. cit., pp. 16-17
inward meaning over the external displays of worship.\textsuperscript{45} This is alien to Orthodoxy where faith is construed as participation of the community in external forms of worship. It also maintains the belief in the infallibility of the community as a whole, which is a fundamental aspect of Russia’s national identity.

Again, like Russia, England is a Christian country whose patriotic identity in the nineteenth century was closely tied to religion. Like the tsar, the English monarch, had, since the Protestant Reformation under Henry VIII, been the defender of the state religion. British identity as a whole is predicated upon Protestant identity which was affirmed by Parliament and the assurances of a Protestant monarchy. The Church of England afforded England a confident sense of its national identity and individuality in opposition to its Catholic neighbours and main rivals, France and Spain.\textsuperscript{46}

The Church of England adheres to the Protestant belief of the community of all believers, whilst its structures and hierarchies are based on those of the Catholic Church. In contrast to the rigours of Orthodoxy, the doctrines of the Church of England are wide enough to encompass several different beliefs, from those who professed to be following Catholicism without the Pope, to true Calvinist Protestants and more evangelical factions.\textsuperscript{47} The reasons for this wide-ranging doctrine are various: Christianity had developed in Roman Britain since its first appearance in the second century, following various influences including Celtic Christianity and Roman Catholicism.\textsuperscript{48} In addition, the Church had always been allowed to develop according to national specificities, rather than adopt a religion wholesale from another

\textsuperscript{45} S. Neill, \textit{Anglicanism}, (London: Mowbray, 1985), p. 119  
\textsuperscript{47} S. Neill, op. cit., pp. 118-121  
civilisation. Even when a part of the Universal Roman Church, England had retained a level of religious independence and national specificity in its legal and trading agreements with the other Catholic nations. This assisted England's rise as an independent trading nation.\(^{49}\) The Protestant reliance on knowledge of Scripture and the Gospels allowed for differences of interpretation and belief. This affords the Church the ability to widen its doctrines still further to encompass new interpretations and adapt to the changing needs of society.\(^{50}\) This is profoundly different from the idea of Orthodoxy where it is believed that the faith itself must not change, but the Church should be able to transform social or national life gradually by working within its members' 'hearts.'\(^{51}\) The adoption of a new religion in a form that was peculiar to England was a basis for consolidating national identity. It allowed the Church to be more forward-looking to meet its members' needs. In Russia the traditionalism of Orthodoxy prevented its development - the country's sense of uniqueness was tied to this rigidity.

Since the Reformation and the founding of the Protestant government, the Church and state had co-existed with the monarch as the nominal head of the Church of England. Parliament had helped to foster and protect this strong sense of Protestant identity by altering the laws of succession to ensure that only a Protestant monarch could gain the throne.\(^{52}\) To unite Protestant society, the Dissenters from the main church, i.e. those who accepted the Holy Trinity, were allowed the legal right to worship openly.\(^{53}\) This highlights a fundamental difference from the idea of religion

\(^{49}\) S. Neill, op. cit., p. 119
\(^{51}\) J. Muckle, op. cit., p. 19
\(^{52}\) L. Colley, op. cit., pp. 19; This was the Bill of Rights, 1689, abandoning the laws of succession so that only a Protestant monarch can gain the British throne.
\(^{53}\) Ibid, p. 51
in Russia. The non-Orthodox, or Orthodox dissenters in Russia, such as the Old Believers were persecuted by the state during periods of enforced Russification.54

In England, although tolerated by law, dissenters from the Church of England, and especially Roman Catholics who were only afforded the right to worship openly in 1829, were nevertheless frowned upon in English society. Anglicans were afforded greater privileges and were elevated in social status by virtue of belonging to the preferred in-group of religious adherence.55 Often the dissenters from the main church belonged to the lower social classes, breaking away from the rigours of social conformity fostered by the church. It was common for the richer landowning families to present gifts to the Church in return for special attentions from the vicar, and for the status afforded by having one's own private place of worship. Consequently, the Church became more of a middle and upper class institution that maintained the social status quo, particularly in the industrialised cities where the working classes had little time for the church. Besides, the Church was not especially conscious of the needs of the poor. The vicar became predominantly a moral guide for the rich, preaching on the correct modes of behaviour, rather than offering spiritual guidance.56

The emphasis of the Church of England on social decorum in lieu of spirituality is the focus of much biting social criticism from the eighteenth century onwards in England as well as abroad. English literature, particularly the nineteenth century classic realist novel of the type of Dickens or Trollope, contains a wealth of references to the lack of compassion amongst the Anglican clergy and a lack of true religious piety. In nineteenth-century Russia, there was a popular tradition of

54 R. Pipes, op. cit., p. 243
56 Ibid, pp. 1-2
serialising and commenting upon works by English authors in the so-called ‘thick’ journals.\(^{57}\) Therefore the educated Russian would have plenty of ‘authoritative’ sources of knowledge about England. We know that the influence of English literature in its depictions of England’s social ills and hypocritical sterility was greatly felt in educated Russian society.\(^{58}\) Many of Russia’s major authors have acknowledged a debt to this kind of English prose. Tolstoi’s correspondence, for example, attests to this fact.\(^{59}\) He not only writes of their impact on him personally, but the casual way in which he mentions the titles of English works in his letters suggests the familiarity of his correspondent with them as well. He wrote that Trollope and Dickens, both harsh commentators on the Church of England, were of great, even of ‘enormous’ importance to him.\(^{60}\) Dickens’ novels also had a great influence on Dostoevskii, who was one of the most prominent nineteenth-century critics of religion in England. As is well known, Dickens is particularly caustic in his criticism of England’s ‘charitable’ organisations and those who run them. Take, for example Dickens’ observations in *Oliver Twist*, moments after the child’s birth when Oliver’s fate is being decided: “Oliver cried lustily. If he could have known that he was an orphan, left to the tender mercies of churchwardens and overseers, perhaps he would have cried the louder.”\(^{61}\) In his prose, the Church’s instructions are used as a form of social discipline, lacking in spiritual teachings, and furthering the goals of those in power.


\(^{58}\) Katarskii discusses the influence of Dickens’ works on Russian authors, arguing that they were the most influential in establishing the realist method in Russia. I. Katarskii, *Dikks v Rossii. Seredena XIX v.*, (Moskva: izdatel’svo truda, 1966), pp. 220-221


\(^{60}\) Ibid, p. 234

.... [There was] a general supplication of the boys, containing a special clause therein inserted by the authority of the board in which they entreated to be made good, virtuous, contented and obedient, and to be guarded from the sins and vices of Oliver Twist: whom the supplication distinctly set forth to be under the exclusive patronage and protection of the powers of wickedness, and an article direct from the manufactory of the Devil himself.62

The social leaders, here 'the board', not only use religion as a disciplinary tool, but they use the perceived respectability afforded by their association with the Church to further their own social ambitions and grow wealthy at the expense of those they are charged with aiding.

The works of Dickens inform Dostoevskii's portrayal of England and its population.63 Dostoevskii's depiction of English faith is reminiscent of Dickens' derisive representation of the hypocritical Church of England in his images of sermonising, two-faced evangelicals.64 Dostoevskii, following his Siberian exile, took great interest in religious problems and devoted much of his work to exploring and discussing them. He used his Dnevnik pisatelia (The Diary of a Writer)65 as a forum for deliberating religion and society in Russia and the West. In the entry for April 1876, Dostoevskii defines Orthodoxy as the main stalwart of Russian identity, arguing that Russia is separated from Europe, and could not be European because of its faith.66 Dostoevskii constantly elevates Russian Orthodoxy and Russian national identity to a superior position. He rearticulates and sustains the concept that a person who is not of
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62 Ibid, pp. 59-60
63 For a discussion of Dickens’ influence on Dostoevskii and echoes of Dickens’ characters in Dostoevskii’s own oeuvre see N. Lary, op. cit.
64 For example, we can see Mrs Clennam in Little Dorrit as a character of this 'type'. For further information on Dostoevskii’s literary influences in Russia see D. Fanger, op. cit.
65 Hereafter to be referred to as simply Dnevnik
66 F. Dostoevskii, Dnevnik pisatelia, op. cit., pp. 286-291
the Russian Orthodox faith cannot be Russian: thus he derides non-Russian religions and promotes Russian nationalism. Discussing England in the March 1876 entry of his *Dnevnik*, Dostoevskii finds that a source of England’s individuality is its Protestant faith. He argues further that the English are a religious people at heart but that their faith divides into several sects. "Вспомним, что англичане, в огромном большинстве, народ в высшей степени религиозный: они жаждут веры и интуит ее бесперерывно, но, вместо религии, несмотря на государственную «английскую» веру, растянуты на сотни сект." (We are reminded that the vast majority of the English are people who are religious: they thirst for belief and search for it constantly, but despite the ‘Anglican’ state religion, they scatter into a hundred sects.) Such splitting of religion into separate faiths is, in his opinion, corrupting and thus he concludes that the English are lacking in a true sense of spirituality. Dostoevskii’s thoughts in this case are very similar to those of Khomiakov, which we discussed above. He again assumes the superiority of Orthodoxy, as it has an enduring hold on the people – a hold, which the Church of England, the state religion, lacks. For him, Orthodoxy’s spiritual superiority over the English religion connects to the utilitarian nature of the latter. Sarah Hudspith argues that Dostoevskii’s concept of *sobornost*, in *Dnevnik pisatel’ia* and other non-fiction works is a natural successor to that of Khomiakov and Kireevsky. She posits that Dostoevskii’s thoughts on religion in England show his viewpoint as becoming more and more Slavophile in orientation as he believes that the Church of England has fallen prey to rationalism at the expense

68 F. Dostoevskii, *Dnevnik pisatel’ia*, op. cit., pp. 266-267
69 Ibid, p. 266
of spirituality and *sobornost* which Orthodoxy embodies. Dostoevskii argues that religion in England is thought of as beneficial to the individual: "... Это дело рассматривается лишь единственно с точки зрения его полезности английскому." (It is something which is considered only from the point of view of its benefit to the Englishman.) Dostoevskii quotes an acquaintance of his who remarked that "все молящиеся не верят в Бога ... затем, что отвернув Бога, они поклонились «Человечеству»." (The worshippers do not believe in God ... Then, repudiating God, they worshipped "Humanity"). The Church is easily corruptible to the will of the individual which is why there is such abuse of the Institution. Thus, he argues, the English Church is a "Церковь атеистов" (A church of Atheists), which believes in humanity, rather than God and is thus reduced to an earthly institution devoid of true spirituality.

The ideas Dostoevskii expresses in his *Dnevnik* show little deviation from those he wrote about in 1863 in his *Zimnie zametki o letnykh vpetchatleniakh* (*Winter Notes on Summer Impressions*). This piece is ostensibly a record of Dostoevskii’s trip to Europe in 1862. In fact, it is more a series of essays on Western civilisation, than a true travel narrative, evoking the works of Russian thinkers, including Chaadaev and Belinskii, for example. Joseph Frank argues that Dostoevskii’s goal with this work is "to convey that European civilization is based on a soulless, heartless materialism, and to imply by contrast – in virtue of his own reaction as a Russian – that such a civilization is inimical and anti-pathetic to the Russian spirit." He is rather successful in his endeavour. In the section on England, Dostoevskii finds that the
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71 Ibid, pp. 54-55
72 F. Dostoevskii, *Dnevnik pisatel’ia*, op. cit., pp. 267-268
73 Ibid, pp. 267
Church is directly at fault for England’s societal ills, as it offers social, rather than spiritual, guidance in its capacity as a mercenary, capitalist institution. He discusses the differences between the Anglican and Catholic clergy in English society: “Каконачный священник сам выследит и ворется в бедное семейство какого-нибудь работника. ... Он всех накормит, оденет, обогреет, начнет лечить больного, покупает лекарство, делается другом дома и под конец обращает всех в католичество.”75 (The Catholic priest himself will track down and force his way into the poor family of some labourer... He will feed and clothe all of them, bring them heat, start healing the sick, buy medicines, become a friend to the household, and end up converting them all to Catholicism.) It seems that Dostoevskii has little time for the Catholic priest who tends to the poor and the sick in society. The priest’s charity is pressed upon the unwitting family, whom he has tracked down without invitation. As Dostoevskii sees it, this help is offered in order to convert the lower echelons of society away from the established church. However, he implies the fault for the Catholic Church’s ability to tempt people into their fold lies with the established Church of England, as this is the institution to which to belong in order to achieve social prominence. He is rather scathing about the Anglican priests, who, he finds, eschew the company of the poor and the sick, preferring the hospitality and the patronage of the rich: “Англиканский же священник не пойдет к бедному... Англиканские священники и епископы горды и богаты, живут в богатых приходах и жиреют в совершенном спокойствии совести.”76 (The Anglican priest will not go to the poor. ... Anglican priests are proud and wealthy, live in parishes and grow fat with their consciences completely at peace.) It is with this picture that the image of the ‘Englishman’ is connected. The English religion is, to Dostoevskii,

75 F. Dostoevskii, Zimnie zametki o letnikh vpechatleniakh, in F. Dostoevskii, Sobranie Sochinenia v piatnadtsati tomakh, t. 4, (Leningrad: Nauka, 1989), p. 396
76 Ibid, p. 397
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practical and mercenary. He remarks that “[в]едных и в церковь не пускают, потому что им нечем заплатить за место на скамье.”77 (They do not allow the poor into the church because they have no money with which to pay for a place on the pew.) For the Russian Orthodox imagination, within which humility and poverty were fundamental aspects of national identity, the English faith provides a direct opposite and is thus perceived as insincere (once again implying Russian Orthodoxy’s superiority). Dostoevskii’s impressions from his time in England thus leave the reader with the suggestion that whatever Orthodoxy may be, it is at least better than this hypocritical and sterile English religion.

Russian prose seems to perpetuate this image of religion in England. Much of its qualification of Russia’s own faith strongly distinguishes it from English Christianity. Religious images in fiction set in Russia are pervasive and subtle, designed to convey the place of faith as permeating everyday life. For example there are numerous instances where we meet peasants crossing themselves, churches are passed or mentioned in passing. These occurrences are not foregrounded in the text, yet are frequent enough to convey the all-encompassing nature of Russian faith in the construct of Russia’s identity. The priests themselves play a relatively minor part, as though they were merely the messengers and the everyday faith is the important message. In contrast, the most common representation of religion in England in a number of Russia’s novels and short stories is through the emphatic depiction of the figure of the clergyman. This includes, for example, Meshcherskii’s Lord-Apostol v bol’shom peterburgskom svete, Tolstoi’s Voskresenie, Gippius’s Sumerkhi dukha and Zamiatin’s short story, ‘Ostrovitiane’, which will all be discussed in the course of this
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77 Ibid, p. 397
chapter. English religion is represented by a character, a personality, rather than through a series of images depicting the harmonious fusion of religion and quotidian existence.

The English clergyman appears in a variety of plots, and when he is in Russia, he is usually shown to associate primarily with the Russian nobility with whom he finds some affinity. One of the earlier examples of the English clergyman has a real-life model in the person of Lord Radstock who travelled to preach in Russia during the religious revival of the 1870s and 1880s. Russia’s Westernised elite had become disillusioned with the ‘backwardness’ of the Orthodox Church through the course of the social upheaval in the nineteenth century. They perceived it as a part of Russia’s civil service, a mere department of the state. As society was modernising following the Emancipation of the Serfs of 1861, the Westernised groups looked towards Europe in search of innovating spiritual enlightenment. Interests in Protestantism, Atheism and Nonconformity in the new, more open climate of the 1870s led to a revival in interest about religious matters. This tier of the educated elite had become estranged from the established church as a result of its outmoded forms of worship, and subsequently came to suffer from a spiritual void. This made them susceptible to other forms of religion potentially capable of bridging this gap. Granville Waldegrave, third Baron Radstock, was a pioneer-missionary who undertook his first trip to Russia in winter 1873-74, and returned in winter 1875-76 in order to preach the Scriptures and disseminate copies of the Bible during the height of this revival. He preached to a group of the wealthy, Westernised members of St Petersburg’s high

79 See, for example, A. Karev, Russkoe evangelsko-baptistskoe dvizhenie, in *Al’manakh po istorii russkogo baptizma*, (Sankt peterburg: Bibliia dla vsekh, 1997), pp. 83-186
80 Ibid, pp. 72-73
society. Although Radstock did not profess to be a member of the official Church of England,\(^\text{81}\) he preached a Protestant-style evangelism, extolling simple piety and the reading of the Gospels.\(^\text{82}\) He was perceived in Russian letters as an 'English priest,' and was thus considered to be a representative figure of England’s religion. Radstock had a small following in the St Petersburg salons, but significantly, received more criticism in the society columns than praise.\(^\text{83}\) Dostoevskii wrote of him in his *Dnevnik* that he was fashionable in Russia because the small, educated tier of its aristocracy was divorced from the main body of the people and the Orthodox soil, wanting their own lifestyles and their own faith.\(^\text{84}\) In his article, ‘Dostoevsky, Zasetskaya and Radstockism’, Malcolm Jones shows the antipathy Dostoevskii showed towards the preacher and the milder view Leskov and Tolstoi held of the man and his faith.\(^\text{85}\) The fictional representations of Radstock vary in their interpretations of his preaching from the relatively mild portrayal of the man in Tolstoi’s *Voskresenie* (Resurrection) and Leskov’s *Velikosvetskii raskol* (A Schism in High Society), to the extremely critical depiction of the preacher in Prince Meshcherskii’s *Lord apostol v bol’shom peterburgskom svete* (A Lord Apostle in Petersburg’s High Society), which reads like a political treatise against Radstock, his faith and his upper-class followers.\(^\text{86}\)

\(^{82}\) Ibid, pp. 5-6  
\(^{83}\) Ibid, pp. 57-60  
\(^{84}\) F. Dostoevskii, *Dnevnik pisatel’ia*, op. cit., pp. 269-270  
Although the representations of Radstock differ in the degree of ferocity of their attacks on the preacher, all three texts negate the spiritual ideas he preaches in favour of the simpler values of the Russian faith and people. As we said, the least scathing portrayal is that of Tolstoi. Although Tolstoi is renowned for his dislike of the Orthodox Church, his work shows how fundamental religion was in all aspects of nineteenth-century Russian society. He uses the figure of the English preacher to provide a comparison. In an earlier article, Malcolm Jones argues that Tolstoi’s portrayal of the English preacher is hostile, almost bordering on caricature.\(^87\) I would argue that whilst it is certainly scathing of the preacher’s lack of compassion, it is not so much a hostile depiction, than a concern to portray indigenous values in a more positive light. In \textit{Voskresenie} Tolstoi alludes to a concept that he articulates further in his 1905 pamphlet ‘On the Significance of the Russian Revolution.’\(^88\) He finds that the Russian people have an inherent inner religiosity that is lacking in other nations, as Christianity has penetrated deeper into Russian culture than elsewhere.\(^89\) “Редкий день проходил, чтобы не было какого-нибудь отношения к внешним формам религии ...”\(^90\) (Hardly a day passed without some outward religious manifestation having been observed.) He shows the differing attitudes of the English vicar and the ordinary Russian people towards charity and kindness. Despite his notable aversion to the official Church, Tolstoi still believed in the main principals of Christian charity, humility and meekness which are embodied in Orthodoxy.\(^91\) He writes about the ordinary passers-by who meet the convicts on the road and generally show sincere sympathy towards them in an expression of Orthodox Russian belief. “Арестант -

\(^{87}\) M. Jones, (1972), op. cit., pp. 13-14
\(^{89}\) Ibid, pp. 565-566
\(^{90}\) L.Tolstoi, \textit{Voskresenie}, op. cit., p. 271
арестант, а все человек." (The prisoner may be a convict, but he is still a human being). For example, we see scenes of the transportation of prisoners and small gestures of kindness and Christian humility by the peasants as some offer the convicts monetary or food items: "Извозчики, лавочники, кухарки, рабочие, чиновники останавливались и с любопытством оглядывали арестантку ... Один деревенский мужик, продавший уголь и напившийся чая в трактире, подошел к ней, перекрестился и подал ей копейку." (Cabmen, tradespeople, cooks, workmen and government clerks stopped and looked curiously at the prisoner ... A peasant, who had sold his charcoal, and had had some tea in a tavern, went up to her, crossed himself, and gave her a Kopeck.) Notice that the tradespeople and the clerks merely watch the prisoners, whereas the peasant is the only one to offer such kindness. The novel is replete with similar scenes of social commentary and diatribes against the institutions of society: the legal system, prisons, the bureaucracy, and the association of Church and State. In these tracts, it is common for the ruling classes to be highly criticised for their abuse of the privileges afforded to them and their lack of ability to feel sympathy for fellow human beings. The English vicar falls firmly into this camp.

Where the Russian peasants show pity towards the prisoners, the English vicar, visiting in order to see the prison conditions in Russia, does not. He is a firm believer in the law and finds that the punishment for those who break the law is just. It is true
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92 L. Tolstoi, Voskresenie, op. cit., p. 322
93 Ibid, p. 10
96 L. Tolstoi, Voskresenie, op. cit., pp. 421-422
that the vicar visits the convicts. He makes a speech which sounds as though it is practiced and is hollow and condescending: "- Скажите им, что Христос жалел их и любил, - сказал он, - и умер за них. Если они будут верить в это, они спасутся."97 ("Tell them that Christ pitied and loved them," he said, "and died for them. If they believe in this they shall be saved.") He makes no attempt to explain his speech, expound any further or give advice. He merely says his piece, passes out Bibles and moves on: "Оказалось, что англичанин, кроме одной цели своего путешествия - описания ссылки и мест заключения в Сибири, имел еще другую цель - проповедование спасения верою и искуплением."98 (It turned out that besides studying the places of exile and the prisons of Siberia, the Englishman had another object in view, that of preaching salvation through faith and by the redemption.)

The English vicar’s concession to charity and faith is limited to distributing copies of the Bible and giving the same speech to every group of convicts. The narrator appears to find this is for show. It is portrayed as though it were a mere duty, rather than innate charity or faith: "Англичанин, раздав положенное число Евангелии, уже больше не раздавал и даже не говорил речей."99 (The Englishman, once he had distributed the allotted number of Testaments, gave away no more and gave no more speeches.) He sees no reason to dally and speak further with the prisoners or to assist them in any way. He has done his required preaching and he is clearly most comfortable with the rich families with whom he stays whilst in Russia.100 These Westernised upper-class folk are, Tolstoi tells us, divorced from Russian religious

97 Ibid, p. 418
98 Ibid, p. 418
99 Ibid, p. 420
100 Ibid, pp. 411-413
life. This is epitomised by Nekhliudov, the main protagonist in Voskresenie: "Как и все люди его круга и времени, он без малейшего усилия разорвал своим умственным ростом те пути религиозных суеверий, в которых он был воспитан."101 (Like everybody else in his social circle and generation he had as his intellect developed ... shaken off the restraints of the religious superstitions in which he had been reared ...) It seems that in this manner the Westernised portion of Russian society and the Englishman have an affinity. Wasiolk argues that, for Tolstoi, the substitution of generalised social codes and strictures has corrupted society by undermining the communality of the traditional culture.102 Tolstoi suggests that to this sphere of society, just as to his Englishman, and to the English as a whole, faith is not such an inherent part of life as it is to the ordinary Russian. The Church is a mere institution. It appears that 'English' religion is a social and intellectual pastime and lacks the innate spiritualism of the Russian variety of Christianity.

Leskov’s ‘Velikosvetkii raskol’ is an essay about Radstock’s visit to Russia. It was written to address some of the biting criticism in the press that Leskov felt to be unfair. It also contrasts the roles played by religion in society in England and Russia, through the depiction of the preacher himself, and of his followers. Leskov paints Radstock as a mild and kind-hearted man. He is nevertheless an un-intellectual, crude fanatic, and misguided in his teachings: “[M]ногое обличает в нем неясность и нелогичность мысли и путанницу понятий ... а порою он представляется даже как бы и в самом деле немногоскорбным головою.”103 ([T]here is much that

101 Ibid, p. 271
103 N. Leskov, Velikosvetkii raskol: Grenvii’ Valdigrev lord Redstok i ego posledovateli, (S-Peterburg: Tipografiia V. Tushnova, 1877), p. 99
reveals vagueness and illogicality of thought and confusion of concepts ... and at
times he even presents himself as if he were actually rather simple.\textsuperscript{104}) His followers
are not looking for true religious conversion, they are following the latest fashion.\textsuperscript{105}
Radstock is merely catering to their whims. Although ‘Velikosvetskii raskol’
criticises the Orthodox Church and its hierarchy for its overemphasis on outmoded
forms of worship, it is not a criticism of the Orthodox faith \textit{per se} and actually finds
Radstock’s Protestantism heretical. Leskov is sceptical of, and argues against, much
of the teaching of this religion, finding it distasteful that the word of God is
simplified.\textsuperscript{106}

Leskov also uses this article to emphasise the hold Orthodoxy has on Russian
society. Radstock’s followers in this tale appear curious as to what he has to say.
However, this inquisitiveness does not encourage Radstock’s followers to defect from
the Orthodox Church. Many of them, it appears, defend Orthodoxy even more after
hearing his sermons.\textsuperscript{107} As an opposing viewpoint, it is quite noteworthy that James
Muckle, in his afterword to the English translation of ‘Schism in High Society’,
suggests that Leskov’s comments about Radstock’s ineffectiveness were included on
purpose in order to get the work published and past the censor. This opinion is
questionable because Leskov’s comments in praise of the strength of Orthodoxy are in
keeping with the rest of the text: whilst criticising the Westernised hierarchy of the
Orthodox Church, Leskov is pointing to the everyday Orthodox faith as embodying a
truth which is lacking in the Protestant teachings of Radstock, and indeed in all

\textsuperscript{104} Translation from J. Muckle, (trans & ed), N. Leskov, \textit{Schism in High Society: Lord Radstock and
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid, p. 42
68-69
\textsuperscript{107} J. Muckle, (1978), op. cit., p. 107
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religions other than Russian Orthodoxy. In setting up this opposition of the two faiths, whether or not it was intended merely as a ruse to pass the censor’s pen, Leskov’s work, like Tolstoi’s, shows just how deeply Orthodoxy is embedded in Russian consciousness and how it is a fundamental aspect of Russian identity. Muckle himself hints at this: “the real cultural incompatibility here … rests in the curious identity of the religious with the national which was a feature of the old Russian mentality.”

Likewise, Prince Meshcherskii’s novel *Lord apostol v bol’shom peterburgskom svete*, contrasts Orthodoxy with Anglicanism. The traditional Russian faith is embodied in those who leave St. Petersburg, returning to the countryside, to seek the guidance of the Orthodox priests. They do not persevere with the supposedly empty teachings of the English ‘Lord Hitchik’ who has appeared suddenly out of nowhere to preach to Petersburg’s high society. The text sustains and re-articulates existing, unflattering, stereotypes of the English in its portrayal of the English preacher. Hitchik, a non-too veiled caricature of Lord Radstock, is comfortable in the salons, and vast country estates of the Petersburg aristocrats. He is shown from the beginning to fit into this society: “il y a un élégance, le comme il faut d’un homme du monde, он прекрасно говорит по-французски” (There is an elegance, as is necessary for a man of the world. He speaks French very well). What stands out is his air of respectability, not his teaching. The preacher is used as a means of showing how shallow westernised Russian society actually is. Its members are thrilled to have an English priest speaking to them. It is important to them that he fits in with their lifestyles. His presence is mere vanity on their part. He is accepted in their society
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because he is English: "английский пастор — это мой идеал"\(^{110}\) (An English pastor — that's my ideal). His external appearance is akin to their own, which means that he is considered to be 'civilised.' On this basis he is accepted as an appropriate member of this social circle, even before its members experience his sermons or understand his religion: "Он гораздо цивилизованнее наших попов." (He is far more civilised than our priests)\(^{111}\) Nevertheless, the instances in which his followers actually approach him for moral guidance show him to be useless, as he is incapable of advising anything other than to hand out books and pamphlets for his followers to read and reflect upon. The lack of longevity of his teachings highlights how ineffectual, and unnecessary, his preaching actually was. Hitchik’s preaching consists of his expounding upon a few passages from his Bible and individual prayers. His gatherings are contrasted unfavourably with the simple sessions of the Orthodox priests in the countryside. In the narrator’s opinion, these meetings offer seekers true spiritual guidance. Hitchik’s teachings, on the contrary, offer nothing of value.\(^{112}\) The narrator mocks the preacher’s suggestion, which his congregation eagerly follows, to set up a charitable organisation to send shoes to the poor in the countryside, as their attempt at spiritual salvation. This deed, the followers seem to believe, will lead to redemption for their sins, and assuage their guilt. Yet ironically, like English Protestantism, its followers are allowed to live their luxurious, Westernised lives without any disruption.\(^{113}\)

Leskov extends the idea of a cultural and religious incompatibility to his fictional works which deal with the English. His short story 'Levsha' ('The Left-Handed

\(^{110}\) Ibid, p. 22
\(^{111}\) Ibid, p. 22
\(^{112}\) E. Heier, op. cit., p. 63
\(^{113}\) Ibid, p. 64
Craftsman’) shows clearly the differences in religious feeling between Russian and English societies. The story itself deals with the rivalry between the two nations. The English present a minute steel flea to Emperor Alexander I to show off their superior craftsmanship. Some time later, Nicholas I, in an attempt to show Russia’s individuality and superiority vis-à-vis the West, orders his craftsmen to outshine the English and do something spectacular. They shoe the flea, and the left-handed craftsman is sent to England to see the reactions to Russia’s innate skills. Leskov associates the Russian characters all through the story with religious practices to portray the depth to which religion permeated life in Russia, in all spheres of society. For example, the Emperor himself returns to Russia, because he is depressed by the military situation and wishes to seek the guidance of his priest. “У государя от военных дел сделалась меланхолия, и он захотел духовную исповедь иметь в Таганроге у попа Федота.”114 (The military situation was making the sovereign melancholic and he wanted to go to confession to the priest Fedot at Taganrog.) The peasants are constantly crossing themselves. Platov, the Emperor’s aide accompanying him in Europe takes his religion with him: “[he] said his prayers in front of his travelling icon.”115 The simple craftsmen are well known for their piety and belief and through this they will justify the faith placed in them by the tsar on behalf of the Russian people, showing the lack of separation in the popular imagination between church, tsar and state: “Туляк полон церковного благочестия и великий практик этого дела, а потому и те три мастера, которые взялись поддержать Платова и с ним всю Россию, не делали ошибки ...”116 (A Tula native is full of devotion to the Church and a great practitioner

114 Ibid, p. 545
116 Ibid, p. 550
of pious deeds and for that reason these three Tula craftsmen who had taken upon themselves the burden of supporting Platov and with him the whole of Russia, made no mistakes ...) Thus, in the Russian imagination, religion is inherent to the Russians, the faith of the craftsmen is as important as their skill for the success of their project.

The craftsmen shoe the flea with a consummate skill that they regard as God-given. "только будем на Бога надеяться"\textsuperscript{117} (we will just trust in God.) However, he addition of the shoes to the weight destabilises it and the flea can no longer dance. The English attribute this flaw to a lack of schooling. They associate education with science and technology, whereas, in contrast, Russian education is merely religious: "Наша наука простая: по Псалтырю да по Полусоннику, а арифметики мы нимало не знаем."\textsuperscript{118} (Our education is simple: it is from the Psalms and the Book of Half-Dreams, but we do not know arithmetic at all.) In fact, Leskov himself believed religion and education to be vitally linked. He wrote articles about religious education.\textsuperscript{119} It sets the two cultures apart in their attitude towards religion. This is articulated in the conversation between the craftsman and his English hosts. The English cannot understand how the Russian can be such a wonderful craftsman without a scientific education. They suggest to him that he should stay in England and work there: "Оставайтесь у нас, мы вам большую образованность передадим, и из вас удивительный мастер выйдет."\textsuperscript{120} ("Stay here and we will give you higher education and make a great craftsman out of you."). The craftsman refuses the offer: "У меня, - говорит, - дома родители есть."\textsuperscript{121} ("I," he said, "have parents at home")

\textsuperscript{117}Ibid, p. 548
\textsuperscript{118}Ibid, p. 561
\textsuperscript{119}J. Muckle, 'Nikolay Leskov: Educational Journalist and Imaginative Writer,' (New Zealand Slavonic Journal, 1984), p. 83
\textsuperscript{120}Ibid, p. 562
\textsuperscript{121}Ibid, p. 562
The English offer to send them money to support them, to which he replies: “Мы, — говорит, — к своей родине привержены, и течение мой уже старичок, а родительница — старушка и привыкли в свой приход в церковь ходить...”

(“We,” he said, “are devoted to our country, and my father is an old man now, and my mother is an old woman and they are used to going to church in their own parish …”) This implies the value that the English place on material wealth as they appear to believe money can compensate the craftsman’s parents for his absence. For the Russian craftsman home, family and church are synonymous with each other and are inseparable parts of life. This is incomprehensible to the English: they do not belittle or criticise him for his faith but instead they offer him an English bride if he should convert to their religion: “Вы, — говорят, — обьыкнете, наш закон примете, и мы вас женем”

(“You”, they say, “will get used to it. Take our faith and we will marry you off.) The blunt manner in which the offer is made implies that changing one’s faith and leaving one’s family is a simple matter. However it seems that to be integrated properly into English society, and allowed to marry, the craftsman should belong to the correct church: However, the craftsman refuses to convert because he considers the Russian faith to be the true faith, and he is obliged to maintain it, just as his ancestors had done: “[Н]аша русская вера самая правильная, и как верили наши правотцы, так же точно должны верить и потомцы.”

(Our Russian faith is the true faith and as our forefathers worshipped, so must their descendants.) The English do not understand this as religion in England comes in a variety of forms. It adapts to changing circumstances in society with ease. This is the opposite of the situation in the unquestioned, traditional Orthodox faith. The English argue that they are also Christians and have the same Bible: “Вы, — говорят англичане, — нашей
веры не знаете: мы того же закона христианского и то же самое Евангелие содержим."

(“You,” the Englishmen said, “do not know our religion. We are also Christians and we have the same Bible.) The craftsman finds proof that, thanks to its external forms of worship and holidays, Orthodoxy is the true faith because it is more integrated into everyday life:

- Евангелие, – отвечает Левша, – действительно у всех одно, а только наши книги против ваших толще, и вера у нас полнее. [...] [У] нас есть и боготворные иконы и гроботочивые главы и мощи, а у вас ничего, и даже, кроме одного воскресенья, никаких экстремных праздников нет …”

(“The Testament,” the craftsman replied, “is the same for everybody. But our books are much thicker than yours and our religion, too, has more in it. [...] We have miracle-working icons and relics of the saints and you have nothing at all and you haven’t any extra holidays except Sunday.”)

The narrator suggests that the Orthodox faith is the main focus of everyday life in Russia, and its importance to a Russian’s sense of identity, whereas he regards it to be of significantly less importance in England in relation to the perception of science and technology. This is also one of the suggestions in his long story ‘Zapechatlennyi angel’ (‘The Sealed Angel’). This tale is told by a peasant worker in a bar on a stormy winter night. It deals with the prejudices in Russian society to dissident groups. The story relates how the authorities confiscated the most revered icon from a group of Old Believers and ‘sealed’ its face with wax, leaving the Old Believers the complex task of retrieving it. The Old Believers are employed by an Englishman and his wife who respect their work very highly and are appalled at their treatment by the Establishment. Working for the Englishman, the Old Believers found a place where they could worship in peace and where they were respected: “Особенно же нам,
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староверам, тут нравилось, что мы в тогдашнее время повсюду за свой обряд гонению подвергались, а тут нам была льгота: нет здесь ни городского начальства, ни уездного, ни попа; никого не зрим, и никто нашей религии не касается и не препятствует...”127 (We Old Believers particularly liked it there. At a time when we were being oppressed for our faith everywhere we had the privilege here that there were no town or estate officials, no priest ... we worshipped in full freedom and our faith gave offence to no-one.) The English people appreciated the religiosity of the Old Believers and found a common language with them, admiring them for their simplicity and work ethic. They are presented as kindly people: “Англичане, чести им приписать, сами люди обстоятельные и набожные, и они нас очень любили и за хороших людей почитали и хвалили.”128 (The English to do them credit are a trustworthy and pious people and they liked us very much and held that we were good folk.) Following the confiscation of the icon, the Englishman approaches the Bishop himself on behalf of the Old Believers, arguing that “Вера дело великое, и кто как верит, тому так по вере дается.”129 (Faith is a powerful force and each of us believes inasmuch as faith is granted unto him.) He is unsuccessful and they have to resort to deception to get the icon back because its loss prevents the Old Believers from working effectively.

Throughout the tale, there is a contrast shown between Orthodoxy and the non-Orthodox. The tale is set up to show Orthodoxy as the true, miraculous faith. The Old Believers are converted, having witnessed the miracle of the unsealing of the Angel’s face. The English couple come across as pleasant, yet they become impatient with the mysticism of the Old Believers: “Но англичанин уже не тот, что был к нам до сего

128 Ibid, p. 212
129 Ibid, p. 228
(Now the Englishman was different towards us from the way he had been before. This long drawn-out business had probably annoyed him and he shouted at us.) The icon, to them, is a tool which guides the Old Believers to work and without which the workers fall into melancholy. The English are more pragmatic and more concerned with the aspect of productivity than the spiritual quality of the icon.

The Englishman asks the painter to paint an icon for his wife, and then to paint an even smaller version, with her picture, on her signet ring. The Old Believers are appalled at the suggestion because the icon is a holy object, rather than an earthly one. The English wish for the revered objects of Russian faith to be reduced to a mere decorative item for personal pleasure and gratification. Yet again, the point is made that the English are less reverent and pious, and mainly concerned with reason and practicalities. Leskov’s opposition between the role of faith in Russia and for the English articulates Russianness through the negative depiction of the English other.

The depiction of English religious figures gets progressively more critical in Russian literature towards the turn of the twentieth century, as the English vicars are treated more harshly than previously. The Reverend Steed in Zinaida Gippius’s *Sumerkhi dukha* (*Twilight of the Spirit*) is a repellent, stand-offish individual for whom religion provides a comfortable living and social respectability. His Russian acquaintances find him deceitful. In their opinions he certainly does not act like a priest: “...[O]н ужасно отвратительный. ... и неужели это в Англии все пони
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I'll TaiCHe? (= "He is terribly repugnant. Are all the priests in England really like that?")

*Sumerkhi dukha* is the tale of an unhealthy young woman, Margaret. She is married to her late father's friend, but falls in love with a fellow patient, Shadrov, when at a sanatorium to recover, and moves with him to St Petersburg. Her husband, an English vicar, twenty years her senior, allows her to have an adulterous relationship. This is until he needs her to return and take care of him when his own health fails. Following the death of her father, Margaret had lived with Mr Steed and his sister in Scotland, as they were the only acquaintances with whom she and her father had associated. However, following his sister's passing, Steed, the vicar, married Margaret - his ward - for the sake of social propriety, to maintain proper appearances. She explains: "Когда сестра умерла, и не можно было у него жить, — это бросило бы тень на него, ... тут он предложил мне обвенчаться."132 (When his sister died I could no longer live with him as it would cast a shadow over him [would be improper]... and so he asked me to marry him.) She does not love him, but feels forever indebted to him for his charity towards her: "Мне было совсем неразумно не выйти за Мистера Стида. Я ему всегда буду благодарна."133 (It would have been unwise for me not to marry Mr Steed. I will always be grateful to him) She is constrained by the social decorum of her class in England, and is perpetually referring to her debt to her husband. The religion practised by Steed is shown to be thoroughly hypocritical. It allows its followers to indulge their whims, even when it is contrary to the teachings of the faith. Steed tells Shadrov, Margaret's lover, that his wife is free to live with her lover, but is equally free to return to England as: "В Англии меньше предрассудков, нежели в лучшем русском обществе. То, что миссис Стид не будет связана с
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вами церковным обрядом, не закроет ей у нас ничьих дверей.”134 (In England there are fewer prejudices than in Russian society. The fact that Mrs Steed is not wedded to you in the church will not close any doors for her.) Gippius sets up a direct contrast with the Russian concept of faith in Shadrov’s attitude towards Mr Steed. He cannot believe that Steed is a priest: “Вы – кажется - священник?”135 (“You are a priest?”). Shadrov is appalled at Steed’s noncommittal attitude towards his faith. He asks Steed: “А пока вы молчите о своих ‘убеждениях’ и служите ваши обедни не веря в Бога?”136 (“And whilst you are silent about your ‘convictions’ and serve your mass, do you not believe in God?”) Dostoevskii’s influence on Gippius is apparent from Steed’s answer:

Я верю в то, во что следует верить. ... Во что верим и должны верить мы, люди: в добро. Во взаимную помощь, в честность, в чувство долга по отношению к другим и в благодарность за содеянное благо. ... Я верю также в брачную любовь, уважение и вольное подчинение более слабого более сильному. Таковы мои принципы. Их, я считаю исчерпывающими.137 (I believe in what I should believe ... In what we do, and should believe – in goodness, in mutual help, in a sense of duty towards each other, and in gratitude for good deeds. ... I also believe in conjugal love, respect and the voluntary submission of the weaker to the stronger. These are my principles and I consider them exhaustive.)

His values appear to fit well into a ‘church of Atheists’ and his description of his religion is quite reminiscent of Dostoevskii’s earlier depiction of the Church of England. Gippius acknowledged Dostoevskii’s influence on her thinking and admired his affirmation of Christ as an incarnation of the spirit.138 She believed in God as the Absolute, abhorring middle-class morality, which appeared to her to be a banal

134 Ibid, p. 265
135 Ibid, p. 265
136 Ibid, p. 265
137 Ibid, pp. 265-266
longing for paradise on earth. She saw the devil in the aspirations of bourgeois existence which “encouraged striving for material well-being and revealed a placid, unconcerned mentality.” It is this type of mediocrity she portrays in the character of Steed. His is a practical belief in humanity and in proper conduct. It is these values that he has taught his wife and his followers and by which he conducts himself. At no point does he admit to believing in God, for which his Russian interlocutor finds his attitude deceitful as the following dialogue demonstrates:

- А ложь?
- Кому же ложь?
- Но те люди, которые приходят слушать, как вы читаете им Писание, говорите проповеди... Ведь они думают, что вы верите в Бога. (“And the lie?”
“Who is being lied to?”
“Well, those people who go to hear you read the Gospels and the sermons. It seems they think you believe in God.”)

What better can reveal the spiritual bankruptcy of the English Church? If its vicars do not believe in God and place their faith in the mundane, what hope is there for the ordinary folk?

Zamiatin’s Vicar Dewley in ‘Ostrovitiane’ (‘The Islanders’) is reminiscent of Gippius’s Steed in his upper-class hypocrisy and reliance on the Church for social respectability. The Vicar Dewley, the гордость Дже́смонда” (the pride of Jesmond), is shown to be an impious individual whose chief aim in life is to rationalise society further according to his absurd ‘Doctrine of Compulsory Salvation.’ Dewley is portrayed as a hypocritical, petty-minded little man who is leading his flock of equally mediocre individuals along the path to social respectability. Implicit in the alienated viewpoint of the author, however, is the idea that they are lacking in true spiritual
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guidance and salvation. For Zamiatin then, as for Khomiakov earlier, the Church is the source of England’s stagnation and lack of Christian feeling. For Zamiatin, organised religion represented the most extreme form of philistinism. The thesis based upon the dichotomy of energy versus entropy which underpins his later works, was first formulated in ‘Ostrovitiane’.\(^{141}\) The mechanisation of life and the quashing of individuality as advocated by the Reverend Dewley are, for Zamiatin, the most extreme form of entropy. It gives rise to the hypocritical piety which he satirises bitterly in ‘Ostrovitiane’ and ‘Lovets chelovekov.’

Zamiatin’s satires are presented as ‘English’ stories, set in England, with no mention of Russia. The author’s viewpoint is emphasised in his undermining his characters through scathing portrayals.\(^ {142}\) ‘Ostrovitiane’ is set in a suburb of Newcastle, where a car accident disrupts day-to-day life, beginning a chain of events which expose its sterility. The moral standing of ordinary folk rests upon their association with a church that embodies all the negative aspects of religion in England as perceived from an Orthodox viewpoint.\(^{143}\) The ironical portrayal of the ‘Sunday gentlemen,’ all of whom look, and act, alike in their respectful observance of the Sunday rituals of smart dress, sombre behaviour and attendance at church is one such example:

\(^{141}\) See M. Ginsburg (ed. & trans.), *A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin*, (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), pp. 107-112. ‘Ostrovitiane’ provided a bridge between Zamiatin’s early works and his most famous piece, the dystopian novel *My, (WE)*, about a future totalitarian state where individuality and freedom has almost been eradicated.


\(^ {143}\) Zamiatin appears to regard this type of hypocritical piety as specifically English as the clerics in his other stories end to be rather naïve and foolish, yet kindly, rather than repellent individuals like Dewley. See D. Richards, *Zamyatin: A Soviet Heretic*, (London: Bowes & Bowes, 1962), p. 89
The notion that “порядочных людей Бог не оставит”145 (God does not abandon respectable people) further underpins the concept that the church provides social standing and respectability. Sinners are those who disrupt the status quo, and those who are not faithful members of the official church. Mr Campbell is one such sinner. He has been caught in the company of undesirables, namely an Irishman and a striptease dancer. The vicar and his associates hope to rehabilitate him into what they perceive to be respectable society: “Дорогой Мистер Кембл! Мы пригласили вас сюда — потому что мы любим вас, ибо Христос заповедал любить и грешников. Мы вынуждены прибегнуть к крайним мерам для того, чтобы вернуть вас на правильный путь.”146 (Dear Mr Campbell! We have invited you here because we love you. Christ taught us to love even sinners. We are obliged to resort to extreme measures in order to lead you back on the path of righteousness.) Righteousness in this society means conforming to the rules of social propriety, rather than carrying out charitable or spiritual deeds. Dewley’s Church of England is strictly mechanised and timetabled, reducing Christian acts to necessary daily activities. Charity is one such duty, for which there is a clearly timetabled slot. When this timetable is interrupted it

145 Ibid, p. 112
146 Ibid, p. 165
causes chaos in the Vicar's mind, and disrupts his ability to fit in all the compulsory
duties: "Великая машина викарии Джоли остановилась ... если, в самом деле, все
передвинуть на три часа, то обед придется в одиннадцать вечера, а посещение
больных — в час ночи. Положение было нелепое и безвыходное."147 (Vicar
Dewley’s great machine had stopped. ... if, for instance, everything was moved up by
three hours, then supper would have to be at eleven o’clock in the evening and
visiting the sick would be at one in the morning. The situation was intolerable and
inescapable.) Visiting the sick is considered one of the vicar’s charitable duties.
However he completely ignores the sick man in his own house, bemoaning his
existence whilst leaving the man’s care to his wife. He grudgingly acknowledges his
wife’s care of the sick man as an obligation which causes her to break the routine
required by his Doctrines: "Что же можно возразить против долга
милосердия?"148 (How could one object to her fulfilling her duty to be
compassionate?) As Dostoevskii noted, the Anglican Church frowns upon the poor
and shuns the sick, ideas which are expressed by Zamiatin’s scathing comments about
Dewley’s attitude towards those outside of his social circle or those who break its
code of conduct by behaving irregularly. Money affords respect in this society. It
allows people into the respectable circles: "Единственная надежда — на
благотворное влияние среды."149 (The only hope lies with the beneficial influence
of the social circle.) Those who are not admitted to this clique are treated with
disdain. The vicar is reportedly not a common sight in the poorer areas of town, in
which the dissidents, the non-conformers, of past times were known to have lived. It
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was considered “должно странное место для прогулок господина викария”\textsuperscript{150} (a rather strange place for a vicar to take a walk).

The English Church is also a substitute for the state in instilling morality into society: “Если государство … пренебрегает своими обязанностями, то мы, мы - каждый из нас - должны гнать ближних по стезе спасения, ... гнать - как рабов. Пусть будут лучшие рабами Господа, чем свободными сынами сатаны...”\textsuperscript{151} (If the government … neglects its duties, then it is up to us, each one of us, to drive our neighbours along the road to salvation … to drive [them] like slaves. Better they be slaves of God than free sons of Satan.) This is the opposite of the concept expressed by the Slavophiles and further developed by Dostoevskii that true freedom is found in faith and spirituality rather than in external, legal freedoms. Zamiatin then seems to suggest that the Church of England with its mundane interests preferred over spiritual values is profoundly ‘un-Russian’.

Similarly, in ‘Lovets chelovekov’ (‘A Fisher of Men’) the protagonist Cragg’s moral respectability stems from his close association with the church. He is perceived as a successful and wealthy businessman, with a lovely wife. He adheres to his religious duties and is therefore considered a moral authority: “Все знали: на бирже – или вообще где-то – Мистер Крагг удачно вел операции; имел [...] прекрасную жену и был одним из добровольных апостолов Общества Борьбы с Пороком.”\textsuperscript{152} (Everyone knew Mr Craggs was successful at the Stock Exchange and other such places. He had [...] a wonderful wife and was one of the voluntary apostles in the Society for the Fight against Vice.) In fact, he is a blackmailer who delights in

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid, p. 165
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid, p. 129
\textsuperscript{152} E. Zamiatin, ‘Lovets chelovekov’, in E. Zamiatin, op. cit., p. 154
nothing more than extorting money from young lovers on Hampstead Heath. To this end he uses his association with the Church as an institution to provide respectability for his immoral deeds. The church organist, Bailey, is also a supposedly moral servant of the church. But in fact, he uses his position to attract young women for illicit and sexual affairs. His Church is described like a Dionysian grotto which is bathed in greenness and sunlight whilst he plays. It serves to expose the hypocrisy of the strictures of this institution. Barta likens Bailey to a Dionysian figure who liberates these women from the strictures of conformity.\textsuperscript{153} He appears to entrance the women, encouraging them to release their repressed (libidinal) emotions: “Вверху на хорах, начал играть органист Бэйли. ... Женщины раскрывались, как раковины. ... Органист Бэйли задумался о великой Изиде — с тысячью протянутых рук ...”\textsuperscript{154}

(Up in the choir Bailey the organist began to play ... Women opened up like shells ... Bailey the organist began to think about Isis with her thousand outstretched arms ...)

Bailey is one of Zamiatin’s more positive characters as he encourages a break from the monotony of day-to-day conformity. His actions expose the church as a moribund institution that is used to give its followers an air of respectability. Behind this supposed morality and repressed emotions they can hide their nefarious personal business, which enables them to pursue their goals of achieving personal satisfaction and material wealth.

The perceived lack of spirituality in the English church and its followers ultimately sustains the negative stereotype of the English. This in turn, again elevates the standing of Russian religiosity and, by extension, Russian national identity. As we saw earlier, the uncovering of English hypocrisy enables the Russian self to rise...

\textsuperscript{153} P. Barta, (1998) op. cit., p. 153
\textsuperscript{154} E. Zamiatin, ‘Lovets chelovekov’, op. cit, pp. 153-154
above its traditional feeling of inferiority vis-à-vis the more prosperous English other. A sense of Russia’s cultural and spiritual superiority is achieved by Zamiatin without any Russian character or location featuring in either of these two stories. The Russian observer-narrator exposes the falsehood of English protestant respectability as symbolic of English society at large which appears as sterile and conformist in the Russian texts. The ‘other’ has been debunked by the ‘self’ in hiding.
CHAPTER THREE
"ENGLISHNESS"

As we have seen, the Church of England occupied a great deal of space within the Russian literary imagination. It also provided a fruitful means of comparison between social and cultural markers of attitudes in England and Russia. Much of the criticism of the Church of England in Russia was directed at its perceived emphasis on social values and notions of propriety at the expense of spiritual matters. Concepts of social respectability can be wide-ranging, from manner of dress or the ownership of specific items of property, to overall behaviour and deportment in public. English social mores also captured the Russian literary imagination leading to the production of impressions of English characters’ behaviour. These together with the Russian representations of social graces paved the way for a distinct typology of ‘Englishness’. This concept is produced by writers who use it to achieve a fruitful comparison with Russian norms. Thus ‘Englishness’ in Russian texts is a product of Russian culture. With this in mind this chapter will examine the literary representations of this phenomenon in the behaviour of Russian literature’s English men and women, with a view to assessing further how these characters and the situations in which they are portrayed allow for the production of the figure of Russian self-identity.

A particular manifestation of ‘Englishness’ in Russian prose is that of the Anglophile. Based upon real-life models found in Russian high society from the middle of the eighteenth century through to the fall of the Tsarist Empire, this character is representative of the ambivalent attitude towards England, especially in
its nineteenth-century forms. The Anglophile is a historical phenomenon that has been immortalised in selected works of Russian prose. Historically, the Anglomany, or Anglomaniacs, were a small group of Russian aristocrats who were sufficiently enamoured with features of behaviour they perceived as English to copy them. Many of this group were prominent figures in the first half of the nineteenth century. For example, amongst the well-known Anglophiles were the government advisor Prince M. S. Vorontsov and the liberal economist and financial reformer Admiral N. S. Mordvinov.¹ Prince Vorontsov’s family were well-known Anglophiles who had strong ties with Britain; his father was the Russian ambassador to Britain. Mordvinov, in particular, admired the English constitutional monarchy and liberal government and advocated their adoption in Russia. These, and many other, Anglophiles structured their lives and estates according to ‘English’ principles and values. Both the real-life Anglomaniacs, and their fictional counterparts, show a marked awareness of aspects of English life and ways. This in turn suggests the degree to which a profile of England was known and discussed in Russia, preparing the background for discussing notions of Russian selfhood. This fascination with England can take different forms, from the mechanical copying of ‘English’ ways in every sphere of life, which we shall term here as ‘Anglomania’, to the selective adoption of aspects of ‘Englishness’ in, for example, estate management, which we shall define as ‘Anglophilia’. There are only a few Anglomany in nineteenth-century Russian fiction. They appear, however, in the works of major literary figures such as Aleksandr Pushkin, Ivan Turgenev and Lev Tolstoi. Hence, these characters are very familiar to readers of Russian literature.

These Anglomaniacs have many features in common, whether they appear in novels or short stories; they are, although not usually the protagonists, significant characters and their Anglomania, or Anglophilia, has a definite impact on their relationships with the other characters. The main events of these narratives occur in some way as a result of their Anglomania. Although these characters are not negatively valorised *per se*, their interlocutors appear to treat them with a fond indulgence that suggests that society sees them as quite absurd, ridiculing them for their slavish imitation of the English. According to the logic of most of these texts, their ‘English’ principles are artificial and adopted, rather than inherent. Therefore they are ineffectual, offering little of value or real importance to Russian society. Examining each main occurrence of the Anglomaniac in turn will allow us to capture an image of the most important features of this ‘type’ and how it helps in the construction of ‘Englishness’ in Russian writing.

Perhaps the literary archetype of the Anglomaniac is Grigorii Ivanovich Muromskii in Pushkin’s ‘Baryshnia-krest’ianka’, written in 1830 as a part of the *Povesti pokoinogo Ivana Petrovicha Belkina* (Tales of the Late Ivan Petrovich Belkin). This set of tales has an invented narratorial persona in Belkin. He is presented as an editor-figure who has written down tales he has been told by passing acquaintances. The use of this multiple narration adds an air of authenticity to the tales. His style is simple and direct. There is a paucity of authorial reflection or analysis. The narrator can play with literary stereotypes and social conventions which are commonplace and familiar to the implied readership. Scholarship on the *Povesti* to
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2 A. Cross, (1993), op. cit., p. 96
3 E. Simmons, *An Introduction to Russian Realism*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965) p. 38
date has been concerned with the role of the narrator and the form of the Tales, there is little or no mention of the Anglomaniac character, the place of the Anglomaniac in Russia or this representation of ‘Englishness’. Despite the fact that Muromskii, his Anglomaniac, displays behaviour, mannerisms, dress and lifestyle that represent nothing more than this man’s idea of England, they are accepted by Belkin as ‘English’. Muromskii, we are told, is a “настоящий русский барин.” (a real Russian nobleman.) He has frittered away his fortune in the city, moved to the countryside to his remaining estate, and wastes the remnants of his riches in creating an English garden and keeping his estate in the English fashion: “Конюхи его были одеты английскими жокеями ... Поля свои обрабатывал он по английской методе ...." (The stable-hands were dressed like English jockeys ... He cultivated his land according to English methods.) His daughter has an English governess, and Muromskii himself reads solely English material from which he can quote many examples of how life should be lived: “Он привел несколько примеров человеческого долголетия, почерпнутых из английских журналов ...” (He quoted several examples of human longevity from English journals.) For all its grandeur, and the use of methods devised by the English who were widely reputed in Russia since Catherine the Great’s time to be highly proficient in matters of agriculture, the estate is not profitable. The narrator goes to great pains to suggest
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6 Ibid, p. 78

7 Ibid, p. 89

that “на чужой манер хлеб русский не родится.”9 (Russian grain does not thrive with alien treatment.) It is specifically the foreign methods of agriculture that are attributed for the crop’s failure. The narrator ignores other possible reasons for its failure to grow, such as poor soil, fertiliser or handling. He is convinced that the imported methods are wrong, they are unsuitable for Russian produce, ergo, in the narrator’s view, the Russian norms are deemed superior to the foreign. On a wider scale, the failure of Muromskii’s English-style estate management, in the opinion of Belkin, the narrator, is already suggestive of the ineffectuality of this type of Anglomania in Russia. Although his alien methods of estate management are ridiculed as not viable in Russia, Muromskii is considered to be rather audacious because he mortgages his estate:

[И] несмотря на значительное уменьшение расходов, доходы Григорья Ивановича не прибавились; он и в деревне находил способ входить в новые долги; со всем тем почитался человеком неглупым, ибо первый из помещиков своей губернии догадался золовить имение в Опекунский Совет ...10 (Despite a considerable reduction in expenditure, Grigori Ivanovich’s income did not increase. Even in the country he found a way of accumulating new debts. And yet for all this he was not considered stupid, being the first landowner in his district to acquire a mortgage from the Tutorial Council.)

This in itself was a novel concept in Pushkin’s Russia. If we recall that Belkin views Muromskii as a typical Russian nobleman, his adoption of foreign ways, some successfully, and others not so, can be ascribed to Russia as a whole. It suggests that, from the viewpoint of a man of average education and abilities, such as Belkin, Russia is capable of adopting some foreign customs which will be beneficial, although wholeheartedly embracing them is detrimental and doomed to failure.

9 A. Pushkin, op. cit., p. 77
10 Ibid, p. 77
This philosophy is realised further in the eventual outcome of the story which sees the reconciliation of Muromskii with the neighbouring landowner, Berestov, who has been set up in direct contrast to Muromskii from the outset. He is the only character who is hostile towards Muromskii. He is a wealthy landowner who despises Muromskii’s affectations and considers his Anglomania a waste of time. He himself had built up his estate and had trebled his income. He misses no opportunity to criticise Muromskii’s Anglomania:

Он не мог равнодушино говорить об англomanии своего соседа и поминутно находил случаи его критиковать. .... Куда нам по-английски разоряться? Были бы мы по-русски хоть сыты.11 (He could not speak calmly about his neighbour’s Anglomania and was continually finding opportunities to criticise him. ... Why do we need to ruin ourselves in the English fashion? We can be fed at least in the Russian way.)

We learn that “[H]енависть к нововведениям была отличительная черта его характера.”12 (Hatred of innovation is a particular feature of his character.) Berestov is unable to accept Muromskii’s quirks. He makes scathing comments about Muromskii’s Anglomania, fuelling the enmity between the two. This rivalry ensures that their children are unable to meet and prompts Muromskii’s daughter to dress up as a maid in order to meet Berestov’s son. The main events in the tale – the courtship by Berestov’s son and Akulina, who is actually Muromskii’s daughter Liza, - are a result of this rivalry and Muromskii’s Anglomania.

Ultimately his Anglomania serves to make Muromskii rather ridiculous, even though he is a fairly sympathetically drawn character. The rivalry that exists between

11 Ibid, p. 78
12 Ibid, p. 77
Muromskii and Berestov is symptomatic of the emerging crisis of nation building and
the desire to create a useable national identity in the early nineteenth century of
Pushkin's era. There is a sudden urgent need to distinguish between the imported
Europeanised behaviour and cultural norms of the gentry on the one hand, and the
supposedly native culture on the other.\textsuperscript{13} It is difficult to define what is Russian, as
this remains unspecified in the text: it is a quality that is alluded to in a series of
opposites between Muromskii and Berestov. Berestov, we are told, is a 'cautious
landowner' whose estate is profitable. His quick dismissal of the foreign, English,
methods specific to Muromskii, implies that he relies upon superior Russian methods.
It is his grain that is successful and profitable. Muromskii, within Belkin's
representation on the other hand, is a vain Anglomaniac, a relic of the Enlightenment-
inspired culture of imitation and adoration of things Western. His estate, although
well kept, is doomed to failure; it is expensive to maintain and impractical, as it is not
suited to Russian life or the climate. Muromskii is described as "образованный
eвропеец"\textsuperscript{14} (a cultured European) whereas he likens Berestov to a bear:
"[Муромский] прозвал своего зоила медведем и провинциалом"\textsuperscript{15} ([Muromskii]
dubbed his critic a bear and a provincial.)

The comparison embraces the stereotypical European image of Russia perpetuated
by visitors, which suggests that Russia is unrefined and wild, and implies that Europe
is more sophisticated. Muromskii's sophistication and Berestov's churlishness are
revealed in the description of their behaviour upon meeting accidentally:
"Муромский, как образованный европеец, подъехал к своему противнику и

\textsuperscript{13} Iu. Lotman, 'Poetika bytogo povedeniia v russkoi kul'ture XVIII veka', in \textit{Trudy po znakovym sistemam}, (No. 8, 1977), pp. 65-89
\textsuperscript{14} A. Pushkin, op. cit., p. 92
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, p. 78
Muromskii, the cultured European, rode up to his enemy and greeted him courteously. Berestov replied with the enthusiasm of a chained bear bowing to a master on the orders of its handler.) The enthusiasm – or lack of it – in Berestov’s response to Muromskii is compared to that of a tethered animal; he is unable to allow his attitude to his neighbour to come to the fore in such a situation. His manners are stilted and artificial, whereas Muromskii models himself on his understanding of the cultured European, in whom such behaviour is ingrained and comes naturally. Yet the Russian landowner, who adheres to Russian methods, manages his estate lucratively enough not to need a mortgage, unlike his Anglomaniac neighbour. The conclusion of the story implies that the external finery of the English ways is rather wasted in Russia. The simpler lifestyles unreliant on foreign customs or fancy fopperies are perfectly acceptable and profitable.

Echoes of Belkin’s Anglomaniac of the 1830s are clearly discernable in the literary Anglomaniacs and Anglophiles of the 1850s and 1860s. In Pushkin’s, and subsequently in Turgenev’s, works, the Anglomaniacs represent the old ways of imitating another’s cultural norms. This makes them unable to fit totally into contemporary society and thus they are ridiculed. In Meshcherskii’s Lord Apostol v bol’shom peterburgskom svete, published in 1876, the Anglomaniacs demonstrate the shallowness of foreign imports in Russian society. Yet their very presence in all these texts emphasises how integrally they inform Russian identity, whose definition appears to depend on the incorporation of foreign models. They sustain the conflict in

16 Ibid, p. 92
their representations of Russian society by trying to reconcile the old dependence on foreign values with attempts to discover what is essentially Russian. In Turgenev's case particularly, the Anglomaniacs are contrasted with their opposite numbers, who serve to highlight the redundancy of these 'English' ways in Russian society.

The first of this new generation of Anglomaniacs is Turgenev's Ivan Petrovich Lavretskii in Dvorianskoe gnezdo (A Nest of the Gentry). As a young man, Lavretskii Senior is brought up as a 'Western gentleman' by an aged Francophile aunt, who dresses him 'like a doll,' encourages him to learn Rousseau and Voltaire and styles him to be a real European dandy. He is contrasted with his father at this stage, who is a 'простой степной барин' (a simple Russian nobleman) and lives on his typical, simple Russian estate. The paternal home is abhorrent to his son with its dark, dirty and chaotic qualities. "Грязно, бедно, дрянно оказалось гнездо; грусть из крохот степного житья-бытия на каждом шагу его оскорбляла; скука его грязда."¹⁷ (Dirty, poor and miserable the [family] nest seemed to him. The solitude and dullness of the daily life offended him at every step.) The third-person narrator gives us the point of view of the Europeanised character whose perspective is that of one who has been estranged from this Russian lifestyle. That this standard of living is deficient is emphasised in the use of emotive language. The adjectives 'dirty', 'poor', 'rotten' sum up the home, but also suggest a lack of development in this civilisation, which has been paralysed to remain ignorant and impoverished like the house.

This is further emphasised by the description of Russian culture given by Lavretskii’s father as a means of justifying his opinion of his son, and his European
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ideals, as decidedly non-Russian. This passage depicts the slovenliness and poverty of the 'normal', daily life in Russia as opined by Lavretskii’s father: “Все здесь не по нем — говорил он — за столом не ест, людского запаху, духоты переносить не может, вид пьяных его расстраивает, драться при нем тоже не смей, служить не хочет: слаб, вишь, здоровьем; фу ты, неженка элакой!”18 (“Nothing here is to his liking,” he used to say. “He cannot bear stuffiness and the smell of people. The sight of drunken people upsets him; and as to fighting in front of him - you mustn’t. He doesn’t want to enter the service; his health is delicate, see! My goodness, what an effeminate creature!)

Abhorring Russian appearance, Lavretskii dresses in English and French clothing and finds his spiritual home in Europe. He marries a servant girl against his parents’ behest and leaves her after three months to pursue a career in England, from which he returns after approximately eight years. He now looks like a real Anglophile, with a short haircut, sporting an English pea-green frock coat and little collars, displaying the supposedly English mannerism of not smiling. He talks only about political and economic matters, and does so through his teeth:

Коротко остривенные волосы, накрахмаленное жабо, долгопольный гороховый сюртук со множеством воротничков, кислое выражение лица, что-то резкое и вместе равнодушное в обращении, произношение сквозь зубы, деревянный внезапный хохот, отсутствие улыбки, исключительно политический и политико-экономический разговор, страсть к кровавым ростбифам и портуэйну — все в нем так и вело Великобританией; весь он казался пропитан ее духом.19 (His short-cropped hair, his starched shirt-front, his long-skirted pea-green overcoat with its multitude of capes, the sour expression of his face, something abrupt and at the same time indifferent in his behaviour, his way of speaking through his teeth, his
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18 Ibid, p. 174
19 Ibid, p. 182
sudden wooden laugh, the absence of smiles, his exclusively political or politico-economical conversation, his passion for roast beef and port wine - everything about him breathed, so to speak, of Great Britain.)

To the narrator his appearance is very strange and rather comical, rendering this essentially unremarkable man noticeable. Lavretskii's dress and behaviour are described in great detail, in contrast to other characters that remain under-described. This suggests that Lavretskii was conspicuous in this society because of his appearance. He embodies stereotypical features of the English that informed social discourse in Russia as well as in some Western European countries.\textsuperscript{20} The passion for underdone roast beef, port, the wooden laugh and utterances through the teeth appear both in Russian textual perceptions, and imitations, of the English. In addition, these images serve to signify the English upper-middle and upper classes, rather than the lower-middle and working classes. Obviously the impoverished working classes would be unable to afford lavish meals of roast beef, and port. Early images of the English, as we have already discovered, were based upon wealthy people, who were able to travel and associate with foreigners. They are the ones depicted in the eighteenth-century English novels that were so popular in Europe during the height of Anglomania. Waddington suggests that these are examples of "an outmoded Gallic Anglomania"\textsuperscript{21} which filtered down into the consciousness of the Russian chattering classes. For example, he argues that the pea-green frock coat would have long since been out of fashion in England, and that by the time of Turgenev's novel it would have been the standard dress of a cabbie.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{20} I. Buruma, (2000), op. cit., pp. 11-13
\textsuperscript{21} P. Waddington, op. cit., p. 23
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid, p. 23
Notwithstanding his style of dress and behaviour, Ivan Petrovich professes to have returned to Russia as a patriot: “Но - чудное дело! - превратившись в англомана, Иван Петрович стал в то же время патриотом, по крайней мере он называл себя патриотом, …”23 (But - a marvellous thing - while he had been transformed into an Anglomaniac, Ivan Petrovich had at the same time become a patriot, at least he called himself a patriot.) This is reminiscent of the early travellers who found that whilst in England they developed patriotic feelings for Russia. Such patriotism, however, was also a feature of Anglomania, considered to be a defining characteristic of English society that had been admired in Russian letters since the eighteenth century.24

English patriotism had manifested itself in a peculiar insularity, the harsh treatment of foreigners and the prizing of the English language above any foreign tongue.25 Ivan Petrovich’s form of patriotism differed significantly. Although he professed to expound Russian virtues, his supposed loyalty was based upon a shallow, idealistic image of Russia as his upbringing and subsequent lifestyle were not particularly Russian. “Россию знал плохо, не придерживался ни одной русской привычки и по-русски изъяснялся странно.”26 (He barely knew Russia, had not retained a single Russian habit, and expressed himself in Russian rather strangely.)

For all his lofty and progressive ideals and the supposed patriotism, however, Ivan Petrovich does nothing of any practical value either around his estate or in society. He talks a lot and airs his opinions. “При зимам …прилежно посещал клуб, ораторствовал и развивал свои планы в гостиных и более чем когда-либо

23 I. Turgenev, op. cit., p. 182
26 I. Turgenev, op. cit., p. 182
держался англоманом, брюзгой и государственным человеком.

(But in the winter ... he diligently visited the club, made speeches and developed his plans in drawing-rooms, and in his behaviour was more Anglomaniac than ever, a grumbling and political person.)

The absence of any definite action reduces him to the status of what Russian literary criticism has traditionally designated a ‘superfluous’ individual with no real purpose. He appears to exist merely to recite mechanically and without any real context foreign values learnt abroad which have no impact on Russian society, except to serve as topics of conversation for Lavretskii and his acquaintances. This is borne out in his final years when he loses his eyesight and spends years roaming Russia. He becomes a bitter old man, in search of an elusive cure for his blindness, and retires to his estate broken and alone. Although he returns from England full of grand plans, none take root in Russia. Like many of his ilk, as we can see in this, and other, later literary representations, he expounds his ideas a great deal but nothing comes of them.

Many of the customs he has been exposed to abroad are unrealisable in Russia. His legacy is passed on to his son, whom he brings up and teaches in accordance with Scottish educational principles, some of which were also part of common practice in English public schools. Up until his father's return, he has a typical Russian education with a mediocre governess, learning French, German and music. Under his father's instruction, his education focuses on becoming a 'real man': “Его будили в четыре часа утра, тотчас окачивали холодною водою и заставляли бегать вокруг высокого столба на веревке; ел он раз в день по одному блюду, ездил верхом,

27 Ibid, p. 186
(He was awoken at four o’clock in the morning, splashed at once with cold water and set to running round a high pole with a cord. He ate only one meal a day, consisting of a single dish; rode on horseback; shot with a crossbow.) The cruel and punishing regime of early mornings, washing in cold water and physical exercise are designed to make him physically strong. It seems to have had the desired effect because Lavretskii Junior is robust as an adult. He is also taught “естественные науки, международное право, математика, столярное ремесло, и геральдика, для поддержания рыцарских чувств, - вот чем должен был заниматься будущий ‘человек’”\(^{30}\) (... the natural sciences, international law, mathematics, carpentry and heraldry, to encourage chivalrous feelings, were what the future ‘man’ was to be occupied with.) This education was considered fundamentally British. It was designed to produce a true gentleman. The English gentleman was expected to make a fine member of society. He would be a controlled, dignified individual who was well educated and steeped in the strict moral code. He would both dress, and comport himself suitably for the occasion. He would behave in a restrained manner in public, supporting the weak and the less fortunate and would have a strong work ethic in order to support his family.

Historically, the introduction and adoption of these practices, and other signifiers of ‘Englishness’ by the Russian nobility was to fail to produce the epistemology of the Enlightenment that Russia had hereto lacked. Without the necessary social and civilisational institutions in place, Russia’s ‘Englishness’ in its various forms and accompanying customs was merely a series of empty, hollow signifiers which ultimately did little for its society. Predtechenskii argues that the Anglomania of the

\(^{29}\) I. Turgenev, op. cit., p. 185
\(^{30}\) Ibid, p. 185
eighteenth and nineteenth-century left no lasting impact on Russian culture.\textsuperscript{31} This concept is evinced in the character of Lavretskii Junior. This style of education was solitary and instilled in the boy an inability to relate to others. He is socially aloof and unable to relate to his contemporaries. "Он им казался каким-то мудрым педином, они в нем не нуждались и не искали в нем, он избегал их."\textsuperscript{32} (He appeared to them to be an odd pedant; they did not care for him, and made no overtures to him, and he avoided them.) The unapproachable air, of course, is one of the main images of the Englishman perpetuated in Russian literature, both in the travel narrative of the early nineteenth century and other later fictional works. For Lavretskii Junior, this lifestyle is obviously unsuccessful. It does not promote anything worthwhile for him either as an individual or for him to pass on to society. In addition to his being impeded socially by this upbringing, it does nothing to bring him happiness and fulfilment in regards to women. His father has inspired in him a contemptuous attitude towards the 'weaker' gender and thus he marries the first pretty woman he meets. She marries him for his wealth and soon cheats on him, as he is unable to show her the warmth and affection she receives from her lovers. Nevertheless, he looked after her at the expense of his own happiness. We are told that "недобрую шутку сыграл англоман с своим сыном; капризное воспитание принесло свои плоды."\textsuperscript{33} (The Anglomaniac had done his son an ill turn; his whimsical education had produced its fruits.) Lavretskii senior's attempts to "из него делать человека" (make a man out of him) neglects the emotional life of the child which leads to unhappiness in adulthood, and creates an emotionally sterile individual. The narrator implies that whilst this type of complex individual is perceived to be common, indeed cultivated, in English society, in Russia he is the

\textsuperscript{31} V. Predtechenskii, op. cit., p. 97
\textsuperscript{32} I. Turgenev, op. cit, p. 188
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid, p. 188
antithesis of the imagined ideal of the ‘natural’, emotional Russian whose simplicity, it is implied, allows for a happier and more fulfilled life.

Many of the physical traits of the Anglomaniac that we see in Lavretskii Senior are attributed to Pavel Petrovich Kirsanov in Turgenev’s *Ottsy i deti* (*Fathers and Sons*). This is by far the most sympathetic portrayal of this fascination with English culture in Turgenev’s work and the character is perhaps the most famous of these literary Anglomaniacs. Pavel Petrovich is a former high-flyer in the army, who now lives on his brother’s estate in the country, having given up his successful career for unrequited love. On returning to the country estate he began to read English books and structure his life according to ‘English’ principles.\(^{34}\) Waddington finds that Pavel Petrovich stands for the “heterogeneity of Russia’ and its ‘irrelevant foreignness’\(^{35}\) in the adoption of these English ways which have no practical use. Pavel Petrovich’s foibles are modelled on English social clichés. Pavel Petrovich is first introduced by a description of his appearance that focuses on his good looks, and fine grooming:

... человек среднего роста, одетый в темный английский *cutom*, модный низенький галстук и лаковые полусапожки ... коротко остриженные седые волосы. ... Павел Петрович выпули из кармана панталон свою красивую руку с длинными розовыми ногтями...\(^{36}\) (… A man of average height, dressed in an English suit, with a fashionable tie and patent boots ... short grey hair ... Pavel Petrovich took his beautiful hand with long pink nails out of the pocket of his trousers.)

Again, but for his sense of ‘English’ fashion, the man would be completely unremarkable. It is because of his grooming and the espousing of ‘English’ political ideas that he is cast from the outset as a direct opposite of Bazarov, the protagonist of

\(^{35}\) P. Waddington, op. cit., p. 113  
\(^{36}\) I. Turgenev, (1994), op. cit., p. 19  
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the novel. Pavel Petrovich is shown to be thoroughly anglicised in his conduct and his ways and embodies several of the stereotypes credited to Englishmen:

...он вообще всю жизнь свою устроил на английский вкус, редко виделся с соседями ... И те же другие считали его гордцом; и те другие его уважали за отличные, аристократические манеры, за слухи о его победах; за то, что он прекрасно одевался и всегда останавливался в лучшем номере лучшей гостиницы; ... за то, что он всюду возил с собой настоящий серебряный носсессер и походную ванну; за то, что от него пахло каким-то необыкновенным, удивительно 'благородными' духами; наконец его уважали также за его безукоризненную честность.37 (...he ordered his whole life on the English pattern ... rarely seeing the neighbours ... both parties regarded him as stuck up and both respected him for his perfect aristocratic manners, for the reputation of his victories, for the fact that he dressed superbly and always stayed in the best room in the hotel; ... for the fact that wherever he went he always took with him a real silver dressing case and a portable bath; for the fact that he always smelt of some unusual and noticeably distinguished scent ... and finally they respected him for his incorruptible honesty.)

He appears to be rather eccentric, because he is, perhaps overly, fastidious in his toilette, always elegantly and foppishly dressed, as per English fashions and as to what is de rigueur for the time of day: "[H]а нем был изящный утренний, в английском вкусе, костюм; на голове красовалась маленькая феска."38 (He was wearing an English-style morning suit and a little fez perched on his head.) He is always immaculately clean shaven, whereas Bazarov is a 'hairy chap', who has "темно-белокурые волосы, длинные и густые"39 (light-brown hair, which was long and thick) and displays none of his refinement. Bazarov himself finds that Pavel Petrovich’s ‘Englishness’, his quirks and impeccable grooming are ridiculous and out of place in the country: "Щегольство какое в деревне, подумаешь! ... Аркадий

37 Ibid, p. 31
38 Ibid, p. 24
39 Ibid, p. 14
Arkadii Nikolaich, do you not think it ridiculous?) Pavel Petrovich himself detests Bazarov: “он считал его гордецом, нахалом, циником, плебеем ... самолюбие какое противное.”41 (He thought him an arrogant and impudent man, cynical and plebeian ... [whose] conceit is quite revolting.) Bazarov’s appearance, behaviour and ideology are the complete antithesis of Pavel Petrovich. He is from a different class and generation and as such we see him denouncing the values for which England supposedly stands and which Pavel Petrovich champions, dismissing them as merely hollow words which have no resonance in Russia: “аристократизм, либерализм, прогресс, принципы – говорил между тем Базаров, – подумаешь, сколько иностранных ... и бесполезных слов! Русскому человеку даром не нужны.”42 (Aristocracy, liberalism, progress, principles – Bazarov interjected – Just think how many foreign ... and useless words! The Russian of today does not need them.)

In his deportment, Pavel Petrovich displays none of the ease of interaction of Bazarov. He is rather cold, aloof and correctly and formally spoken. His attitude towards Russian life is similar to that of Lavretskii Senior, discussed above. He cannot abide the peasants, and spends little time associating with them, although he professes to be liberal-minded and a champion of their cause for liberty.43 Freedom of the peasantry was one of the main issues of the day as the story is set in the aftermath of the Emancipation of the Serfs. Here again, Pavel Petrovich is able to rely on supposedly English values to support his cause and he defends them rigorously to Bazarov:

40 Ibid, p. 21
41 Ibid, p. 40-41
42 Ibid, p. 43
43 Ibid, pp. 43-44
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Defending the aristocracy, Pavel Petrovich is displaying an English-style conservatism. In keeping with his chosen ideological views, he argues that a person’s self-respect is partially a result of the proper deportment and correct dress. This is of course corresponds to his views on the English and establishes grounds for his own personal dignity. It is also reminiscent of the early nineteenth-century travellers’ impressions of English preoccupation with fashion. Although he does not express this explicitly, Pavel Petrovich is eager to be perceived as an ‘Angloman’. In fact, his argument that his dress and deportment are consequences of his self-respect is very reminiscent of Russian requirements for being an English gentleman, as we discussed above:

Я [...] хочу доказать, что без чувства собственного достоинства, без уважения к самому себе, - а в аристократе эти чувства развиты - нет никакого прочного основания общественному ... bien public, общественному зданию. Личность, [...] вот главное; человеческая личность должна быть крепка, как скала, ибо на ней все строится. Я очень хорошо знаю, например, что вы изволите находить смешными мои привычки, мой туалет, мою опрятность наконец, но это все проистекает из чувства самоуважения, из чувства долга, да-с, да-с, долга. [...] I want to prove that without a sense of pride, without a sense of self-respect - these feelings are developed in the aristocrat - there can be no firm foundation for the social. ... bien public ... the social fabric. It is personal character that matters [...] A man’s personal character must be
as strong as a rock, as everything else is built on it. I am well aware, for instance, that you find my habits, my style of dressing, my punctiliousness amusing. But those things develop through a sense of self-respect, from a sense of duty – yes sir – duty ...)

In fact, the words and ideas he is espousing reveal little real understanding of these terms or the accompanying traditions that they signify, as they lack their equivalent in Russian society. Nevertheless, the bandying of differing ideologies between Pavel Petrovich and Bazarov, between two differing factions of Russia’s educated elite, fuels the antipathy between them. In fact it reaches a point where they fight a duel over a trifling event. Bazarov’s excuse for this is Kirsanov’s Anglomania: “Вы можете сказать, что я брал всех англоманов.”46 (You can say that I started abusing all Anglomaniacs.) The two ideologies cannot be reconciled and thus the two characters separate, neither of them to achieve anything noteworthy in society for all their laudable ideas. Pavel Petrovich’s life after he leaves the country is similar to that of Lavretskii. He spends his time expounding his ideas to the nobility who tolerate him and find his Anglomania rather odd and amusing.

Pavel Petrovich is portrayed by the narrator as a comical figure, modelling himself on Russian perceptions of Englishness to an almost ridiculous extent. The treatment of Pavel Petrovich by the storytelling voice suggests that the narrator is distanced from him and this aspect of Russian identity. Turgenev, like Pushkin’s narrator, portrays the Anglomaniac as ridiculous and infatuated with the minutiae of Englishness. Yet again, this sustains the idea that imported English ways are a sterile façade of life which produces a fascination with trifles of etiquette and toilette but offer nothing of practical value to Russian society. Whilst focussing on the smaller

46 Ibid, p. 121
issues of deportment and grooming, the Westernised nobility, perhaps in response to oppressive autocracy, ignores the larger problems that face Russian society. The value of Pavel Petrovich’s type of fascination and slavish imitation of ‘Englishness’ is best summed up by Bazarov in his ironic comment when he shows how badly the estate is being run. The necessities of life on the estate are being neglected. It is in disrepair. For example, the door handle is broken, but in contrast all the fancy trappings are in place: “В моей комнате английский рукомойник, а дверь не запирается. Все-таки это поощряют надо - английский рукомойник, то есть прогресс!”47 (In my room there is an English washstand but the door does not lock. Anyhow this should be encouraged – English washstands – that is progress!) Again, one senses the presence of a metaphor for Russian society as a whole, in regard to its fascination with, and adoption of, Western mores. The logic of the text seems to imply that the adoption of the external features of a culture without the traditions, knowledge and experience to back them up on a larger scale cannot lead to greater happiness and fulfilment, and instead leads to a mere façade of civilisation.

The fascination with these accoutrements of ‘English’ society helps to portray Pushkin’s and Turgenev’s Anglomaniacs as rather pathetic. They are, for all their grand talk and affectations of grandeur, ineffectual. They are not negatively portrayed, although they offer little of use to anyone. Richard Freeborn claims that these characters illustrate the social issues faced by many Russian intellectuals in the aftermath of the failed Decembrist revolt of 1825. He argues that these figures had a ‘divided cultural inheritance’ as a result of ‘the incompatibility of the ‘imitative’ and

47 Ibid, p. 21
‘indigenous’ elements’. Russia had offered them little and so they had followed Western mores and looked to Europe for intellectual stimulus, but post-1825 were left behind.

A less ineffectual Anglophile is Leo Tolstoy’s Vronskii, in Anna Karenina. He is an important character, although again not the protagonist of the novel. His Anglophilia differs from that of the earlier examples. Indeed it is possible to make the case that he is an Anglophile, rather than a true Anglomaniac as he is not depicted in the foppish, imitative manner of the earlier examples. His Anglophilia, we learn, is restricted to the management of his estate, and is rather successful. This estate is opulent and decorated in the finest and latest English styles:

Оставшись одна, Дарья Александровна взглядом хозяйки осмотрела свою комнату. Все, что она видела, подъезжая к дому и проходя через него, и теперь в своей комнате, все производило в ней впечатление изобилия и щедрости и той новой европейской роскоши, про которые она читала только в английских романах ...

(Left alone, Dar’ia Aleksandrovna surveyed her room with the gaze of a housewife. Everything that she had seen on the way up to, and inside the house and now saw in her room gave her the impression of the wealth and sumptuousness of the new European style of luxury, about which she had only read about in English novels...)

This display of wealth and fashion belies the fact that overall the house is cold, unwelcoming and unfriendly. Dolly’s impressions of the nursery sum up her feelings towards the estate. She is clearly ill at ease there, but it is the nursery which is described in the greatest detail from her perspective: “В детской роскошь, которая во всем доме поражала Дарью Александровну, еще более поразила ее. ... Но

obshiy dush deyskoy ... ocheny ne ponравились Dar'ye Aleksandrovne.50 (The luxuriousness of the nursery impressed Darya Aleksandrovna more so than that of the rest of the house ... But Darya Aleksandrovna did not like the overall feel of the nursery at all.) Tolstoi’s literary production of the house and the estate in general draw upon the characteristics of a Russian perception of ‘Englishness’: there are plenty of riches and finery and the house contains the latest gadgets, all of which mask an overall sense of internal sterility and inhospitality.51

The owner of the estate, Vronskii, himself embodies many of these characteristics, particularly when he is at home. The plot of Anna Karenina, in which a married woman of society falls in love with a young officer and leaves her family and the respectable society for him, is well enough known. Such a love affair is in keeping with the idea of the spontaneous, warm and incomprehensible Russian soul. Anna dreams when on a train journey and reading an English book: “Герой романа уже начал достигать своего английского счастья, баронетства и имени ...”52 (The hero of the novel has already begun to attain his English happiness - a baronetcy and an estate.) She imagines it to be herself and Vronskii. As we see Vronskii through the novel, with Anna early on in Moscow and later in Italy, he too fits in with this ideal as a loving and affectionate man who has little regard for the consequences of their actions. At Vozdvizhenskoe, Vronskii’s estate, it appears that she has fulfilled her dreams. Edwina Blumberg writes that “the English novel traditionally conveys a sense of orderliness, propriety, and happiness in marriage and home,”53 which is what

50 Ibid, pp. 610-611
52 L. Tolstoi, op. cit., p. 103
Anna appears to have on the estate. There is an abundance of material goods from England and Vronskii has a stable run by an English jockey and trainer.\textsuperscript{54} However, the warmth Vronskii had been able to show Anna elsewhere appears to be lacking now they are at home. Vronskii becomes a businessman and manages his estate in the English fashion. Getting more and more involved with his business and social affairs, he is unable to reconcile his new lifestyle with his awkward family life and loses his previous spontaneity and passion. His withdrawal into the practical affairs of his estate and his interaction with his business associates mark his growing colder in his personal life. This makes Anna appreciate the difficulty of her position as a social outcast: “Вронский приехал на выборы и потому, что ему было скучно в деревне и нужно было заявить свои права на свободу пред Анной.”\textsuperscript{55} (Vronskii went to the elections because he was bored in the country and also he needed to assert his right to his independence to Anna.) His aloofness towards Anna grows the more time he spends on his estate, and becomes more ‘English,’ and more of a focussed businessman. Pursuing wealth and social status leads to greater unhappiness for the couple and worsening personal relationships. Vronskii’s anglicised behaviour has a direct impact on Anna, who commits suicide because she feels unloved, alone and an outcast in society. Tolstoi has charged the English with soulless frigidity in another story. Such a quality typifies the wealthy English hotel guests and their responses to the peasant singer in ‘Liutsern’, a story which we will discuss in greater detail in Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, p. 561. In this article Blumberg also argues that \textit{Middlemarch} is a likely source of inspiration for \textit{Anna Karenina}. She draws attention to several parallels between the two novels as evidence for her suggestion.

\textsuperscript{55} L. Tolstoi, op. cit., p. 652
The embodiment of supposedly English values in these characters is used as a foil for the Russianness of their opposites. The anglicised characters are all depicted as being fixated with external appearance and the trappings of material wealth. They have rather typecast styles of behaviour; the later Anglophiles are colder, more stilted and less humane in their interaction with others, which is in keeping with the general attitude towards the English as the nineteenth century progresses. In literary representations England comes to signify something barren and sterile, which is of no worth to Russia – a civilisation supposedly more natural and less pretentious.

In the characterisation of the Englishman in Russian literature, we can also see similar stereotypical traits as those which are assigned to the Anglicised Russian. The overall picture of Englishness created by the characterisation of these Englishmen is used for comparison and contrast with the Russian character. Having looked at the depictions of the Anglicised Russians in Russian fiction and the impact they have on the society around them, I shall now turn to images of Englishmen and English social respectability and subsequently to the corresponding representations of the Englishwoman in the pages of Russian literature. This will complement the depiction of the Anglophile and provide further material for creating a typology of Englishness as produced in Russian prose.

The most fruitful examples of Englishness from the point of view of social propriety come from the Russian images of Englishmen and Englishwomen and their everyday behaviour, both in England and in Russia. Although Russian thought tends to discern an affinity with the lower classes of Europe, as we have discussed previously, typically the Englishmen in Russian fiction are drawn from the wealthy,
educated classes as characters from this echelon afforded Russians the most productive and engaging means of comparison. As we noted before, Russia lacked a developed middle class in the nineteenth century, whereas in England, it was arguably the most prosperous and upwardly mobile of all the classes. It was also the most progressive middle class in comparison with other European nations.\footnote{D. Cannadine, \textit{The Rise and Fall of Class in Britain}, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 2-4}

As the historical record confirms, the middle classes in England, in the main, strove for a sense of social respectability which depended on a strict code of orderly conduct. The old notions of the English gentleman as an aristocrat and member of the upper classes were supplanted by the idea that anyone could achieve gentlemanly status through hard work and the observance of proper deportment. This gave rise to a whole new style of social decorum, which was more dependent on the external image of respectability than the innate sense of it that had characterised the aristocratic gentleman.\footnote{N. Platz, 'The Symbolic Dynamics of the Gentleman Idea in the Victorian Novel', \textit{(Literaturwissenschaftliches}, No. 38, 1997), pp. 147-65} This depended upon the proper demeanour in all areas of life. The first, and perhaps immediately most striking, aspect was one's dress and bearing. As we saw in Chapter One, the Russian, in addition to other, travellers commented upon how the Englishman always dressed well and in accordance with the latest fashion. Additionally, the Englishman had a strict code of behaviour; his gait had to be correct, he had to greet others in the proper manner and conduct his business with an eye to propriety at all times. In this manner, many travellers noted that it was impossible to tell the English lord from the ordinary middle-class man on the street.\footnote{N. Erofeev, op. cit., p. 48} Those on the street conformed to the Victorian notion of the English ‘gentleman,’ and, combined

\footnote{56 D. Cannadine, \textit{The Rise and Fall of Class in Britain}, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 2-4
\footnote{58 N. Erofeev, op. cit., p. 48}
together, created an orderly and conformist society that Russian literature eventually came to depict as a hypocritical façade that is devoid of life.

Russian literary images of the Englishman strive to make the most of this aspect of Englishness. The Russian conception of the ‘gentleman’ differed greatly from that of the English. The Russian equivalent of ‘dvorianin’ (nobleman) has a far narrower meaning than the English concept, which highlights, according to Catriona Kelly, the privileged status of this rank. The Russian notion of the ‘gentleman’ also suggests that “gentlemanliness, in terms of politeness” was not always understood.\(^{59}\) It is therefore often ridiculed. The gentlemen are viewed from outside, from the point of view of the Russianness of the observer. Goncharov’s *Fregat “Pallada”*, as we shall see, provides a good illustration of such a lack of understanding. Goncharov’s narrator is not immersed in the foreign culture: he is principally based upon the frigate that is home to almost five hundred Russian sailors and officers. It is, as he describes it “уголок России”\(^{60}\) (a little corner of Russia.) As a consequence of this, even when staying in lodgings in foreign countries, he is comfortable in his role as an outsider, and describes himself as an observer.\(^{61}\) It is his wish to find comparisons with his own culture that he can glean from his observations: “[Ч]то в этой жизни схожего и что не схожего с нами?”\(^{62}\) (In this life what is similar to, and what is dissimilar to ours?)

This work takes the form of a travel narrative; it is a series of letters home and diary entries narrated in the first person and it assumes a Russian reader whose


\(^{60}\) I. Goncharov, *Fregat “pallada”*, (Moskva: Drofa, 2002), p. 52

\(^{61}\) Ibid, p. 38

\(^{62}\) Ibid, p. 40
subjectivity is identical with the narrator's. Although ostensibly based upon Goncharov’s own notes from his actual voyage on the real Frigate “Pallada”, it is acknowledged that this is a work of narrative fiction, following established literary convention. Although the work is bound together as the tale of a journey around the globe, the chapters deal with disparate places and peoples, and can therefore be taken individually. The chapters pertaining to the diplomatic visit to Japan, the initial purpose of the trip, and also the chapter concerned with the visit to South Africa have inspired the greatest investigation on account of the freshness of the subject matter within the Russian canon. These two countries were rarely visited and described by Russian travellers. What concerns us here is the initial chapter “От Кронштадта до мыса Лизарда”, (From Kronstadt to ‘Lizard Point’) as it describes the narrator’s trip to England. We shall return to his chapters dealing with his trips to South Africa and Singapore later, in Chapter Four. Of greatest interest to us here is the use of stereotypes and familiar images of Englishness. Furthermore we will be able to assess the place of Goncharov’s work in relation to the imagery of ‘Englishness’ between the early nineteenth century travel narratives on England and the later fictional depictions of the English upto 1917. This will enable us to make significant developments in the handling of the theme.

The narrator in the Fregat “Pallada” is a literary persona. He is consciously a product of his era and nationality. Shklovskii defines him as a middle-aged man who is used to his comforts. Goncharov’s text obviously alludes to Karamzin’s Letters of a Russian Traveller. In both narratives, the narrator plays the central role and is the

---

main character, while all the other personae are depicted as 'phantom’ characters\(^{65}\) to illustrate the narrator’s taxonomising viewpoint: “[В]ремени лишь было столько, чтобы взглянуть на Англию и на англичан. Оттого меня тянуло все на улицу; хотелось побродить ... среди живых людей.”\(^{66}\) (I had only a certain amount of time to look at England and the English. That is why I was longing all the time to be in the street. I wanted to wander ... amongst living people.) The narrator tends to rely on generalisations and abstract images, rather than specific descriptions of individuals, in order to legitimise his observations. He seeks out aspects of life that are similar, or not too different from what he is accustomed at home. His eye is not on the spectacular but on the ordinary – on those homely habits of everyday life that men hold in common.\(^{67}\) As with Karamzin’s Pis’ma, the object of the journey for the narrator is more than mere description of places and sights. It is a discussion of the narrator’s thoughts and feelings about the other cultures with which he comes into contact, and thus illuminates aspects of his own cultural background. Thus the subjective viewpoint of the narrator becomes more important than the object under observation.\(^{68}\) In this manner his construction of ‘Englishness’ as seen from his viewpoint as a Russian observer articulates his sense of Russian identity. Goncharov’s narrator’s voice arises out of the discursive space of his era,\(^{69}\) and thus his descriptions clearly inform the typology of ‘Englishness-as-otherness’ in contemporary Russian thought.

\(^{65}\) The notion of ‘phantom characters’, characters without any flesh or substance is used in W. Keenan, ‘Leskov’s Left-Handed Craftsman and Zamjatin’s Flea: Irony into Allegory’, (Forum for Modern Language Studies, No. 16, 1980), pp. 66-78

\(^{66}\) I. Goncharov, op. cit., p. 39


\(^{68}\) E. Krasnoshchekova, op. cit., p. 154

\(^{69}\) Ibid, p. 173
We have established above that the narrator’s aim is to observe the everyday conduct of Englishmen on London’s streets, rather than to attempt to integrate into English society. From the outset, the narrator adopts an ironical tone, describing Englishmen with an air of detached amusement, making the scenes he observes appear absurd. His norm-setting gaze thus implies that he is superior to those he is observing. The tendency in Russian letters is to describe the foreign other based on external appearance. This is consistent with a general approach of looking at the artificiality of English attitudes versus an innate Russian spirituality. The narrator’s comments regarding the Englishmen’s greetings in the street where their ritual appears farcical are typical of this propensity. “[C]начала попробуют оторвать друг у друга руку, потом осведомятся взаимно о здоровье и полежают один другому всякого благополучия...”\(^{70}\) (first they tried to tear each other’s hand off, then they enquire mutually about each other’s health and wish each other everything of the best.) Here, the narrator is relying upon, and cementing, established stereotypes and clichés, suggesting that the gentlemen appear to be pompous and self-satisfied, enacting typical scenes of everyday English life. The text implies that social niceties in England are so basic and so simple, that they can be summed up in a few sentences. In tones reminiscent of Karamzin and his successors, he remarks upon the Englishman’s superior attitude towards others: “[H]а лице, выражение глубокого уважения к самому себе, некоторого презрения или, по крайней, мере холодности к другому, но благоговения к толпе, то есть к обществу.”\(^{71}\) (On their faces is an expression of profound self-esteem, of a certain disdain for others, or at least of coldness towards them, but of reverence for the herd – that is for society.)

---

\(^{70}\) I. Goncharov, op. cit., p. 38

\(^{71}\) Ibid, p. 39
This reverence towards society is displayed in the conformity of behaviour on the streets in general, which both fascinates and repels the narrator.

Such stereotyping thrives on confirming pre-existing clichés and images in the readers’ minds. The impression the narrator creates is of a distinct lack of individuality in this society. The gentlemen are described in generic terms, rather than as individuals, creating the sense that these people are mere parts which help to make up the whole of society. Such generalisations and caricatures replace real people, avoiding the need for describing specifics in favour of sweeping images designed to display differences from the author’s own background. The characters the narrator describes are enacting supposedly typical, proscribed roles in the overall play which is English society. In the fixity of social expectations, the narrator implies that English society is lacking spontaneity and ‘life’.\textsuperscript{72} For example, he has arrived in London on the day of the Duke of Wellington’s funeral procession, an event he complains bitterly about because it disrupts his visit. There is no semblance of real life on the streets as everybody is observing the funeral: “Но decorum [внешнее приличие] печали был соблюден до мелочей. Даже все лавки были заперты.”\textsuperscript{73} (The etiquette of sorrow was observed conscientiously. Even all the shops were shut.) The conformity in the mourning for the national figure is a source of both annoyance and mystery to the narrator as it is so widespread and consumes society as a whole for the day. The recognition of, and attachment to, a national hero strikes Goncharov’s narrator as a manifestation of a common sense of national awareness. The sheer numbers of mourners shows the extent to which this was developed in England. His sense of surprise seems to suggest that such a quality is lacking in the narrator’s culture.

\textsuperscript{72} Milton Ehre discusses the images of London in \textit{Fregat "Pallada,"} finding that Goncharov’s impressions of the English are overwhelmingly negative. See M. Ehre, op. cit., esp. pp. 142-153
\textsuperscript{73} Ibid, p. 38
In addition to this reverence for the national hero, the narrator also describes the distinct respect for and pride in the nation’s history, evinced in the preservation of grand, national monuments such as Westminster Abbey. "[В]родя среди живой толпы, отыскивая всюду жизнь, я ... наткнулся на великолепное прошлое. ... Такие народные памятники — те же страницы истории, но тесно связанные с текущей жизнью."74 (Wandering amongst the lively crowd looking everywhere for life, I ran into a magnificent past. ... [N]ational monuments, though they are closely bound up with everyday life are pages of history.) Whilst there is an air of respect for the nation and for the reverence towards its history, this is negated by the overriding impression that the present, in its repressive conformity, is lacking the glories of this illustrious past. For, although there is a ‘lively crowd’ on the streets, the narrator is busy ‘looking everywhere for life.’ He states that although London is a large city at the centre of the world’s trade, there is no semblance of real life: "Общее впечатление, какое производит наружный вид Лондона, с циркуляцией, народонаселения, странно ... а чего бы, вы думали. Не замето? — Жизни, то есть ее бурного брожения."75 (The general impression that London makes is strange, with her outward appearance and circulating population .... What do you think is inconspicuous? Life ... that is its vigorous fermentation.) He is making an implicit contrast with his own world, which we can assume is less orderly and more chaotic than London. He is surprised, for example, by the fact that the traffic in London stops immediately for a policeman. This kind of remark suggests such orderly behaviour would be atypical in his society. He sums up what he terms as a lack of vivacity in

74 Ibid, p. 40
75 Ibid, p. 46
London, attributing it to oppressive, strict regimentation of English life and the rules by which societal life is governed:

Although he likens the city to a ‘living being’, he finds that it is soulless and too mechanically regimented for his taste. Shunning the description of specific individuals, the narrator relies upon such concepts as trade, or practicality. Trade, too, in the narrator’s opinion, is at fault for the lack of vivacity here. Commerce, in his opinion, is a substitute for life in this city. Trade gives London its wealth but it also robs the city and the people of all that makes up ‘real’ life: “[T]орговля видна, а жизни нет.”77 (trade is apparent but there is no life.) Everything is a commodity. He finds, though, that practicality has brought wealth for the English, even though it has robbed them of their individuality and humanity:

Все бы это было очень хорошо, но есть эта практичность, но, к сожалению, тут есть своя неприятная сторона: не только общественная деятельность, но и вся жизнь всех и каждого, сложилась и действует очень практически, как машина.78 (This practicality would be all very well, but unfortunately it has an unpleasant aspect, for not only public activity but the whole life of each person and every person functions very practically, like a machine.)

76 Ibid, p. 46
77 Ibid, p. 46
78 Ibid, p. 48
The narrator relies upon value-laden judgments to depict what he sees as a ‘vast machine’; ‘unfortunately’, the ‘negative aspect’ of practicality, to him, produces the orderliness of this society. It is presumably owing to his Russian background that the narrator reveals anxiety about technology and industry and that he generalises about the dehumanisation resulting from industrialisation.

Steeped in serfdom as Russian society was in 1855-56, it was impossible for it to modernise to the extent of competing with efficient Britain. Russian society was dependent on imported technology, primarily from Britain, as it was unable to produce examples of equivalent quality. The resentment this fostered towards the more technologically capable societies is manifest in the characterisation of these as lifeless machines, as evinced by Goncharov’s narrator. Implicitly the narrator is rearticulating binary oppositions, such as them/us, rational/spontaneous, in which the English rational life is automated, in contrast to ‘our’ human life which is chaotic, but real. The machine of London society has robbed its inhabitants of their animation. He states that in London “[d]обротель лишена своих лучей” (virtue is deprived of its radiance), because even laws and morals are dispensed in various quantities according to the needs of the machine. For him, this is a society which hides behind a mere façade of respectability as the machine is not infallible and all-encompassing; there are aspects of city life which fall through the cracks of the law. For each supposedly positive, respectable attribute of society, there is an opposite which, when it comes to light, exposes the sham that is the system. For example, “искусство запирать замки спорит с искусством открывать их.” (the art of making locks unpickable vies with the art of picking them.) He also comments upon the British
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administration which encourages social conscience and charity, but is prone to brutality in maintaining its vast empire: "Филантропия возведена в степень общественной обязанности, а от бедности гибнут не только отдельные лица, семейства но целые страны под английским управлением."\(^{82}\) (Philanthropy is raised to the level of public duty but whole countries not just individuals or families, perish due to poverty under English administration.) Tellingly, he sums up with the comment: "призадумываемся над репутацией умного, делового, религиозного, нравственного и свободного народа!"\(^{83}\) (you wonder about the reputation of a clever, business-like, religious, moral and free nation!) Each of the values that England supposedly stands for has a hollow resonance when formulated in such a manner. Reflecting upon the characteristics of English society allows the narrator to form specific value-judgements about the perceived sterility and emptiness of English respectability, based as it is on rationality. He is implying in the process, as Karamzin and Viazemskii did before him, for example, that his own cultural values are based on humane feelings, which are non-rational but from the heart and entirely spontaneous. He thus adopts a view of superiority and negates the values of Englishness and the supposed respectability of the English gentleman and his society.

Similar concepts of Englishness abound in Zamiatin’s portraits of the English gentlemen and English social respectability in his short stories ‘Ostrovitiane’ and ‘Lovets chelovekov’, written in 1916 and 1917 respectively. As Goncharov’s narrator offers a norm-setting spectator’s taxonomising point of view of London’s society, Zamiatin’s stories rely upon the authorial viewpoint to convey a sense of Russianness. Russia does not intrude upon the stories at all. What are purported to be scenes of

\(^{82}\) Ibid, p. 49  
\(^{83}\) Ibid, p. 49
‘ordinary’ middle-class life in England are undermined by the ironic and satirical tones which convey a sense of authorial spiritual superiority. The middle-class Englishness, for Zamiatin, suffers from the disease of entropy, of stagnation and petty hypocrisy. Zamiatin spent a year in Britain in 1916-17, living and working with the English. His attitude toward the English was constantly ambivalent. He admired their gentle and reserved nature, as it resembled his own temperament. Even in appearance, he resembled an Englishman; he was always well groomed, he often wore English tweeds and smoked a pipe. However, he abhorred and despised the conformity and hypocrisy, and general lack of spirituality of the English middle-class. There are distinct overtones of Goncharov’s point of view in ‘Ostrovitiane’. Vicar Dewley’s Jesmond world is likened to a huge machine that is run along the principles of his ridiculous ‘Doctrine of Compulsory Salvation.’ These are designed to expunge the spontaneity of humanity from daily life. Similarly, Zamiatin’s Sunday Gentlemen, which we mentioned in Chapter Two, are reminiscent of Goncharov’s Englishmen in the bland generalisations used to describe them. These gentlemen are identical in both their appearance and lifestyles. The absurd representation of this group of gentlemen serves to underpin the notion of the strict conformity of middle class English life in all matters and the adherence to the strict code of societal conduct. The idea that these gentlemen could be produced in a local factory helps facilitate the concept that English society is like the Vicar Dewley’s oppressive machine; it has produced dozens of duplicates indoctrinated in the ways of society who will uphold its values, and who are mere dispensable cogs in the grand scheme of things.

84 D. Richards, op. cit., p. 85
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The narrator uses specific description in the case of some characters. These characters are often the forces of energy, or spontaneous individuals who have the ability to disrupt the workings of the machine. They further underpin this concept of the absurdity of the rationally organised society as the machine fails to dominate in all spheres of human nature, and is doomed to disruption. Such individuals are defined through the use of metaphoric comparison\(^6\) in the form of an individual item or physical feature which is representative of their character and used to convey the author’s impression of this person. Through the use of such objects characters are ‘mechanised’ and are made to be a part of the ‘machine’ that is English society. For example, we are introduced to one of the main protagonists, Mr Campbell, in the chapter entitled ‘a foreign body’. Campbell is the foreign body in the vicar’s household; he is a disruptive individual, rather than a fellow gentleman, who stops the machine working efficiently. His behaviour is not what it should be for a gentleman of his stature. He sets the events in the story in motion by his car accident. This is a deliberate ploy to receive compensation and solve his financial problems and restore his, and his mother’s, status. He is portrayed as being a disreputable influence from the outset. He is not wearing a shirt under his jacket, which causes the vicar to raise his eyebrows in contempt, for this is unacceptable in his society. He also acts as a disruptive influence on Mrs Dewley, making her appear more humane than she does when he is not present. She not only loses the pince-nez that are symbolic of a barrier between her and the outside world, but she also has a purpose which disrupts the tedium of the timetabled lifestyle:

---

\(^6\) The term ‘metaphoric comparison’ is used by Alex Shane in his ‘Zamjatin’s Prose Fiction’, (The Slavic and East European Journal, Vol.12, No. 1, 1968), p. 20
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The pince nez in the story create an image of Mrs Dewley which ties her into the overall ‘machine’. The pince nez are at once a technical device which corrects her vision and also frames her face, providing a distance which separates the person from the machine-like individual produced when she dons them. Without the pince nez, Mrs Dewley is human, distracted and blissful and is susceptible to passions and to having a soul. Releasing the ‘human’ behind the pince nez, the barrier between the person and the outside world, is threatening to disrupt the status quo of the pragmatic machine as it makes Mrs Dewley less efficient and more spontaneous.

Similarly Campbell is depicted as a tractor or a car. These are further examples of technology, but they are also items which have a propensity to go wrong, or can deviate from the straight path demanded by the machine. Indeed, Mrs Campbell defines the motor car as ‘невоспитанное’ (ill-bred), and thus his depiction suggests that Campbell himself is not quite the gentleman he ought to be from the beginning. His is a relatively sympathetic portrayal as he is the instrument by which the hypocrisy of this society is exposed. His character evolves and he moves further away from ‘respectable’ society. As this happens, he changes from a car that is motoring on straight ahead, to become a car with its steering wheel broken when there is a glitch in his planning. Then he becomes a lorry which rushes forward and simply will not stop.

87 E. Zamiatin, op. cit., p. 100
This suggests that he has the ability to break free of the constraints of his society and become an animated character in his own right. It also attests that the machine of society is not as efficient as it might be, that there is room for spontaneity however much English society may try to repress it. Campbell does, however, adhere to the principles of his class, equating material goods with respectability. He wants to buy an electric iron for the house he is planning to set up with Didi, a dancing girl. This electric iron is symbolic of respectability for him; he dreams about it ironing away the street and making everything smooth and orderly: “[Я] олзет и приглаживает все, и не остается ничего ... только что-то плоское и гладкое как зеркало.”

Campbell’s need to secure domestic objects such as furniture and, by extension, respectability is symbolic in the indoctrination of his upbringing, from which he has not yet managed to break free entirely. His association with O’Kelly the Irish lawyer has gone a long way towards distancing him from the strictures of his class. O’Kelly is a sort of anti-gentleman who, in his exuberance, also shows up the rigidity of middle class Jesmond society. O’Kelly is loud, brash, energetic and non-conformist. He is Irish, and the source of much irritation to the well-to-do Jesmonders. For the narrator, he is the most likeable of Zamiatin’s male protagonists as he is the least restrained and most comical character in the tale. Indeed, he is rather naughty, and undermines propriety as much as possible. He loves to disrupt the orderly life of the
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Jesmonders: "It is difficult to believe it, but O’Kelly turned up to lunch ... in a morning coat. The whole lunch was spoilt. He is characterised by his ‘four arms’: ‘он – четверорукый джентльмен’ ([he is] a four-armed gentleman.) He is always busy and over-exuberant and appears to have arms and ugly features everywhere. His ugliness is compared to an ornament of a pug – “Джонни похож на Мистера О Келли?” (Doesn't Jonnie [the pug ornament] look like Mister O’Kelly?) Being unattractive is also considered ungentlemanly in Jesmond society where physical beauty or stature is a feature of the ‘well-bred man’. The well-bred man in this society should blend in – he should be one of these mass-produced gentlemen, and he should have no exceptional features: “Как известно, человек культурный должен, по возможности, не иметь лица. То есть не то, чтобы не иметь, а так: будто лицо, а будто и не лицо – чтобы не бросалось в глаза ....” (It is well known that a well-bred man, as far as is possible should have no face. [He] should have a face and at the same time appear faceless. It should not stand out.) O’Kelly’s only saving graces in the eyes of Zamiatin’s English society are that he is a lawyer, which is a respectable and gentlemanly profession, and he is wealthy which of course allows him to associate with the upright members of the community. In the eyes of the supposedly reputable Jesmonders, O’Kelly is a corrupting influence on Campbell. He introduces him to the lower echelons of society in the form of Didi, the dancer. Furthermore, he also takes Campbell to boxing matches. He is, in this manner, the agent of Campbell’s destruction and the one to expose the façade of life in Jesmond’s society.
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The exposure of the disreputable underbelly of English society undertaken in ‘Ostrovitiane’ is also apparent in Zamiatin’s short story, ‘Lovets chelovekov’. Here, Zamiatin adopts a similar approach to London society as he did to that of Jesmond. The orderliness of society is a façade which drops as soon as the Zeppelins bomb the city, to be replaced by chaos. The main protagonist is Craggs. He has all the features necessary to be a middle-class English gentleman. He has a beautiful wife who keeps an orderly house. He has money, which is exemplified in his wife’s collection of silver teaspoons: “У миссис Лори была превосходная коллекция чайных ложек.”\(^{94}\) (Mrs Craggs had a wonderful set of teaspoons.) Collecting nick-knacks and useless trinkets to put on display was a pastime of the middle classes which alluded to their status and relative means. It is also stipulated that Craggs is well-off as he has a “текущий счет в Лондон-Сити-энд-Мидланд Банк” (current account in the London City and Midland Bank) Craggs is well known in society and esteemed, because of his prosperity and the ‘right’ connections – he was a voluntary apostle of the Society for the Fight against Vice and is thought to have made his money on the Stock Exchange. Craggs is characterised as a ‘чугунный монумент’ (‘a little iron monument’). This image lends credence to his status as a gentleman, and a ‘treasure’ of his society, but it also shows him as cold, inflexible and inhuman. In addition, his structured movements and his procession to church, which is likened to an equation, suggest that he is a part of a mechanically rationalised society, similar to that of the mechanical automaton of Dewley’s machine. His outward respectability hides the fact that Craggs is a blackmailer. The so-called respectability of this society is therefore a sham and is exposed as being as hypocritical and sterile as its gentlemen are. Craggs’ aura of respectability arises owing to his possessions, including his wife, and his

status, all of which have been purchased using the money he has blackmailed from others. The society is therefore reduced to a state of spiritual bankruptcy in which morality and respectability are public affairs, propagated in the pursuit of orderliness and for hiding the distasteful nature of the real goings-on.

In addition to exposing the moral hollowness of the gentlemen, Zamiatin reveals the world of the Englishwoman in his two stories. As his male characters are made to fit the binary oppositions of conformism / spontaneity, rationality / irrationality, so do his female protagonists. Mrs Craggs, like her husband, is a product of this sterile society in which respectability comes through orderliness and material prosperity. She keeps a spotless house and in turn receives her ‘payment’ in the form of her ornamental spoons, and lacy underwear. She has consequently moved up the social scale by marrying, a point which is emphasised through her mother’s and sister’s attitudes when they visit her. They are there to confirm her new status and social wealth: “Счастлива вы, Лори ... Помнишь как ты, бывало, с нами на рынке ... а теперь ... Мрамор миссис Лори розовел – это так нужно – извне получить подтверждение, что ты ... счастлива ...”95 (“You are lucky, Laurie. ... Do you remember how you used to come to the market with us ... And now ... The marble Mrs Laurie blushed: it was so necessary to receive outside confirmation of one’s good fortune.”)

Laurie Craggs is characterised as marble, suggesting her outward appearance is fine and delicate, and proper as it should be. She is further depicted by the image of

---

95 Ibid, p. 164
“Занавес», легчайшего и все же непрозрачного шелка.”96 (a curtain of the lightest, but still opaque, pink silk) which hangs across her lips. This provides her barrier to the world, in much the same way as Mrs Dewley’s pince-nez (above). It is only drawn back in a moment of secret sexual pleasure with Bailey, the organist, which occurs in the chaos of the Zeppelin raid. This event – like a Dionysian explosion – is followed briefly by the abandonment of rationality in the city.97 Ultimately, ‘order’ is restored. Laurie returns to her day-to-day life as a hypocritical and sterile character who has sold herself for the material wealth and status that marrying above her class affords her.

Similarly, Zamiatin’s female characters in the Jesmond society reveal themselves to be just as obsessed with status and wealth as Mrs Craggs, as well as their male counterparts. His “розовые и голубые [дамы]”98 (pink and blue ladies) accompany the Sunday Gentlemen as mere products of the machine of rational and conformist society. They appear at the Vicar’s dinner party and acquiesce with everything he says, appearing in the tale as mere bystanders. Lady Campbell is a figure of contempt in the tale who embodies all that is wrong with English society in Zamiatin’s view. It is thought that she is modelled after the Lady Noble of the Armstrong Shipping family, with whom Zamiatin spent time during his year in England. Lady Noble was a very typical upper-middle-class lady with traditional English views on propriety and conduct, and, in keeping with middle-class fashions of the period, held soirees in a sitting room hung with portraits.99 Lady Campbell is portrayed through the image of a broken umbrella, and her neck is said to be held up by an invisible bridle: “Какая-то

96 Ibid, p. 151
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Some kind of unseen bridle held her head high all of the time.) She is an impoverished member of the gentry. She displays no maternal love for Campbell, her son. She is merely concerned with their reputation as he consorts with the ‘wrong sort’ of people. Her main priority appears to be preserving the status quo of respectability in her household. In order to preserve order and keep up appearances she makes her serving lady wear white gloves to serve meals and she buys a gong which she beats each mealtime even when she is alone. In the name of social propriety and keeping up appearances, Lady Campbell puts off repairing her shoes for a month in order to be able to afford to serve liqueurs at dinner with Mr O’Kelly.

Mrs Campbell is the opposite of Didi, the ‘dancing girl’, with whom her son falls in love. Didi is a force of energy, and as such is positively valorised as exuberant and full of life. She is not respectable, she is a divorced dancer and lives in very insalubrious lodgings, in Mrs Auntie’s boarding house. She leads Campbell ‘astray’. She is the female agent thanks to whom the sterility and hypocrisy of Jesmond’s middle-class society is exposed. In contrast to Mrs Campbell and her peers, Didi is unrestrained; she often laughs out loud. She is spontaneous and uninhibited. She is described as having a tomboyish face ‘мальчишьее лицо’, which is accentuated by her boy’s hairstyle “по-мальчишьим подстриженные волосы.” This, of course, makes her stand out as an individual. It also makes her alluring to Campbell. Mrs Dewley also shares this quality. After the disruption to her routine and the subsequent loss of her pince nez she is physically attractive and has a glow to her.
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Zamiatin’s depictions of the English women seem to draw upon the English governesses depicted in situations in Russia. These governesses have many features in common. They are, in the main, not particularly attractive, or are plain ugly; they are haughty and are portrayed as being strict and rather prim. Certainly, Pushkin’s Miss Jackson in ‘Baryshnia-krest’ianka’ is one of the first of the English governesses in Russian fiction. Hers also happens to be one of the kindest depictions of Englishwomen. She is described as being a rather strait-laced spinster, and as being prudish. She pays close attention to her appearance: she dyes her eyebrows, powders her face and is always properly dressed in her corsets, giving her a figure like a wine glass. Her portrayal is fairly neutral; she is portrayed as plain and unremarkable, yet she assists the lovers and thus serves as a positive character. The owner of face powder, Miss Jackson, although unknowingly, helps Lisa disguise herself in front of Alexei, the man who knows her as Akulina, the servant girl. Miss Jackson is furious with Lisa when she suspects her of stealing and trying to make fun of her. At all other points in the story she is called by her name, in this event the narrator emphasises her nationality, calling her the ‘English governess’ and the ‘Englishwoman’. The Anglicised Russian is amused by Lisa’s prank, and the other Russians are intrigued by her. Miss Jackson does not find it funny and the emphasis on her nationality is perhaps to portray that haughtiness is an English characteristic, and not Russian in the slightest. Nevertheless, she is mollified and is shown to be kindly by nature as she gives Lisa some of her English powder as a token of reconciliation.

---

102 In his *When Miss Emmie was in Russia*, Harvey Pitcher states that Pushkin’s Miss Jackson was actually the first English governess to be depicted in literature. He argues that in 1830s, it was still less common for families to have an English, than a French, German or even Swiss governess. He argues that this is evinced in Pushkin’s treatment of his ‘Madame Miss Jackson’ as a caricature, who is working for an eccentric. See H. Pitcher, *When Miss Emmie was in Russia: English Governesses Before, During and After the October Revolution*, (London: John Murray, 1977), pp. 6-7
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Where Miss Jackson appears to be a kindly, if proud, individual, the heroine of Chekhov’s ‘Doch’ Al’biona’ (‘A Daughter of Albion’), is given no such grace as a nice character. This story has received mixed reactions because some English readers found the caricature of the governess to be offensive.\(^\text{104}\) She is an ugly woman who is “[в]ысокая, тонкая англичанка с выпуклыми речными глазами и большим птичьим носом, похожим скорей на крючок, чем на нос”\(^\text{105}\) (a tall, thin Englishwoman with bulging lobster-like eyes, and a large bird nose that looked more like a hook than a nose.) She, unlike Miss Jackson, does not appear to be rescued by her neat grooming, and to make matters worse, her appearance is made less appealing still by the outfit she is wearing. Her shoulders are apparent through her dress, and they are described both as ‘skinny’ and ‘yellow’, making the overall aesthetic impression rather unfavourable. “Одета она была в белое кисейное платье, сквозь которое сильно просвечивали тонкие, желтые плечи.”\(^\text{106}\) (She was wearing a thin white dress through which skinny yellow shoulders were clearly visible.) As the title suggests, this ‘Mamselle’ is intended to be a representative of a ‘typical’ Englishwoman. This is borne out in the statement made by her employer regarding her, and by extension, the English attitude to Russian as well as other foreign languages. The narrator enables the character of the landowner by giving him direct speech, and the statements he makes are intended to be representative of those of his type. He is very rude and brash, and extremely critical of the Englishwoman in her inability to speak Russian: “Живет дурица в России десять лет, и хоть бы одно слово по-русски! Нап какой-нибудь аристократичка поедет к ним и жив по-

---


\(^{106}\) Ibid, p. 46
ихнему брехать научится, а она ... черт их знает!"  

107 (This fool has been living in Russia for ten years and does not even speak a word of Russian! Any little nobleman of ours goes over there and learns how to babble in their language. But not her ... to hell with her!) The suggestion that ‘any’ nobleman, as implied by the somewhat derogatory term ‘аристократичка,’ could pick up English is a pointed remark. It implies that English cannot be overly difficult to master, as it is simple enough for Russians to learn with ease. However, we can infer from this that Russian is obviously more complex as this Englishwoman cannot manage even a few words. Ergo, the foreign is inferior to the Russian in its simplicity. The comment also manages to imply that Russians are cleverer, thus superior, to the English as they are able to master the English language where the Englishwoman fails to learn Russian.  
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Janko Lavrin argues that the governess is the victor in this scenario, yet Chekhov does not positively valorise his Englishwoman’s personality. She treats her employer with disdain and regards him imperiously when he tries to shock her. Gorkii argued that Chekhov’s target was, in fact, the Russian landowner.  

110 He clearly despises the Englishwoman. She is alone in a foreign country, does not speak the language and her employer obviously does not welcome her.  

111 However, Chekhov’s story is a masterpiece in terms of representing cultural differences and miscommunication. He of course manages to reveal the Russian employer to be just
as bad as this woman. He is uncouth; drawing attention to her physical imperfections: "Ты посмотри на нос! На нос ты посмотри!" (Look at that nose! Just look at that nose!) He treats her with little respect. This in turn is matched by her profound condescension towards him.

If Chekhov's and Pushkin's English governesses are intended to be typical examples of the Englishwomen found in Russia, this would confirm the pronouncement made by Goncharov in his observations on women in England. He appears rather enchanted with the women he sees in English society: "Они прекрасны, стройны, с удивительным цветом лица ..." (They are beautiful, slim, with remarkably fresh faces) He in fact claims that only ugly women who have no special talent need to leave England: "Женщина же урод не имеет никакой цены, если только за ней нет какого-нибудь особенного таланта, который нужен в Англии ... Одно преподавание языка, или хождение за ребенком, там не важность: остается уехать в Россию." (An ugly woman has no value if she has no particular talent that is in demand in England. They can teach language or look after children, there it is not needed: as a last resort they can go to Russia.) A similar inference informs the novel Anna Karenina. Dolly is unimpressed with the baby's head nurse: "нарядная, высокая, с неприятным лицом и нечистым выражением англичанка... англичанка очень не понравилась Дарье Александровне. Только тем, что в такую неправильную семью как Анна, не пошла бы хорошая, Дарья Александровна и объяснила себе то, что Анна со своим знанием людей, могла взять к своей девочке такую несимпатичную, нереспектабельную
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(A tall, smart Englishwoman with a disagreeable face. ... Darya Aleksandrovna did not like the Englishwoman at all. How could Anna, with her insight into people, have engaged such an unprepossessing, non-respectable-looking woman for her child? The only explanation she could give herself was that no respectable nurse would have gone to work for such an irregular household as Anna’s.) Tolstoi, like Goncharov, implies that only those who were not able to go elsewhere, somewhere more prestigious, ended up in Russia. Asserting that it is specifically ugly Englishwomen who are fated to work abroad and that there is no use for them in English society projects the ‘snobbish superficiality’ of the English within their Russia literary representations. In particular, it is in keeping with Zamiatin’s idea of the ‘perfect’, ‘well-bred’ face. That these women should end up in Russia as a last resort would suggest there are no preconceived ideas in Russia as to facial perfections. This can be construed as another example of Russia’s comparative freedom and its lack of such social conformity and expectation as exists in England. Providing this contrast, and the implication that Russia is vastly more accepting of perceived physical imperfections, may be why the Englishwomen in Russian literature are depicted far more harshly than those from real life documented by the travellers from Karamzin’s time to Goncharov’s.

The distinctly unflattering England within Russian literary space aims to draw attention to the hypocrisy and sterility of English life. These representations of Englishness, in the guise of the Russian Anglophile, the Englishman and the Englishwoman contrast with the implied and idealised Russian mores. For the interpreting subjectivity that these narratives assume, a sense of Russian superiority

115 L. Tolstoi, (1998), op. cit., p. 610
gains acceptance. The implied Russian observer perceives that automated English values lack the ethics of spirituality and humaneness for which Russia supposedly stands.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE ENGLISH ABROAD

I have argued that nineteenth and early twentieth-century English society evoked feelings of considerable ambivalence for the Russian observer. There was a degree of admiration for the supposed sophistication of the powerful, wealthy and efficient English, which went hand-in-hand with criticism of their excessive conformity and lack of spontaneity. Their society was likened to a great machine of civilisation, which Zamiatin in particular took great delight in exposing for its perceived hypocrisy and sterile lack of humanity. This was a society which had a strong sense of its own superiority and well-being. It was supported in this by the wealth and notoriety gained by its enormous Empire overseas. The rulers of the Russian Empire also coveted such a status, yet they failed to achieve it. Russian society was penetrated by products of British technology and workmanship and discussions about British technological prowess abounded in Russian periodicals.\(^1\) Russia’s better-informed citizens thus had first-hand knowledge of British technological prowess and overall might.\(^2\) It is little wonder then, that the British model induced powerful emotions and elicited stereotypes in Russian consciousness which are subsequently apparent in Russian discourse.

In Chapter Three I examined Russian literary depictions of ‘Englishness’ and English society. This chapter will focus on the fictional representation of the exportation of English culture abroad. Specifically, it will concentrate on the textual

\(^1\) V. Predtechenskii, op. cit., pp. 40-41
\(^2\) Erofeev argues that the range and quality of English-made goods in Russia was considerable and as such led to the impression of the English as a hard-working and efficient nation. See N. Erofeev, op. cit. pp. 58-59
representation of British technological achievements. Such accomplishments were both made possible by, and also created the means to keep enlarging, the vast British Empire. We will therefore also need to address literary images of the Empire itself. Firstly we shall explore Leskov’s depictions of Anglo-Russian rivalry in English factory life and craftsmanship. This will be complemented by Dostoevskii’s and Chernyshevskii’s images of the Crystal Palace as the pinnacle of British technological accomplishment, and the impact of this phenomenon on Russian self-perception. Following this, the remainder of this chapter will concentrate on the Russian impressions of British colonialism and the exportation of ‘Englishness’ abroad in Tolstoi’s ‘Liutsem’, Goncharov’s Fregat “Pallada” and Bunin’s ‘Brat’ia’.

We have seen that Russia perceived Britain to be its main rival in the second half of the nineteenth century, and that in status the two empires were regarded as opposites. The second half of the nineteenth century saw Russia attempting to begin to modernise to enable its colonising mission to develop further, whilst the British Empire was at the height of its strength and influence. The expansion of the British Empire could not have occurred without the social mobility and the technological prowess achieved in Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As is well known, Britain led the way in the newly modernised Western world. The British devised new methods of engineering and invented new technologies which facilitated the building of the Empire. This strengthened the sense of British superiority which so grated on the Russian imagination and fuelled the hostility which is underpinned by Russia’s own unfulfilled aspirations of colonising overseas territories. Leskov explores this Anglo-Russian rivalry in his short story, ‘Iazvitel’nyi’ (‘A Spiteful
Chap'). Using a skaz narrator, Leskov is able to investigate the interaction between the two cultures without identifying overt sympathies with either. He is disdainful of both. The central character, the narrator, is an ‘official for special assignments’ on the staff of the local governor. He is sent to the estates of Prince Kurakin, as he is a native of the area, to determine the cause of local unrest and is able to associate both with the local peasants and the merchants to discover the problem. The disturbances are a direct result of the clashing of two cultures and ideologies. The manager is an Englishman, Stewart ‘Iakovlevich’ Dane. His character is ostensibly based on Leskov’s uncle, Alexander Scott, the manager of Count Perovsky’s estates in Penza.5 Interestingly, Leskov had always held his uncle in great regard, and so the hostile portrayal of Dane in this story is unusual.6 Dane has been attempting to instil a new, English-style working regime in the local factory, which has been met with resistance by the peasant workers. His ideas on the correct system to employ in the workplace are founded upon the need to be orderly and reasonable: “«Нужна только система. Не нужно быть ни варваром, ни потатчиком, а вести дело систематически, твердо, настойчиво, но разумно.»”7 (“... A system is all that is required. One should be neither barbaric, nor indulgent. Management should be systematic, firm, unwavering, but rational. There should be method in everything one does.”)

This idea of a management style fits in with the concepts we explored earlier concerning the English gentleman and the idea of rationality. From the later eighteenth century there had been a shift in thought in England, and also in Western

6 Ibid, p.112 McLean argues that this hostile representation of his uncle is most likely to be a response to a personal quarrel, or grudge. Leskov recounts in his diaries about working in his uncle’s firm as a commercial agent. He travelled extensively around Russia, which enabled him to gather experiences which later took form in his writings. See Ibid, pp. 51-54
7 N. Leskov, ‘Inzvitel’nyi’, in N. Leskov, op. cit, p. 43
Europe, which encouraged orderliness as a form of discipline in the workplace as well as in society. The use of violence and more physical punishments was denigrated as 'primitive' and 'uncivilised'.8 Dane’s goal is to instil such a structure in the Russian factory without resorting to corporal punishment, specifically beatings, which the Russian system still relied upon. From the point of view of the villagers, the methods he employs are laudable and show just how backward the existing regime is: “Bot ... настоящий человек; умный, рассудительный, аккуратный. Во всем у него порядок, знает он, сколько можно ему издержать, сколько нужно оставить; одним словом, видно, что это человек не нашего русского, дурацкого воспитания!”9 (There is ... a real man. Intelligent, efficient, full of common sense. There’s order and method in everything he does, he knows how much to spend and how much to keep in hand. In a nutshell you can see he’s no product of our idiotic Russian upbringing!)

However, despite the villagers’ praise of the new steward’s methods, we learn very little of what is actually achieved. The silences regarding his progress imply that there is, in fact, little improvement. Dane attempts, unsuccessfully, to build a distillery, impeded by the social conditions and the workers. Although the other villagers praise his methods, those who actually work for him find his regime alienating. By the early nineteenth century in England, there had also been a shift in the concept of masculinity, especially amongst merchants and professionals. A man’s reputation now depended upon his professional standing and his integrity.10 In contrast, however, the ability to withstand harsh physical punishments was still prized in Russia, especially

---

9 N. Leskov, op. cit., p. 44
amongst its peasantry as a matter of customary discipline\textsuperscript{11}: “Хороший барин ... Ничего ни капли не строг он. ... Очень хорош, - похуже надо, вот и жалобы. Не по нутуру мужчинам.”\textsuperscript{12} (He’s a good man ... He is not strict at all ... He is very good - he needs to be a little less so, that is why there are complaints ... the men just cannot stomach him.) The change in work ethic and punishment was regarded as degrading by Dane’s workers and thus his venture was doomed to failure without their cooperation.

The workers argue that his punishments are inhumane, as they are humiliating, rather than violent. The central character, a peasant worker, describes his experience in some detail, suggesting that it is an event which has stayed in his mind:

Привел к заводу, велел лакею принести из барских хором золотое кресло; поставил это кресло против рабочих, на щепу посадил меня на него, а в спинку булаку застремил да меня к ней и привязал, как воробья, ниточкой.\textsuperscript{13} (He had me taken to the factory [where] he ordered a lackey to bring a gold armchair from the grand gallery. He put the chair on top of some wood chips in front of the workers, sat me down on it and pushed a pin into the back of it and tied me to it with thread, like a sparrow.)

They regard such chastisement as unnecessarily degrading. Indeed, the stripping of the peasant’s ability to work and to subject him to the ridicule of his comrades in such a manner seems unduly harsh: “Он язвительный человек такой.”\textsuperscript{14} (He is such a

\textsuperscript{11} Alexander Fodor quotes Maxim Gor‘kii’s words written in January 1918 on the issue of corporal punishment in Russia: “Nowhere is man beaten so often, with such zeal and joy, as in our Russia. ‘To smack in the teeth’, ‘to punch up the throat’, [...] ‘to bloody the nose’, all these are our nice Russian pastimes. We brag about it. People have become too accustomed to being ‘knocked about from the time they were small’; they are knocked about by their parents and masters [...]” H. Ermolaev (trans & intro.), M. Gorky, \textit{Untimely Thoughts; Essays on Revolution, Culture and the Bolsheviks, 1917-1918}, (New York: Paul S. Eriksson, Inc., 1968), pp. 111-112, Quoted in A. Fodor, \textit{Tolstoy and the Russians: Reflections on a Relationship}, (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984), p. 45

\textsuperscript{12} N. Leskov, op. cit., p. 46

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, p. 55

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid, pp. 54-55
spiteful man) It suggests a complete lack of flexibility and compassion in the Englishman. It also implies Dane’s over-confidence in his ways as he persists in his endeavours until the peasants make him flee by setting fire to his house and exacting retribution in the form of a beating. Offered a means of conciliation, the peasants prefer the usual legal punishment for their actions; exile to Siberia or public flogging, rather than reconciling themselves to the Englishman’s regime:

-Да мы прощения попросим, а уж опять его к себе принять не согласны.
-Так следствие будет.
-Ну, что будет, то нехай будет; а нам с ним никак нельзя обходиться.  
 (“Yes, we will beg his forgiveness, but we will not take him back again.”
“So there will be consequences”
“Well, what will be, will be, we just cannot cope with him.”)

Three men are subsequently sent to penal servitude, twelve to military service and the rest are flogged and returned to their place of residence.

The irony of the story rests in the fact that neither side is victorious in this rivalry as the Englishman fails in his attempts and nothing improves. The Russian peasants are portrayed as stubborn, ignorant and devious and only defeat the Englishman by clinging to their own backwardness. This new system is unacceptable to the workers, yet the narrator makes it clear that Dane has done nothing wrong and that his system is progressive. The narrator seeks out the local landowners. They are full of praise for the Englishman’s humane regime. However, there is one old merchant who is able to understand the Englishman’s precarious position there and the workers’ hostility towards him. The situation in which the Englishman finds himself attests to

---

15 Ibid, p. 57
16 H. Mclean, op. cit., p. 113
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the lack of understanding between foreigners and Russians. Reminiscent of Karamzin’s comments that what works in England would not necessarily be successful elsewhere, ‘Iazvitel’nyi’ again confirms that the Englishman’s timetabled regime may work in England but is doomed to fail in Russia. The social conditions in Russia are not capable of sustaining modernity as they are too set in tradition. The narrator delights in the Englishman’s downfall as he came “like a colonial administrator with an assumption of moral and intellectual superiority, and is in the end vanquished by the immobility and brutishness of the Russian peasantry.”

Similarly, in ‘Levsha’, Leskov also exploits this Anglo-Russian rivalry; this time in England. He again manages to criticise both societies and highlight the fundamental lack of understanding between the two. In Chapter Two I examined the many references to the religious differences between the two peoples in this story. This allowed me to determine that, although both professed to be Christians and shared the same Bible, from the narrator’s viewpoint, the English were far more preoccupied with material sophistication than with religion. In contrast, the craftsman’s faith was traditional, and was inherent to his sense of (Russian) identity. I propose here to examine the portrayal of craftsmanship and the workplace in this story, in the fictional construction of which Leskov foregrounds a Russian view of the differences between Russian and English societies.

From the outset, the narrator alludes to the two tendencies in Russian identity, specifically, towards a slavish acceptance of Western superiority and an exaggerated national pride which borders on chauvinism. The opening of the story sees Emperor

17 Ibid, p. 113
Alexander I travelling through Europe to see the different countries. The emperor regards everything foreign as superior. He ends up in England and spends some time viewing the museums and artillery displays, where, according to the story, the English are trying to ‘impress’ him. Platov, the Cossack who accompanies him, tries in vain to convince him of Russian superiority by showing the Tsar that the pistol which is the pride of the English was in fact made by a Russian gunsmith: “Платов показывает государю собаку, а там на самом сугробе сделана русская надпись: Иван Москвин во граде Туле.”18 (Platov shows the Emperor the trigger, and there on the barrel itself is the inscription in Russian ‘Ivan Moskvin of the town of Tula’)

Although Emperor Alexander had been convinced of the foreigners’ superiority, national pride was asserting itself under Nicholas I. It was thus important to the new tsar that Russian workmanship be seen to be superior to English: “Государь Николай Павлич в своих русских людях был очень уверенный и никакому иностранцу уступать не любил.”19 (The Emperor Nikolai Pavlich had confidence in his Russian people and did not like to concede [superiority] to any foreigner.) When Platov relates to him the story of the microscopic, dancing metal flea made by the English the Emperor is determined that Russia not be outdone. Thus he sends Platov to the Tula craftsmen so that they can create a superior object which will assure the English of Russia’s equality: “Брат мой этой вещи удивлялся и чужих людей, которые делали нимфозорию, больше всех хвалил, а я на своих надеюсь, что они никого не хуже.”20 (My brother was amazed with this thing and he praised the foreigners who made it most of all, but I have faith in our own, that they are no worse than anyone else.) The craftsmen, as mentioned earlier, shoe this flea. Miraculously it is

19 Ibid, p. 547
20 Ibid, p. 548
done with only natural talent and no machinery to help. However this exercise is not merely futile, it proves disastrous to the flea, as its intricate mechanism is spoilt and it can no longer dance, because the craftsmen are uneducated in the laws of physics.

The next part of the tale takes place in England where the cross-eyed, left-handed craftsman is sent as an example of the superior Russian workman. He had made the nails which held the shoes in place. The Russian Emperor is engaging in a game of one-upmanship with the English, and so the fact that it is the left-handed craftsman who is sent there is also significant. Left-handed people were often thought to be clumsy and awkward. In many cultures left-handedness, and being cross-eyed carried great social stigma. With his disadvantages, the Russian’s innate skill in producing such fine work – the nails for flea’s shoes – is incredible, which strengthens the Russian case for superiority.

The left-handed craftsman is also sent as the typical Russian ‘little man.’ He is a simple peasant, whose name we are not told. We learn that he has, in addition to his marvellous inherent talent, a strong sense of familial loyalty and patriotism, and is yet stifled by the backward societal conditions into which he was born. As discussed earlier, nineteenth-century Russian national identity is based upon the idea of the peasant as the national figure. The peasantry was believed to retain all that was typically ‘Russian,’ and untainted by the foreign customs which the nobility had embraced. Thus for Leskov to have a typical Russian peasant as his central character is to emphasise the innocent, natural humanity which was being rediscovered in the peasantry. Leskov’s peasant craftsman, however, lacks the Englishmen’s refined social skills and detailed education. This lack of education and training shown here,
coupled with the Russian reliance on religious books and their faith, as discussed above, highlights the comparative economic backwardness of his society. “Оставайтесь у нас, мы вам большую образованность передадим, и из вас удивительный мастер выйдет.” 21 (Stay with us; we’ll make a highly educated man of you and you will become quite an accomplished craftsman.) The English assume their superiority in this area, as it is only with the education that they can provide that the craftsman can achieve commercial viability, which, from their point of view is the ultimate success.

The story is told by a skaz narrator who appears by his level of speech and his often comical ignorance to be of a low social class 22. Nevertheless the use of such a technique allows for serious social commentary to be disguised within the substandard speech of an uneducated narrator. 23 To show how proficient they are, the English take the craftsman on a tour of the factories and sawmills. Rather than studying the machinery of industry, the craftsman takes a great interest in the way the workmen live and work. In the English factory, the differences between the individual human rights of the two countries are revealed. Disguised as the narrator’s matter-of-fact reporting of the craftsman’s feelings, the following passage is also a commentary on Russian society:

Он смотрел все их производство: и металлические фабрики и мыльные заводы, и все хозяйственны порядки их ему очень нравились, особенно насчет рабочего содержания. Всякий работник у них постоянно в сытости, одет не в обрывах, а на каждом способный тужурный жилет, обут в толстые щиглеты с железными набалдашниками, чтобы нигде ноги не на что не напороть; работает

21 Ibid, p. 562
23 Ibid, p. 68
He c 6 ohjiom a 6 obyneHHeM h HMeeT cebemni. (He saw all their factories, their machine shops and their soap factories and their sawmills. He liked the way they did things very much, but he especially liked the way their workers lived. Every one of their workers had enough to eat and he did not dress in rags, but wore a good, warm jacket and thick leather, iron-shod boots, so as not to injure his feet on anything; he did not do his work because of a thrashing, but because he had been taught and knew what he was doing.)

The matter-of-factness with which the skaz narrator represents the left-handed craftsman’s feelings towards what he experiences in England has a two-fold purpose. It is an indictment of Russia’s backward living conditions, but at the same time it is a celebration of the Russian craftsman’s talents in producing such work in spite of the highly unfavourable conditions in which he lives. This suggests that there is an inherent genius in the Russian people. The text assumes that the reader is familiar with the value judgements it creates. The narrator describes the English people’s acknowledged technological and social superiority and in doing so intimates the existence of adverse social conditions in Russia experienced by the craftsman and the implied reader. This commentary alone suggests the abject poverty in which the Russian worker lived. We have already been told of the conditions in which the craftsman and his colleagues worked:

Сошлись они все трое в один домик к левше, двери заперли, ставни в окнах закрыли ... День, два, три сидят и никауда не выходят ... кришу сняли, ... у мастеров в их тесной хороминке от безотдышиной работы в воздухе такая потная спираль сделалась, что непривычному человеку с свежего поветрия и одного раза нельзя было отдохнуть.26 (The trio went into the house of the left-handed craftsman, locked the door and closed the shutters over the windows ... They stayed in there one, two, three days and never left ... They pulled the roof off ... the atmosphere in the craftsmen’s little room was so thick that it rushed out in a spiral of foul air, and those outside not used to it were nearly unable to breathe.)

24 N. Leskov, op. cit., p. 564
25 Ibid, p. 550
26 Ibid, p. 553
As much as the left-handed craftsman is enamoured with the working conditions of the English, which are a far cry from his own primitive, malodorous house, the narrator’s description of the factory sounds artificial and manipulative and makes his point rather too heavily. It is too organised, clean and well-ordered to be real. The narrator employs similar stereotypes of England to those which I have already discussed in Chapter Three. The workplace is very orderly and well arranged. It is very efficient but it is sterile and overly regimented:

Перед каждым на виду висит дольбица умножения а под рукую стирабельная дочечка: всё, что мастер делает,— на дольбицу смотрит и с понятием сверяет, а потом на дочечке одно пишет, другое стирает и в аккурат сводит: что на цифрьях написано, то и наделе выходит.27 (In front of each worker hangs a multiplication table and by his hand, there is a slate. Whatever the master does, he looks at the table with understanding, then one person writes something on his slate, the other cleans it off and thus everything is correct. What was written in the figures comes out in the work later.)

Society as a whole is an extension of this artificial, mechanical workplace: “A придет праздник, соберутся по-парочке, возьмут в руки по наложке и идут гулять чинно-благородно, как следует.”28 (And whenever there was a holiday, they would gather in pairs, take a walking stick in their hands and go for a walk, decorously and nobly, as was proper.) This passage shows the English factory workers as fully integrated, respectable members of English society, a status which the left-handed craftsman and his compatriots are denied at home. The workers all follow conventionally prescribed patterns of social behaviour: these accounts in ‘Levsha’, and also those we read in ‘Iazvitel’nyi’, draw upon well-established stereotypes in Russian discourse. The use of such generalised images further cements

27 Ibid, p. 564
28 Ibid, p. 564
the impression of English society in the Russian imagination. In addition, this description has a comic effect, similar to the ones we see in Zamiatin’s work; it appears as though the English workers are mass-produced, identical members of society. The narrator is ridiculing the strict conformity of this society even whilst he is acknowledging its social and technological superiority. Beyond producing an alienating account of life in England, the texts also indicate modernity. The idealisation of the simple peasant for innate talents and simple virtues is a means of expressing doubts about the erosion of traditional social and religious forms in the new, technologically advanced world. The end of ‘Levsha’ is a lament for the olden times in Russia. The tale reminisces about the first half of the nineteenth century, to the early years of Nicholas I’s reign in the mid 1820s. It makes the case that this was an era of greater spontaneity and natural talent, for the genius of such craftsmen as the left-hander. The onset of modernity and the industrial age in Russia has seen the mass-producing machine supersede such inherent talent as that of the left-handed craftsman:

Таких мастеров, как баснословный левша, теперь, разумеется, уже нет в Туле: машины сравняли неравенство талантов и дарований, и гений не рвется в борьбе против прилежания и аккуратности. Благоприятствуя возвышению заработка, машины не благоприятствуют артистической удачи, которая иногда превосходила меру, вдохновляя народную фантазию к сочинению подобных нынешней баснословных легенд. Рабочие, конечно, умеют ценить выгоды, доставляемые им практическими приспособлениями механической науки, но о прежней стариине они вспоминают с гордостью и любовью. Это их эпос, и притом с очень "человечиной душою".29 (Such craftsmen as the legendary left-handed craftsman can no longer be found in Tula. Machines have bridged the gap between natural talents and endowments. Genius cannot be expected to compete with application and accuracy. Whilst favouring an increase in salaries, machines do not encourage the artistic boldness that sometimes broke through the realms of possibility, inspiring the popular imagination

29 Ibid, pp. 569-570
to write similar fantastical legends as this. The workers, of course, value the benefits given to them by the practical devices of science, but they remember the past with pride and love. This is their epic literature, and one with a very 'human soul' too.)

Hatred of the machine is clearly a part of the anti-British set of images as the vast majority of machinery in the nineteenth century originated from Britain. Technological advancement entailed pressure to move towards a capitalist economic structure and away from the land-locked, self-keeping system employed in Russia. The narrator talks in abstractions of 'любовь' (love) and 'гордость' (pride) which lead to generalisations, rather than praising the specific features of individuals. He extols the past, using points of reference without probing the particulars responsible for this by-gone greatness, in order to gloss over any negatives attributable to the old fashioned, innate ways.

The 'Russian soul' is personified in the cross-eyed, left-handed artisan, a common man and everyday worker who transcends the primitive conditions into which he is born by virtue of his talent. It is this spirit which Leskov implies is lacking in England's mechanised society. The representation of the human soul falling victim to mechanisation and technology is familiar also to readers of other European literatures, as well as to Dostoevskii. In his Zapiski iz podpol'ia (Notes From the Underground) Dostoevskii uses the image of the Crystal Palace, the building that housed the Great Exhibition of 1851 in London, as the symbol of a disastrous, soulless materialism and the loss of any sense of human values. The Great Exhibition in 1851 was the first large international display of achievements in manufacturing, inventions, works of art. It was also a showcase of British manufacturing supremacy. Pride of place in the exhibition was given to the goods brought from the various parts of the British
Empire,\textsuperscript{30} showing off the exportation of British culture to disparate parts of the world.

The Crystal Palace is a familiar symbol to readers of nineteenth-century Russian literature, as it is also used by Nikolai Chernyshevskii in his \textit{Chto delat’? (What is to be Done?)}\textsuperscript{1} Dostoevskii himself had also used the Crystal Palace previously in his \textit{Zimnie zametki o letnykh vpetchatleniakh} in which he described London in a chapter entitled ‘Baal.’\textsuperscript{31} The symbol of the Crystal Palace in the works of these two writers draws upon the ambivalent views of England in Russian discourse. For Chernyshevskii, the Crystal Palace represents scientific progress in the form of a rationalistic utopia that is wholly beneficial for humanity. On the other hand, for Dostoevskii, it gives a terrifying vision of a future utopia in which the individual has been lost.\textsuperscript{32} In its place comes the worshipping of materialist values coupled with a complete lack of human freedom.\textsuperscript{33}

Dostoevskii’s travel notes were intended as a forum through which he could articulate his views on human nature, culture and society and the question of Russia and the West. This is in keeping with the tradition of Russian travel writing.\textsuperscript{34} Dostoevskii was unable to speak any English.\textsuperscript{35} He spent a total of five days in

\textsuperscript{30} J. Davis, \textit{The Great Exhibition}, (Stroud: Sutton Publishing Ltd., 1999), p. 185
\textsuperscript{31} Naming the chapter after the ‘false god of the flesh’ has the effect of reinforcing Dostoevskii’s view that London in particular had capitulated to materialism at the expense of its human values. See J. Frank, ‘Dostoevsky: The Encounter with Europe’, \textit{(Russian Review}: Vol. 22, No. 3, 1963), pp. 237-252
\textsuperscript{32} For an examination of the conflicting visions of the Crystal Palace in Dostoevskii and Chernyshevskii see V. Serdiuchenko, ‘Futureologiia Dostoevskogo i Chernishevskogo’, \textit{(Voprosy Literatury, Mai-Jun’ 2001)}, pp. 66-84; see also D. Offord, ‘Dostoevsky and Chernyshevsky,’ \textit{(The Slavonic and Eastern European Review}, Vol. 57, No. 4, 1979), pp. 509-530
\textsuperscript{35} D. Offord, (2003), op. cit., p. 203
London, from which he produced his notes on Victorian life. London, to Dostoevskii, is imbued with the spirit of capitalism and the bourgeoisie and as an increasingly more secular and less spiritual world. It is worth noting that Dostoevskii’s imagery has some resemblance to Karamzin’s London in his *Pis’ma*, and especially to the soulless London of Goncharov’s *Fregat “Pallada.”* Dostoevskii represents the triumphant and secular building of the Crystal Palace as the symbol of all the materialist values he abhors. The image of the Palace is repugnant to him even as it captivates and intrigues him. It encapsulates his feelings about London, and Western culture in general. He describes it in terms of an apocalyptic end to humanity, as he knows it:

Da, выставка поразительна. Вы чувствуете страшную силу, которая соединила тут всех этих бесчисленных людей, пришедших со всего мира, в единое стадо; вы сознаете исполинскую мысль; вы чувствуете, что тут что-то уже достигнуто, что тут победа, торжество. Вы даже как будто начинаете бояться чего-то. Как бы вы ни были независимы, но вам отчего-то становится страшно. Уж не это ли, в самом деле, достигнутый идеал? - думаете вы; - не конец ли тут? не это ли уж и в самом деле, "единое стадо". Не придется ли принять это, и в самом деле, за полную правду и занеметь окончательно?36 (Yes, the exposition is striking. You feel a terrible force that has united all these people here, who come from all over the world, into a single herd; you become aware of a gigantic idea; you feel that here something has already been achieved, that here there is Victory and triumph. You even begin to be afraid of something. No matter how independent you might be, for some reason you become terrified. ‘Hasn’t the ideal in fact been achieved here?’ you think. ‘Isn’t this the ultimate, isn’t it in fact the ‘one fold’? Isn’t it in fact the necessary to accept this as the truth fulfilled and grow dumb once and for all?37)

To Dostoevskii, as Katz writes, “the Crystal Palace was more than a building – it represented an idea.”38 Dostoevskii is drawn, like so many other visitors, to the

---

36 F. Dostoevskii, *Zimnie zametki o letnykh vпечатлениях*, op. cit., p. 416
38 M. Katz, op. cit., pp. 70-72
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Crystal Palace exhibition, yet to him it represents the same downfall of spontaneity as the machine does to Leskov in ‘Levsha’. It is, in his opinion, a temple worshipping the false God of the flesh which deeply shocks Dostoevskii the publicist. This view is expounded further in his fiction, specifically in Zapiski iz podpol’ia. This story is a direct assault on Chernyshevskii’s Chto delat’ in which the Crystal Palace is alluded to as a Utopia which provides a radiant future where people are completely free to do as they please. The differing perspectives of Dostoevskii and Chernyshevskii regarding the Crystal Palace symbolise the contradictory visions of the West, and of modernity in Russian thought. The defence of individualism and human spirituality coincided with the desire for the international prestige and technological achievements of the British that the Exhibition showcased.

The scale and spread of the British Empire by the time of the Exhibition was such that its influence could be felt in almost every part of the world. We have by now examined the Russian literary images of Britain’s technological prowess, set either in England or in Russia. We shall now move on to the images of the British Empire, and the exportation of English culture in Russian literary representation. The exporting of English mores is taken to task by Tolstoi in ‘Liutsern’. The story resonates with many impressions of Russian literary discourse’s production of England. The action takes place in Lucerne, where the English characters and the Russian narrator are all fellow residents in a hotel. The short story is semi-autobiographical as it is ostensibly

---

39 Ibid, p. 70
based upon an incident which Tolstoi himself witnessed.\textsuperscript{41} It is, however, Tolstoi’s persona, Prince Nekhliudov, a wealthy Russian nobleman, who is familiar to readers from Tolstoi’s earlier tales, from \textit{Childhood and Youth} onwards who narrates.\textsuperscript{42} The use of this character allows Tolstoi the freedom from writing a story which is strictly autobiographical. In using a persona which is already familiar to readers of Tolstoi and whose status is already known, Tolstoi is freed from having to give the narrator a biography.

The story contains several themes which are consistent in Russian literary images of the English abroad. The English are represented primarily through external characterisation, through descriptions of their dress and behaviour. In contrast, the narrator expresses his thoughts and feelings. Nekhliudov draws implicit contrasts between himself and them, and is at pains to distance himself from them. Nevertheless he shares some of their characteristics as a rich, Westernised nobleman who mixes in the highest circles of society and is staying in the same hotel. He argues that the people are constrained by being overly \textit{comme il faut}, and he finds the English ‘conformity’ they bring to this place stifling. The exportation of English values is persistent in Russian criticism of British colonialism. The theme of ‘nature’, i.e. cultural ‘authenticity’ identified with the past, versus modernity is prevalent in the story. Tolstoi’s narrator consistently laments that English-style civilisation - at odds with Nature - spoils beauty, spontaneity, simplicity:

Великолепный пятиэтажный дом Швецергофа построен недавно на набережной, над самым озером, на том самом месте, где в старину был деревянный, крытый, извилистый мост, с часами на углах и

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid, p. 385
The magnificent five-storey Schweizerhof Hotel has been recently built on the quay, close to the lake at the very place where of old there was a crooked, covered bridge with chapels at its corners and carvings on its beams. Now, thanks to the enormous influx of English people, their needs, their tastes and their money, the old bridge has been torn down and a granite quay, as straight as a stick, erected, on which straight, rectangular, five-storied houses have been built, in front of which two rows of little lindens with stakes fastened to them have been planted between which the usual small green benches have been placed.)

The depressing regimentation of the buildings and landscape matches the conformity of the English visitors themselves. Donna Tussing Orwen argues that “rational individualism makes each Englishman an island unto himself, with nothing connecting him to the inner life of any other individual.”44 The dinners are as mechanically organised as the landscape, and just as isolating to Nekhluiudov:

Как вообще в Швейцарии, большая часть гостей - англичане, и потому главные черты общего стола - строгое, законом признанное приличие, несочетаемость, основанные не на гордости, но на отсутствии потребности сближения, и одинокое довольство в удобном и приятном удовлетворении своих потребностей.45 (As usual in Switzerland, the majority of the visitors are English and therefore the chief characteristic of the common table was the strict decorum they regard as an obligation - a reserve not based on pride but on the absence of any necessity for social discourse and on solitary contentment with the comfortable and agreeable satisfaction of their requirements.)

---

44 D. Tussing Orwin, Tolstoy’s Art and Thought, 1847 – 1880, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 69 She argues that the ‘natural’ versus ‘civilised’ dichotomy in ‘Liutsem’ is in keeping with Tolstoi’s overall appreciation of nature and the soul. The music in ‘Liutsem’ is able to express the feelings of freedom and well being that nature induces which had been stifled by the ‘civilised’ English.
45 L. Tolstoi, op. cit., p. 43
Nekhliudov distances himself from the English people further when listening an itinerant singer. He appreciates the simple music as it draws him out of the despondency induced by the English at dinner: "Вместо усталости, рассеянья, равнодушия ко всему на свете, которые я испытывал за минуту перед этим, я вдруг почувствовал потребность любви, полноту надежды и беспричинную радость жизни." 46 (In place of the weariness, dullness, and indifference towards everything in the world that I had felt a moment before, I suddenly experienced a need for love, a fullness of hope, and a spontaneous joy in life.) Everybody present seemed to enjoy the music; the pleasure they appear to experience would tend to prove that they are not philistines: "Все, казалось, испытывали то же самое чувство, которое испытывал и я." 47 (They all seemed to experience the same sensation that I did.) But the narrator castigates them for their inhumanity towards the peasant singer. The English merely laugh in the singer's face when he holds out his hat: "[И]з этих сотни блестящие одетых людей, столпившихся слушать его, не один не бросил ему копейки." 48 (Not one of those hundreds of brilliantly dressed people who had come to see him threw him a single penny.) This behaviour incenses the narrator who launches into a tirade against them:

И всем им, казалось, так было спокойно, удобно, чисто и легко жить на свете, такое в их движениях и лицах выражалось равнодушие ко всякой чужой жизни ... и что все это должно быть, и что на все это имеют полное право, - что я вдруг невольно противопоставил им странствующего певца, который, устальный, может быть, голодный, с стыдом убегал теперь от смеющейся толпы. 49 (To all of them life in this world was so comfortable, clean, and easy; their movements and faces expressed such indifference to any other kind of life other than their own ... that it all must be so, and that they have a right to it all, that I

---

46 Ibid, p. 56
47 Ibid, p. 56
48 Ibid, p. 51
49 Ibid, p. 53
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involuntarily contrasted them with the vagrant singer who, tired and perhaps hungry, was escaping shamed from the laughing crowd.)

In an attempt to distance himself from the English attitude towards the peasant singer, Nekhliudov runs after him to take him for a drink in the hotel. In doing so, he alienates himself from the upper-class guests. They are incensed that he should bring an itinerant into a restaurant where he clearly does not belong, and at Nekhliudov's insistence that the singer drink with him in the finest bar. This episode highlights yet again the identity crisis of Russia's cultured elite. They were self-conscious and somewhat ill at ease amongst Western Europeans as they were unsure as to their status. Like Nekhliudov, they did not share the values epitomised by the English in Tolstoi's tale. However, they were also estranged from the peasant culture of their narod. This is borne out by Nekhliudov's attempts which simply embarrass the singer who is uncomfortable in these surroundings: "Певец, прежде отказавшийся от вина, теперь торопливо допил все, что оставалось в бутылке, с тем чтобы только поскорее выбраться отсюда."50 (Before he had refused the wine, now he hastened to empty the bottle in order to get away as soon as possible.) Thus, Nekhliudov's attempts to reconcile the two disparate social classes failed.

The story ends with a diatribe by the narrator on the English and their modernised society which values material and social advancement over simple humanity. Here again, we can see the Russian attempt to defend human spirituality over the encroaching materialistic values epitomised by the English hotel guests. This is a denunciation of modernity and a form of anti-Westernism. The scenes of beauty and nature are merely interludes, as is the singing of the traveller. They are the exceptions

50 Ibid, p. 54
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to the norm which interrupt the daily life of this place. Everything subsequently
reverts to normal, back to the prescribed set routines valued by ‘civilisation’. It is
particularly prevalent in Switzerland, which has been overrun by the English and their
values and “где цивилизация, свобода и равнство доведены до высшей степени,
где собираются путешествующие, самые цивилизованные люди самых
цивилизованных наций.”51 (where civilisation, liberty and equality have been
brought to the highest point, and where the most civilised travellers from the most
civilised nations congregate.) The narrator implies that civilised society and humanity
are mutually exclusive in this world: “Но как вы, дети свободного, человечного
народа, вы, христиане, вы, просто люди, на чистое наслаждение, которое вам
dоставил несчастный просящий человек, ответили холодностью и
насмешкой?”52 (How could you, children of a free, humane nation, as Christians or
simply as human beings, respond with coldness and ridicule to the pleasure afforded
to you by an unfortunate beggar?) He highlights the hypocrisy of the nation whose
representatives seem unable to extend acts of kindness and generosity towards an
itinerant beggar, but advocate charity through the rhetoric of their Establishment:

Отчего эти развитые, гуманные люди, способные в общем на
всякое честное, гуманное дело не имеют человеческого
сердечного чувства на личное доброе дело? Отчего эти люди, в
своих палатах, митингах и обществах горячо заботящиеся о
состоянии безбрачных китайцев в Индии, о распространении
христианства и образования в Африке, о составлении обществ
исправления всего человечества, не находят в душе своей
простого первобытного чувства человека к человеку? (Why
have these developed humane people who collectively are capable
of any honourable and humane action, no inclination to perform a
kindly personal action? Why do these people – who in their
parliaments, meetings and societies are warmly concerned about the
condition of the celibate Chinese in India, about propagating

51 Ibid, p. 67
52 Ibid, p. 66
Christianity and education in Africa, about the establishment of societies for the betterment of the whole human race – not find in their souls the simple elemental feeling of human sympathy?)

Even though English hypocrisy is singled out, 'Liutsern' projects a criticism of Western society in general, in the form of a condemnation of the brutalities of colonialism, which, the narrator implies is commonplace in the newspapers and books of the time. Tolstoi rejects the Western notions that its materialist society equalled 'progress.' This also alludes to the concept that wealth and humanity are incompatible:

Что англичане убили еще тысячу китайцев за то, что китайцы ничего не покупают на деньги, а их край поглощает звонкую монету; что французы убили еще тысячу кабилов за то, что хлеб хорошо роится в Африке и что постоянная война полезна для формирования войск; что турецкий посланник в Неаполе неможет быть жил, и что император Наполеон гуляет пешком в Пломбире и печатно уверяет народ, что он царствует только по воле всего народа – это все слова, скрывающие или показывающие давно известное... (That the English have killed another thousand Chinamen because the Chinese buy nothing for money even as their country absorbs metal coins, that the French have killed another thousand Arabs because corn grows easily in Africa and constant warfare is useful for training armies; that the Turkish Ambassador in Naples must not be a Yid, and that the Emperor Napoleon walks on foot at Plombieres and assures the people in print that he reigns only by the will of the whole nation - these are words that conceal or reveal what has long been known.)

This passage rearticulates criticism of Western colonialism apparent in Russian thought, within which the Russian subject’s own historical position is silent. The literature of the day, beginning with Goncharov’s Fregat “Pallada”, carries this type of ideological position. The novel, as we discussed before, is a series of chapters.

53 Greenwood argues that there is an ‘ardently moralistic element’ to ‘Liutsern’ which transcends the world of journalism and letters. He argues that Tolstoi appears disillusioned with his fellow man as he begins to question the notion of ‘progress’ in the moral sphere. See E. Greenwood, Tolstoy: The Comprehensive Vision, op. cit., pp. 54-56

54 Ibid, p. 52

55 L. Tolstoi, op. cit., p. 67
about the voyage of the Frigate ‘Pallada’ to various countries on its mission to Japan. No matter which country or culture the narrator is describing, the normative standard throughout the text is represented by Russia. Ehre writes that he was able to find something comparable “to a Russian estate, a street in Petersburg … Even when what he saw was authentically different Goncharov often attempted to project upon it qualities of the familiar – if only in his imagination.” This affords the traveller the opportunity to define his own sense of self through the prism of disparate cultures and traditions. In addition to the voyage aboard the frigate, the recurring central topos of the novel is the Englishman, “in a black frock coat, round hat, white vest, and with an umbrella in his hand”, present in Africa and China, representing his ever-expanding civilisation.

We have already seen that Goncharov’s narrator was clearly no Anglophile. His descriptions of English society are highly critical of strict conformity, and of the perceived lack of vivacity he observed in London. Such impressions clearly inform his depiction of the English in his subsequent chapters, in particular in the longest one on South Africa. The use of stereotyped images to describe the Englishmen in the towns hints at the narrator’s detachment from them: “Англичанин – барин здесь, кто бы он ни был: всегда изысканно одетый, холодно, с пренебрежением отдает он приказания черному.” (The Englishman, whoever he may be is a gentleman here; he is always dressed with refinement; he is aloof and he gives orders to a black disdainfully.) Similarly, descriptions of the towns are punctuated with comments that

“Город чисто английский” (it is a typical English town), or “как в Англии” (just

---

56 M Ehre, op. cit., p. 151
57 Quoted in Ibid, p. 147
58 H. Mondry, op. cit., p. 75
59 E. Krasnoshchekova, op. cit., p. 143
60 I. Goncharov, op. cit., p. 107
like in England). The narrator tells us that they have even imported the modern
amenities including running water systems, just like at home. He also points out that
"[a]нгличане ввели свою систему сборов..."61 (The English have brought their
system of charges). Everything has been imported to recreate England in this colony.
There are of course unfavourable comments suggesting a lack of imagination, and that
the English have exported their culture wholly to what used to be a pristine, beautiful
and ‘natural’ land:

There are of course unfavourable comments suggesting a lack of imagination, and that
the English have exported their culture wholly to what used to be a pristine, beautiful
and ‘natural’ land:

Я пристально всматривался в физиономию города: та же Англия, те
же узенькие, высокие английские дома, крытые аспидом и
черепицей, в два, редкие в три этажа, ... На каждом шагу бросаются в
глаза богатые магазины сукон, полотен, материй, часов, плант, -
много портных и ювелиров, словом – это уголок Англии.62 (I stared
intently at the features of the town; the same England, the same rather
narrow tall English houses, with slates and tiled roofs, two storied, and
occasionally three. ... At every step rich shops selling cloths, linens,
materials, clocks, hats – many tailors and jewelers. In a word, it is a little
corner of England.)

The narrator – a critic of the petty, dull exportation of English conformity, -
admires the industriousness of the English here. The way in which the English work
here suggests that it is similar to home. They work in a variety of roles and yet still
manage to keep the air of superiority to which they are accustomed. This is how the
narrator describes the colonisers:

Англичанин сидит в обширной своей конторе, или в магазине, или на
бирже, хлопочет на пристани, он строитель, инженер, плантатор,
чиновник, он распоряжается, управляет, работает, он же едет в
карете, верхом, наслаждается прохладой на балконе своей виллы,
причащая под тень виноградника.63 (The Englishman ... sits in his
spacious office or in his shop or in the Commercial Exchange. He bustles
about on the quay. He is a builder, engineer, planter or bureaucrat. He
gives orders, arranges, does his work, and then he rides in his carriage or

---

61 Ibid, op. cit., p. 108
62 Ibid, p. 106
63 Ibid, p. 107
on horseback. He enjoys the cool breeze on the balcony of his villa hidden in the shade of a vineyard.)

The English in South Africa represent the successful spread of their modern empire, which Goncharov’s writing contrasts predominantly to the fading Boer colony. “[О]статки голландского владычества редки. Я почти не видел голландцев в Капстаге ...”64 (The remains of Dutch authority are scarce. I scarcely saw any Dutch in Cape Town.) Henrietta Mondry has argued that Goncharov creates a typology of the two colonial nations in the Cape, the English and the Boers. This typology, she argues, relates to what has become known as the ‘Oblomov-Stolz’ dichotomy in Russian identity. “The essence of the antithetical disposition of these characters lies in the symbolic split of the Russian national psyche into the Eastern, mystical and inactive (Oblomov) and the Western, pragmatic and industrious (Stolz).”65 Goncharov describes the differences between the two in terms of their styles of byt.66 The English are categorised by a predilection for modern furniture and all available forms of comfort; their choice of paintings in their homes, depicting horse races, symbolises that they are flourishing here. This is contrasted with the patriarchal Dutch lifestyle with houses containing old-fashioned furniture and pictures of kings and queens:

На ... картинках представлена скачка с препятствиями: лопади вверх ногами, люди по горло в воде. По этим картинкам я заключил, не видав еще хозяев, что гостиниця английская. У голландцев скачек не изображается, зато везде увидишь охоту за тиграми и лисицами, потом потреты королей и королев. ... Вообще можно различать английские и голландские гостицы с первого взгляда. У англичан везде виден комфорт или претензия на него, у голландцев — патриархальность, проявляющаяся в стариной, почерневшей от времени, но чисто содержащей мебели ...67 (The picture is of a steeplechase: horses are head-over-heels and people are up to their necks

64 Ibid, p.106
65 H. Mondry, op. cit., p.73
66 Ibid, p. 73
67 I. Goncharov, op. cit., p. 99
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in water. According to these pictures I concluded, without having seen the hotelkeeper yet, that the hotel is English. The Dutch do not paint steeplechases – instead you see everywhere tiger-hunts and fox-hunts and portraits of kings and queens. ... You can generally distinguish hotels as English or Dutch at the first glance. The English [prize] comfort or the pretension of it. The Dutch are patriarchal. This is manifest in ancient but well-preserved furniture blackened with time ...

Although Mondry argues that Goncharov’s narrator cannot ignore the English spirit of industrialism, she emphasises that his nostalgia for the old way of life is represented by the Boers. Certainly, he is dismissive of English hotels, and finds them disagreeable. He continually complains about the meals they serve. We read that: “английский обед смотрит сном хоть кого.”68 (An English dinner would exhaust anybody.) The narrator always points out whether he is in an English or a Dutch hotel.

“Нетрудно было догадаться, что хозяева были англичане: мебель новая, все свежо и везде признаки комфорта.”69 (It was not hard to guess that the proprietors were English. The furniture was new, everything was fresh, and everywhere had the signs of [a regard for] comfort.) The rooms described are the main living rooms which guests would see upon arrival. But then the ‘English’ bedrooms, are never to his satisfaction. “В комнатах пахло сыростью. ... По стенам даже ползали незнакомые нам насекомые”70 (The rooms smelt damp ... insects unknown to us even crawled along the walls.) This hints at the English fondness of disguising structural weakness by superficial improvements to the surface. This we saw in Mikhailov’s description in his travel narrative of the English obsession with carpets on every floor. In contrast to this disdain, the Dutch inn is given a much more pleasing description and appears to be more like a home than a hotel:

68 Ibid, p. 112
69 Ibid, p. 123
70 Ibid, p. 123
Thus here, the Dutch - unlike the English - look after the ‘substance’ and are not worried about appearances. Also, the Dutch are included here in the Russian ‘I’ that is compared and contrasted with the English ‘other’.  

Combined with this feeling of nostalgia and homeliness, a visit to a Dutch farm in the country reminds the narrator of the heroes of stories he has read and evokes some real animation, which has been lacking in his writings so far:

The narrator’s preference for the Boer over the English is borne out in his remarks on the Anglo-Boer rivalry. “Дед хозяйна и сам он, ... отличались нерасположением к англичанам, которые “наделяли им много зла”, т. е. выкупили черных, ... учредили новый порядок в управлении колонией, провел дороги. .... Англичане

---

71 Ibid, pp. 120-121
72 P. Barta, (2000), op. cit., p. 155
73 I. Goncharov, op. cit., p. 136
(Our host’s grandfather, and he himself, were noted for their aversion to the English, who “had done them a lot of harm.” That is they had bought up the blacks ... they were instituting a new order in the government in the Colony and were laying roads. ... The English had spoilt them [the blacks] and had trained them to be idle.) The inclusion of this conversation, plus the fact that he does not allude to similar comments by an English inhabitant, give away the narrator’s indifference to black people by chastising the English — as the Boers do — for ‘spoiling’ local Africans.

His predilection for the Dutch does not prevent the narrator from complaining that the Europeans, both the English and the Dutch, have driven the natives into hiding in the pursuit of progress and civilisation. He remarks that the only blacks he sees are convicts and servants. However, in his treatment of the natives he is just as dismissive as the Dutch and the English. Despite his ambiguous feelings towards the English and his fascination with the Boers, he adopts a typical European attitude towards the non-white population in the colony. They are not classified as belonging to various tribal groups and made up of individual human beings, but instead he categorises them through generalised, stereotyped descriptions:

По одной дороге с нами шли три черные женщины. ... Все три начали громко хохотать. Не раз случалось мне слышать этот хохот черных женщин. Если пройдёте мимо — ничего; спросите черную красавицу о чем-нибудь, например, о ее имени ... она сорвет, и вслед за ответом раздается хохот и подруг. 

(Three black women were following our path. ... All three began to roar with laughter. It was not the only time I heard that kind of laughter from black women. Just pass them and nothing happens, but ask a black beauty something, for example her name, and she

74 Ibid, p. 139
75 Ibid, pp. 96-97
talks nonsense and after her answer her laughter and that of her friends ring out.)

Later when they are greeted at a hotel by a black man he continues in the same vein with impersonal, clichéd descriptions: “Что у него ни спрашивали или что ни приказывали ему, он прежде всего отвечал смехом и обнаруживал ряд чистейших зубов. Этот смех в привычке негров.”76 (Whatever you asked him or whatever you ordered him to do, he first answered with a laugh, exposing a row of the whitest teeth. This laugh is a habit of the blacks.)

The degradation of the native population through stereotypes and negative images as in Cape Town occurs in the later chapters of Fregat “Pallada”, in which Goncharov makes it clear that the Russian visitors see themselves as enlighteners.77 Although overstating it slightly, Ehre makes a similar point. He argues that the traveller’s (he writes Goncharov’s) views can be summarised as “‘bourgeois’, ‘imperialistic’, and, in its naïve optimism and unquestioning faith in inevitable material and social progress, conventionally ‘nineteenth-century’”78 and that this is the “fullest statement of [Goncharov’s] social views to be found in his writings.”79 Nevertheless, the traveller is dismissive of their hosts in Singapore, Japan and Shanghai. The Singaporeans are greedy and slavishly adopt English mores; they love money as much as the Europeans. The Japanese, Goncharov dismisses as ugly and stupid in appearance, ridiculing their traditional headgear. “Голова вся бритая, как и лицо, только с затылка волосы подняты кверху и зачесаны в узенькую, коротенькую, как будто отрубленную косичку, крепко лежавшую на самой

76 Ibid, p. 123
77 E. Krasnoshchekova, op.cit., pp. 182-183
78 M. Ehre, op. cit., p. 151
79 Ibid, p. 151
makovke. Skолько хлопот за такой хитрой и безобразной причёской!"80 (Their heads and face were clean-shaven. Only the hair on the backs of their heads was pulled upwards and combed into a narrow, short, chopped-off tail lying tight to the crowns of their heads. What a lot of trouble to produce such an intricate and ugly headdress!) Drawing upon Western European colonial discourses about the other, he feminises the Japanese, describing one official as 'resembling an old maid,' and another as 'an unquestionably good aunt.'81 He also classifies the Japanese as "женоподобные"82 (woman-like). The feminising of the other is a strategy of showing cultural dominance over the object of scrutiny. Attaching the attributes of women to people from the East "what is different from and desired by the male European subject."83 It is a means of exoticising the other, showing them as weaker, and thus asserting the dominance and superiority of the Occidentalist subject.

In Singapore, the narrator is disdainful of the Chinese government because of its supposed weakness. He remarks that "[и]звестно, что китайцы — ужасные педанты."84 (It is known that the Chinese are terrible pedants.) But at the same time he sees that they are also downtrodden by the English. He grudgingly admires them, as they are peaceable and submissive. He remarks: "Не знаю, кто из них кого мог бы цивилизовать: не китайцы ли английан своей вежливостью, кратостью, да умением торговать тоже."85 (I do not know which of them could civilise the other.

Perhaps the Chinese could civilise the English with their mildness, politeness — and

80 I. Goncharov, op. cit., p. 219
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their trading ability too.) Although there are significantly fewer references to the
British in Shanghai, Goncharov is as critical of the English here as he was in South
Africa and he does his utmost to distance himself from them. As in South Africa,
Goncharov complains about the meals served by the English: "Утром встали и
пошли ... обедать. Вы не поверите? Как же иначе назвать?"86 (We got up in the
morning and went down to ... dinner. You do not believe me? What else could it be
called?) The English have exported their way of life to Shanghai too and it is as dull
there as Goncharov found it in England. It is regimented and comfortable, but is
lacking 'depth' and the 'natural' spontaneity that Goncharov prizes. In a manner
reminiscent to his observations about the English in South Africa he remarks:
"Всюду, куда забрались англичане, вы найдете чистую комнату, камин с
каменным углем, отличный кусок мяса, херес и портвейн, но не общество. И не
ищите его. Англичане всюду умеют внести свою чопорность, негибкие нравы и
скучу."87 (Where the English have gone to you will find a clean room, a fireplace
with coal, an excellent piece of meat, sherry and port, but society you will not find,
and do not look for it. The English everywhere know how to introduce their stand-
offishness, inflexible ways and boredom.) Goncharov, in addition, complains of the
way the English treat the Chinese, with utter disdain. This is comparable to many
earlier grievances about the English:

Вообще обращение английчан с китайцами, да и с другими, особенно
подвластными им народами, не то чтоб было жестоко, а
повелительно, грубо или холодно-презрительно. ... Они не признают
эти народы за людей, а за какой-то рабочий скот ... Не скрывают
презрения к ним."88 (Generally the behaviour of the English towards the
Chinese and others, especially those people who are subject to them,
although not cruel, is peremptory, rude or coldly contemptuous. ... They

86 Ibid, p. 306
87 Ibid, p. 322
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do not acknowledge these people as human beings, but take them for draught animals ... They do not hide their disdain for them.)

Of course, the Russian narrator does not engage in any sort of introspection as to Russia’s own culpability in treating the inhabitants of their peripheral lands in a similar manner. Similarly the narrator fails to acknowledge that his own stereotyping and ridiculing of the mores of the local inhabitants in the various countries is akin to the British treatment of their subject nations. Russia’s historical and social policies are shrouded in complete silence whilst the text makes the unstated assumption that the Russian perspective stands for the norm-setting views of a generic standard of civilised values. From this perspective the British management of its colonies is lacking. The narrator is indignant at what he sees as English duplicity in denouncing the slave trade whilst permitting the Chinese to slave away in producing opium, from which the English make money: “Это уж – из рук вон – торговая нация!”89 (It is certainly a wretchedly commercial nation!) He is at pains to denounce the greed of the English, seeing it as a substitute for spontaneity. English-style commercialism leads to the sort of sterility which Goncharov portrays as allowing the English to view everything as a commodity, even human lives.

Bunin’s ‘Brat’ia’ (The Brothers) also adopts this as a theme. This story is split into two halves. As a whole it exposes a diseased and moribund civilisation.90 Similarly, Poggioli found that “even exotic backgrounds and tropic settings are used by Bunin for the purpose of expressing […] the cruelty of life and the absurdity of the world.”91 The first half takes place in Ceylon and constitutes a powerful indictment of European

---

89 Ibid, p. 328
colonialism. The story is that of a rickshaw man who transports rich Europeans around and lives an unhappy life before he dies and his rickshaw is taken over by his son. The son runs around at the behest of a rich Englishman before he sees his bride working as a prostitute in the European corner of town, subsequent to which he commits suicide. The second half takes place on a Russian ship which the Englishman has caught to go home. It consists of a conversation between the Englishman and the Russian captain, in which the Englishman denounces the futility of colonialism.

The two halves are joined together and inspired by the epigraph from Sutta-nipata, one of the oldest and most profound books of Buddhist scripture: "Взгляни на братьев, избивающих друг друга. Я хочу говорить о печали." (Look at the brothers, slaying one another. I wish to talk of sorrow.) The first section on the misery of the rickshaw man and his son, the utter uselessness of their lives captures the futility of the colonial experience for humanity. Later, the Englishman’s lament to the Russian captain surmises that the Europeans have lost touch with Nature, and are progressively destroying it wherever they go. Buddhist ideology fuses the two halves of ‘Brat’ia’, as quotations from Buddhist writ punctuate the narrative in both.

The theme of the degeneration of humanity in the pursuit of wealth that informs Tolstoi’s ‘Liuitem’ is a prevalent one in Ivan Bunin’s entire oeuvre, and figures powerfully in ‘Brat’ia’. The colonial civilisation in Ceylon, which is the setting for the first half of the story, is at odds with nature and with the sun which shines brightly:

93 J. Woodward, op. cit., p. 108,
This passage sets the tone from the outset. The narrator alludes to the concept that the colonisers spoil what was beautiful natural territory by building their cities and tempting the locals with material wealth. The commercialism instilled by the colonisers has infected the locals. They participate in the system of trading and bartering, some labouring in the paddy fields, some pearl diving and some even selling their daughters for the use of the Europeans. In the manner of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the narrator articulates the relationship between Society and Nature: the locals gain freedom from constraints when they are move away from the European colonials’ city. The first half of the story contrasts Nature versus the artificiality of the city, and the locals against the English colonisers. The Russianness of the tale pertains predominantly to the viewpoint of the invisible narrator, who takes the side of the ‘simple folk’ – the local indigenous population over the English. Most strikingly, the black skinned natives are contrasted with the English, who are dressed all in white. It is not merely physical descriptions which contrast the English with the Ceylonese. The locals’ hopes and dreams of happiness and love inform the narrative whereas the narrative depicts the English as lacking any human qualities other than those of the slave master. Neither the Englishman, nor the rickshaw boy, have proper

95 I. Bunin, op. cit., p. 263
names. They are personifications of their separate worlds. The descriptions of these two ‘types’ rest upon the contrast of the primitive versus civilisation. The rickshaw men and their compatriots are described alongside images of the environment and the cycle of natural life. They are branded by the Europeans, which the narrator, seems to find normal, and perhaps appropriate: "На левую руку рикша, между плечом и локтем, англичане, нынешние хозяева острова, надевают бляху с номером." (On the rickshaw man’s left arm, between the shoulder and the elbow, the Englishmen, the current rulers of the island, put a badge with a number.)

The narrator’s sympathy with the subaltern underdog of the English is merely rhetorical - his normative gaze exhibits the Orientalist point of view. The native inhabitants are objectified. They are subordinated, in the Russian view, to mere ‘things’. We also see here, again, the tendency to feminise the subaltern. They are made exotic and attributed with traits that are unworthy of a ‘civilised’ human being. “Он был черен, очень худ и невзрачен, похож и на подростка, и на женщину.” (He was black, very thin and unsightly, resembling both a youth and a woman.) They are like branches, and they are the ‘people of the forests’. As children they play in the water, they live amongst the trees and they die, like the rickshaw man and his son, amidst these trees or by the sea. Bunin’s storyteller, however, describes them as ‘savages’, and dismisses them as a physical type. They are compared with animals throughout the story, effectively denying them their humanity: “И опять, как собака, сел рикша …” (And again, like a dog, the rickshaw man squatted down …) They are expendable, more so than horses are to the English: “…лошади плохо переносят

98 I. Bunin, op. cit., p. 263
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The heat in Ceylon is hard for the horses to bear. Every wealthy resident who owns a horse sends it to the mountains for the summer.

The Ceylonese men pull the English around in rickshaws and are beaten with sticks in place of the horses. "Они заменяют лошадей — возят европейцев по городам и окрестностям их" (They switch places with the horses — they carry the Europeans around the towns and their environs.) There is one Russian character who appears very briefly towards the end of the first half, almost as an aside: "Один русский моряк снялся с ними в фотографии и подарил ему карточку." (One Russian seaman had his photograph taken with him and gave him a copy.) He is specifically labelled as a Russian seaman. It is important for the narrator to stipulate his nationality. The Russian’s behaviour differs markedly from that of both the Ceylonese and the English. Being a sailor, his visit to the Island is fleeting, unlike that of the Ceylonese inhabitants and the colonisers, whose city is a permanent fixture. Where the English treat the native islanders as beasts of burden, the Russian is kindly towards the rickshaw man, giving him a copy of the photograph he has taken. A photograph with a ‘native’ is, for a traveller, a souvenir, a novelty item. This has the effect of highlighting the differences between the Russians and the English colonisers who mistreat the indigenous population. Russian discourse, as we have discussed previously, had frequently implied a degree of sympathy with the indigenous population of Western colonies or the lower classes of Western countries. Doubt may arise frequently regarding the sincerity of the sentiment owing to the general lack of such a sympathetic view towards the Russian Establishment’s own ‘underdogs’, at home or in Russian occupied lands.

101 Ibid, p. 263
102 Ibid, p. 269
In contrast to the Ceylonese, the English live in the city, which has all the modern amenities of the West, including teahouses, an apothecary, a barber’s salon and plenty of shops. We see the English colonisers enjoying themselves and playing games. The rickshaw men however are commodities. They are a part of life in this city, merely as labourers, but otherwise they do not exist. They are not integrated into the city life, and have no place there aside from their use as ‘horses.’ The English are as unfamiliar to the rickshaw men as they are to the English. As a representative of a culture which aspired to, yet did not attain, a similar status to that of the European colonisers, the Russian narrator posing as a neutral bystander equates the English and the Ceylonese: “Мимо него шли женщины, пожилые, некрасивые, такие же длиннозубые, как его черная мать.”103 (Women walked past him. Elderly, ugly, as bucktoothed as his black mother.) Where the native inhabitants are made exotic by being compared to animals, or being feminised, the English completely lack individuality.104 They are described as endlessly seeking pleasure and escape from life. The narrator quotes from the Buddha: “Люди постоянно идут на пиршества, на прогулки, на забавы» ... «Вид, звуки, вкус, запахи опьяняют их, — сказал он, — желание обивляет их...”105 (“People are constantly going to feasts, going for walks, having fun — he said — “Sight, sounds, taste and smells intoxicate them.” He said desire surrounds them...)

The physical features of the colonisers echo the sentiments of the Buddha’s words, suggesting that the English are soulless and empty: “У всех вид был полумертвый,

103 Ibid, p. 271
105 I. Bunin, op. cit., p. 271
They all had the appearance of being half-dead, they spoke without moving their lips.) The imagery which surrounds the English is that of death and morbidity, suggesting that they, like the city they have built, are physical manifestations of their moribund culture. Marullo suggests that these colonialist are like 'mummies', because they are wrapped in white and covered in helmets and veils. The Englishman cannot wait to escape the oppressiveness of both the city and the Ceylon climate and ends up leaving aboard a Russian steamship. The viewpoint of the narrator, within which Russia's own status in the world and its colonial aspirations are shrouded in silence, infers the superiority of Russian culture.

This impression bears fruit in the second half of the story on board the Russian ship. Kryzytski dismisses this section of the story as “undramatic, tedious, depressing, with no action and much trivial, random conversation.” However, for our discussion, the conversations which take place aboard the boat are equally as important as, if not more than, the ‘action’ of the first half. The Englishman spends his time talking with the Russian captain about civilisation and colonialism. Goncharov regarded his Russian ship, no matter where in the world it was, as a ‘little corner of Russia.’ It is significant that the conversation takes place on a Russian ship. It is on Russian territory that the Englishman’s self-reflectivity awakens and he identifies the loss of instinct and the degeneracy of European civilisation. Russians elicit finer feelings in the Englishman, alluding to the fact that it takes the Russian soul to make the Englishman admit to the disease of sterility that is rife in his own culture. The two switch back and forth between discussing Europe and England, implying that in this conversation, Europe also stands for England. It is as if it were
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under the influence of Russian spirituality that the Englishman discovers that Europe is now spiritually bankrupt and that the world of commercialism and wealth has overshadowed the spiritual. “Бога, религии в Европе давно уже нет, мы, при всей своей деловитости и жадности, как лед холодны и к жизни, и к смерти.”109

(There has been no God, no religion in Europe for a long time. We, with all our business activity and greed, are cold as ice towards ice towards both life and death.)

In Ceylon the Englishman acts as a typical colonial master and is complicit in the rituals of colonialism as are all his countrymen. He drives around in the rickshaw, prodding his runner, as do all the other Englishmen. He observes the decorous rituals of changing his clothes and freshening up before dinner. On the Russian ship, he becomes conscious that Iris culture has degenerated through its expansion in the name of so-called progress. He, and the English in general, have treated everything as a commodity to be used in the furthering of the Empire, or for personal pleasure, and he is now haunted by this thought:

... В Африке я убивал людей, в Индии, ограбляемой Англией, а значит, отчасти и мною, видел тысячи умирающих с голodu, в Японии покупал девочек в месячные жены, в Китае бил палкой по головам беззащитных обезьяноподобных стариков, на Яве и на Цейлоне до предсмертного хрипа загонял рикш ...110 (In Africa I killed people. In India, which is being despoiled by England, and therefore in part by me, I have seen thousands die from hunger. I bought little girls in Japan to be my wives for a month. In China I beat defenceless, monkey-like old men over the head with a cane. In Java and in Ceylon I drove rickshaw men until I had heard the death rattle in their throats.)

The comments of the Englishman, created by Bunin, reveal an ever-increasing awareness of “the cruel wounds of life and the cynical indifference of the material
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universe,\textsuperscript{111} as the West grows increasingly mechanised. As the cycle of life and death is personified by the rickshaw boy, the Englishman comments upon the rise and fall of nations as a cyclical event. Thus the British Empire will be victorious for a while, and then will succumb to the next winner. This is a rather apocalyptic vision of a future. He describes that when one sees the primitive and sees Nature in places such as Ceylon or India, one can feel man descending into the blackness and inevitable universality. This was, according to Woodward, how Bunin saw the crisis of modernity facing the West and also Russia.\textsuperscript{112}

Russian literary depictions of the English abroad, in whatever country they meet them, are, in the main, critical and show a self-absorbed nation for whom humanity and nature have been superseded by wealth and greed. The Russian authors are at pains to highlight the negative images of the British Empire in an era when it had achieved the status that was unavailable to the Russian Empire. British technological achievement and empire-building successes afforded them a strong sense of superiority. The silence about Russia’s own empire building endeavours which accompanies the image of the British Empire is testament to Russia’s insecurities about its own status vis-à-vis Englishness.

\textsuperscript{111} R. Poggioli, (1957), op. cit., p. 141
\textsuperscript{112} J. Woodward, op. cit., p. 112
CONCLUSION

The concept of 'Englishness', as we have seen, occupied a great deal of space within nineteenth and early twentieth century Russian belles-lettres. England was not the subject of this dissertation. As its title suggests, England is an imagined object, considered here as an entity which is created and moulded within the discursive realm of Russian cultural imagination. In particular, as the preceding chapters discussed, the image of England and the English between 1855 and 1917 provided a significant amount of material for the fashioning of Russian self-identity through comparisons and contrasts with this other, alien, culture. For centuries Russia had been depicted as 'backward' and 'barbarian' by Western European intellectuals, yet it was with the West that the post-Petrine Establishment primarily aimed to identify. Having suffered a disastrous defeat in the Crimean War which exposed its social and technological backwardness, it is little wonder that Russian authors became increasingly concerned with their 'image' when compared with Britain's even at a time when Britain was at its political and economic peak. The exposure of England's vices, I have argued, implies the existence of counterbalancing Russian virtues, thus soothing the sense of injured pride, inferiority and insecurity of many Russians. I argue that authors would have us believe that for England's strict, moribund social conformity there is Russian spirituality and freedom, concepts on which Russia's sense of its self-identity rests.

The dissertation has examined how Russian national identity was implied within literary depictions of England and the English. The eighteenth century Enlightenment-fuelled notions of a universal culture had given way to ideas of each culture's individual uniqueness. This concept was being explored in European literature and
philosophy and it began to take root in Russian belles-lettres in the late eighteenth century. The endeavour of defining Russian uniqueness started informing travel narratives from the late eighteenth century. England was thus made to be a spectacle under the gaze of the Russian traveller whose perspective the text foregrounded as ‘normal’.

In contrast to the majority of largely benign eighteenth century travel writers and diarists who visited and wrote about England, accounts from 1790 to the 1840s came to display a strong sense of ambivalence towards England. This trend became characteristic and predominant to later literary articulations of ‘Englishness’. The travelogues offered Russia’s authors firsthand accounts of England inasmuch as they claimed to present objective data which provided a firm foundation for the later literary stereotypes of ‘Englishness’ and had a lasting impact on Russian attitudes. The diarists and writers of letters represent the first wave of Russian thinkers attempting to determine Russia’s uniqueness vis-à-vis Europe. Gradually this form was replaced by literary prose fiction which highlighted the search for Russia’s self-identity. This theme – addressed more often implicitly rather than overtly - became a major feature of stories and novels throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century.

In nineteenth-century Russian belles-lettres it is difficult to establish a clear distinction between essays, publicistic works and works of fiction as social issues and questions of Russia’s identity and place in the world crossed freely between genres. Although I have concentrated on prose fiction, predominantly the short story or the novel, I have also focussed on relevant non-fictional writings.
In order to construct a picture of how Russian prose between 1855 and 1917 imagined England, and by implication Russianness, I have focussed on how the texts portrayed the themes of religion, social respectability, and also the British Empire. These are not only the main themes of ‘Englishness’ in Russia’s prose, but also the principle points in which the two cultures diverge. In doing so, I have neglected politics. Literary narratives, unlike historical writings, construct a world of human possibilities and opportunities, rather than attempting to ‘reflect’ what has happened. In order to construct an image of a people or culture, writers focus their gaze on ideas about individuals and society.

This is not to say of course that there is no ‘literature engage’. The poem by Ivan Turgenev written in 1876, ‘Kroket v Vindzore’ (‘Croquet At Windsor’), serves as the best illustration. It was written following the suppressed anti-Turkish Bulgarian uprising. Rather than a diatribe against the Turks, the poem is a hefty criticism of the British. This is in keeping with the newspaper reports of the time, which castigated the British government and its Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli, for being decidedly pro-Turkish and unsupportive of fellow Christians.¹ “Толкует нам «Times» как болгарский народ / Ста жертвой турецкого гнева ...”² (The ‘Times’ explains to us how the Bulgarian people / Have become victims of the Turkish wrath) Some of the press in Britain and abroad, and also an element of British public opinion charged Disraeli’s government to support the Bulgarians out of a sense of moral responsibility.

The British government failed to live up to this obligation, and thus Turgenev’s response was penned.

The poem is set at Windsor where the Queen is playing croquet, the sport of the gentrified classes, with her courtiers. It appears to be a supposedly innocent scene with the court and the Queen’s daughter playing a game on the lawns. However, the balls they are using suddenly appear to the Queen to be the heads of innocent Bulgarian women and children slain in the atrocity. Written by one of the outspoken Westernising authors, who had always held the English in great esteem, this piece stands out in Turgenev’s oeuvre for its overtly political nature. It is clearly expressing the anti-British sentiments of the Russian government as well as the people of the 1870s. We see considerable differences from Turgenev’s mocking personification of English customs or deportment in his Anglomaniacs. It is also unlike his amusing depiction of the ‘rabbit-toothed Englishman’ in Nakamune (On the Eve) or the silly affectations of the landlord, Arkadii Pavlych Penochkin in ‘Burmeistr’ (‘Bailiff’) who insists his servants dress in livery and wear white gloves in the English fashion. The Queen in ‘Kroket v Vindzore’ cannot be pitied, unlike Russian literature’s English governesses, for possessing unattractive features and an inability to fit into English society. She embodies the British nation whose government is guilty by offering political support to the Turks:

О ужас! Кровавой струей залит
Весь край королевской одежды!
«Вело это смыть! Я хочу позабыть!
На помощь, британские реки!»
«Нет, Ваше Величество, Вам уж не смыть
Той крови невинной вовеки!»3 (O horror!

3 Ibid, p. 188
Blood soaks the Royal robes!
Wash it away! I wish to forget!
Help, British rivers!"
“No, your Majesty, you will never ever wash out
That innocent blood!”

Inspired by Lewis Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland*, particularly in light of Carroll’s Queen’s favourite saying: “Off with their heads,” this unusually explicit poem nevertheless typifies Russian literature’s representation of England. As we said, Russian authors prefer to present the social and cultural nuances of the English as unreasonable versus the normal, Russian alternative. As Turgenev’s poem reveals, the harsh words about Queen Victoria and her government imply the image of a cynical, amoral, hypocritical England, unlike a compassionate, Christian Russia. Russian imperialist expansion in the South and South East at the expense of the Islamic world remains an eloquent silence in ‘Kroket v Vindzore’, as in other nineteenth and early twentieth-century literary texts. Russia’s literary England helps to create and sustain a mysterious but wonderful Russia. This is the Russia which is portrayed in the well-known and much loved quatrain written by Fedor Tiutchev in 1886:

УМОМ Россию не понять,
Аршином общим не измерить:
У неё особенная стать -
В Россию можно только верить.5
(With the mind Russia cannot be understood,
With the common yardstick she cannot be measured,
She has a particular stature,
In Russia you can only believe.)

\footnote{4 N. Zekulin, op. cit., p. 198
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